Dear All:

A friend of mine sent this to me, and I thought I should share it!

> The following excerpts appeared in the New York Times and on the Zogby
> web site yesterday and juxtaposed, the two had me rolling in the
> aisles.
> > "Seventy-six percent of people who voted for Mr. Gore said they were
> > sure that most Floridians intended to support the vice president. Mr.
> > Bush's supporters were not as certain about votes intended for their
> > candidate; nearly a third of Mr. Bush's own voters said they did not
> > know who Floridians intended to vote for, and nearly 10 percent said
> > voters probably favored Mr. Gore."
> > Elsewhere Zogby Polling noted the following:
> > "Democrats overwhelmingly (68%) said Gore should continue challenging
> > the Florida results compared to 26% who said he should concede. In
> > contrast, 91% of the Republicans and 56% of the Independents said Gore
> > should concede."
> > So 43% of Republicans question whether George W. Bush won in Florida,
> > but 91% of them think that Al Gore should concede!!!!!!! Haven't
> > these people heard about majority rule!!! Guess that's why old Mr.
> > Cheney wanted to keep Nelson Mandela in prison!
> > Regards,
> > Signature deleted
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Tour d'force.
My Methods students can use this too.

Susan

At 10:51 PM 11/30/2000 -0500, you wrote:
>Today's New York Times contains a front page headline story on a major
>survey of interest. At page A30 there is the standard How the Poll Was
>Conducted sidebar. I have long felt that we can do a better job
>explaining our methods to the public, sometimes even making notes on
>what I feel would be better language. So it wasn't that hard to just
>pull the seven paragraphs apart and see how they might be improved.
The suggested revisions below are offered as one person's attempt to do
>a little more than just complain. They are offered in a constructive
>spirit. I am sure that many on aapornet can do much better -- so I
>invite you to. P.S. There is no intention of picking on these two
>publishers; it just happens that I read the Times and care about what's
>in there. Maybe other media use different wording that would be harder
>or easier to improve. It's just an exercise -- but it is hoped a
>useful one!
>
>(Apologies if any of the current text was copied incorrectly.)
>
>CURRENT - The latest New York Times/CBS News Poll is based on telephone
>interviews conducted on Monday and Tuesday with 1,012 adults throughout
>the United States.
>
>SUGGESTED - The latest New York Times/CBS News Poll is based on
>telephone interviews conducted on Monday and Tuesday with 1,012 persons
>age 18 and older residing in the U.S. (excluding Alaska and Hawaii).
>
>COMMENT - There are surely people who do not know how we define adults
>so why not tell them? I may be mistaken about Alaska and Hawaii;
>this is just an impression but if they are not included we should tell
>them. And if they are included, maybe "throughout the U.S." could be
>strengthened.
>
>********

>CURRENT - The sample of telephone exchanges called was randomly
>selected by a computer from a complete list of more than 42,000 active
>residential exchanges across the country.
>
>SUGGESTED - A computer was programmed to select (#) telephone exchanges
>(Area Code + first three digits) at random from the complete set of
>approximately 42,000 all across the country.
>
>COMMENT - Computers don't think yet. Why not tell them how many
>exchanges are in the sample? The current statement may leave some
>readers with the impression that all 42,000 exchanges are in play for
>the interviewing. The expression in (  )s may be unnecessary if most
people know that. I'm not sure.

CURRENT - Within each exchange, random digits were added to form a complete telephone number, thus permitting access to both listed and unlisted numbers. Within each household, one adult was designated by a random procedure to be the respondent for the survey.

SUGGESTED - Within each selected exchange, random digits were added to form ten-digit telephone numbers, thus permitting access to both listed and unlisted numbers. Within each household contacted, one adult was designated by a random procedure to be the respondent for the survey.

COMMENT - Minor edits; the point with "contacted" is to emphasize that a call is made and then some procedures are applied prior to the interview.

CURRENT - The results have been weighted to take account of household size and number of telephone lines into the residence and to adjust for variation in the sample relating to geographic region, sex, race, age and education.

SUGGESTED - Preliminary results have been statistically adjusted to compensate for unequal probabilities of inclusion resulting from differences in the numbers of adults and telephone lines in the household, and to correct for accidental under- or over-sampling of any of five demographically-defined population segments.

COMMENT - I doubt people understand "results have been weighted to take account of..." and yet it sounds like something that must be obvious. Why not tell them more and let those who are challenged by the statement mull it over and most will figure it out. Also, the second part ("adjust for variation") lacks any sense of why one would do that when, I think, it can be made fairly obvious.

CURRENT - In theory, in 19 cases out of 20, the results based on such samples will differ by no more than three percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained by seeking out all American adults.

SUGGESTED - In theory -- and assuming 100 percent cooperation among those contacted, results based on such samples will differ by no more than three percentage points in either direction from what would have been obtained if every person in the country had been interviewed.

COMMENT - The statistical model is based on 100 percent cooperation. How can we talk about a confidence interval without explicit reference to that fact, especially in light of recent trends with response rates? On the second part, why shift over to "seeking out all American adults" when other language is more concrete and may make the point better?
CURRENT - For smaller subgroups, the margin of sampling error is larger.

SUGGESTED - For subgroups where there were fewer than 1,012 interviews, the margin of sampling error is larger than three percent.

COMMENT - "Smaller subgroups" is redundant. Are there "larger subgroups?" and if so does the statement apply to them? Plus many surveys over-sample small population groups of interest, further confusing this point (their smallness is no longer proportionate).

Also, this statement refers to "sampling error" without explicitly or implicitly telling the reader what it is. It is hoped that in the suggested revision reference to "larger than three percent" permits the reader to get a better understanding of this by its connection to the earlier statement.

CURRENT - In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting any survey of public opinion may introduce other sources of error into the poll. Variation in the wording and order of questions, for example, may lead to somewhat different results.

SUGGESTED - In addition to sampling error, the practical difficulties of conducting surveys -- variations in question wording and sequence, and in respondent involvement and comprehension, for example -- may result in additional margins of error that cannot be quantified.

COMMENT - Once again, I don't think we can ignore potential error arising from outright refusals, failure to comprehend, intentionally inaccurate responses (remember "Just lie!") and other problems emanating from respondents. At the same time, we provide some rationale for sticking with the quoted confidence interval by telling the reader that (for all practical purposes) error associated with these other factors cannot be quantified. Some may feel you end up at the same point so just leave it out. But to me this seems better.

SUGGESTED ADDENDUM - The New York Times/CBS News Poll methodology adheres to guidelines published by recognized academic, professional, government and industry experts in the field of survey research.

COMMENT - Perhaps high profile glamorous publishers like those referred to in this example would like to consider their own imprimatur sufficient for public acceptance -- but why not take credit for sincere attempts to conform with best practices? I feel that a statement like this bolsters credibility; perhaps others disagree.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
Interesting suggestions and perhaps an improvement in precision. I do notice, however, that the overall "improved" version is 11% longer than the original (without the addendum) and 23% longer with the addendum, assuming my quick math is correct.

You're suggesting the New York Times write even longer? A frightening thought.

____________________

Barry Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
I have some difficulty with both the treatment of these data in the Times, and (especially) by Andy's friend.

First off, I assume the question relied on here is what was shown in the "complete poll results" posted on the Times website, copied below.

24. Regardless of what the current vote total is, who do you think more voters in Florida INTENDED to vote for, Al Gore or George W. Bush?
This does not break down the results by preference, but the categories are not quite what one might suppose from the prose in the Times summarizing the results. Specifically, use of the words "sure" and "not as certain" add a nuance not originally presented to respondents. Ignoring questions of rounding ("almost one in three" and "almost one in ten" CANNOT sum to 43%), the interpretation converts thinking "more voters intended to vote for Gore" to being "sure Gore won", which I think is a stretch. Beyond that, being consistent, if one shorthands this category in this way for Gore it is only fair to do the same for Bush, in which case the sentence more accurately might end "but the corresponding percentage among Bush backers was only 57%. This is a difference, to be sure, but not quite as stark as is suggested in the original prose. Omitting the distinction for Gore voters between don't know and more intended to vote for Bush compounds the problem.

More egregiously, Andy's friend handles the question as if it were a dichotomy "sure Gore won" vs. "question whether Bush won", and I am uncomfortable with taking the don't know response as treating it so substantively. ("Uncertain of who won" has a connotation different from "question whether A won").

Another problem with the Times piece was that it spoke of Gore and Bush voters. Looking at the complete results posted, the closest I can come to a preference question is the one reported below, which manifestly is NOT "how did you vote". Surely, this item would more closely reflect how one views the contest than would one about original preference. I'm not saying this question is not worth asking, merely that treating it -- as it appears the Times did -- as reported vote is not appropriate.

7. Regardless of whom you supported for President, given all that has happened since the election, who would you rather see become President -- George W. Bush or Al Gore?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gore</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Both (vol.)</th>
<th>Neither (vol.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DK/NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/00 CBS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/00L</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In juxtaposing the Zogby results, Andy's friend goes a good deal further. They are based on self-reported party ID, which group is very definitely not the same as either voters or those who now would like to
see one man or the other become President. So treating the groups as equivalent (attributing the views about probable winner to "Republicans") is really pushing. Even if every Republican voted for Bush (an overstatement) many of those in his column were Independents, who feel rather differently as the Zogby results show. Lastly, even if one COULD equate Republicans and Bush voters, it does not surprise me that someone who claimed not to know who "actually won" in Florida could nonetheless feel that Gore should concede -- certainly it is not as surprising as someone who is "sure" Gore won feeling he should give up. And recalling the original wording noted above, fewer than one in ten of those who want Bush to be President think Gore probably had more votes. That is a good deal less startling.

This may all seem like carping, but it seems to me that the original piece in the Times, not to mention Andy's friend's interpretation, raise some important questions about the reporting and interpretation of survey results.

Don

G. Donald Ferree, Jr.
Associate Director for Public Opinion Research
University of Wisconsin Survey Center
1800 University Avenue
Madison WI 53705
608-263-3744/262-1688 (V) 608-262-8432 (F)
gferree@ssc.wisc.edu

So after I ask about how many hours a week someone works and what type of business it is, I want to ask about breaks in employment.

It seems this is done basically two different ways:

1. "How many weeks during the year does NAME usually work at this job or business? Include paid vacation and sick leave as work time."

2. "During the last year, how many weeks was NAME without a
paid job?"

Which is the better approach to ask--weeks worked, or not worked? And of course one is "usually" while the other is actually.

I am hoping someone among us with an economic bent can offer insight.

My interviewer's gut says the second is simpler, but the first is SIPP, and I have a lot of respect for the utility of that instrument.

Thanks bunches,

Colleen K. Porter  
Project Coordinator  
cporter@hp.ufl.edu  
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109  
UF Department of Health Services Administration  
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009  
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

========================================================================
Date: Fri, 01 Dec 2000 12:18:29 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Operationalizing seasonal employment
References: <3A2788E2.26598.A1C102C@localhost>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Staying with the question format followed by another survey you might want to use for comparison is the best bet, unless there is another, better known or more highly respected survey with a different question format.

Colleen K Porter wrote:
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> > It seems this is done basically two different ways:
> > 1. "How many weeks during the year does NAME usually work at this job or business? Include paid vacation and sick leave as work time."
> > 2. "During the last year, how many weeks was NAME without a paid job?"
> > Which is the better approach to ask--weeks worked, or not worked? And of course one is "usually" while the other is actually.
I am hoping someone among us with an economic bent can offer insight.

My interviewer's gut says the second is simpler, but the first is SIPP, and I have a lot of respect for the utility of that instrument.

Thanks bunches,

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator
cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-009
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

The first three questions in this survey of Palestinians are quite problematic. All they really show is that most Palestinians support the positions of their leaders. Does that mean that they would not support it if their leaders compromised on the issue? The answers would suggest not, but in fact they do not tell us what would likely be the case. Obviously these are highly politicized questions and there is no value for Palestinian to say they would support such a compromise any more than it would be for their leaders to do so except as part of a negotiated agreement.

Further, the first and third questions do not even pose a meaningful tradeoff. They just refer to a vague peace with the only condition mentioned being an unappealing one.

dick halpern wrote:

Hi folks,

While we are swimming in the US Election turmoil here is an interesting and depressing set of findings from a survey recently conducted among Palestinians. The findings suggest that the chances for any kind of Mid-East conflict resolution seem pretty slim. Full results can be obtained from the web site: www.birzeit.edu/dsp/ A full analysis and interpretation is provided.
Sometimes people say it's just the leaders and that the Palestinian man in the street really doesn't support the fight against Israel and the Jews. Here is a recent Palestinian survey that clearly shows the PA tactics being employed have won the full support of the lay people.

--- Birzeit University Development Studies Programme

The Palestinian Intifada and the Peace Process 6-8 November 2000

Time & Date of publication: Evening, 13 November 2000
Date of field research: 6-8 November 2000
Sample size: 1,234 Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip
Number of field researchers: 55 male and female researchers
Number of sample locations: 75 locations
Percentage of error: (+ or - 3%)
Development Studies Programme Telephone: 972-2-2959250 Fax: 2958117
e-mail: dsp@palnet.com - www.birzeit.edu/dsp/

The Palestinian Intifada and the Peace Process - Detailed Results

1. Do you believe that peace is possible between Palestinians and Israelis if East Jerusalem is not the capital of a Palestinian state?
   Yes 5.6 no 92.0 not sure 2.3

2. If East Jerusalem comes under Palestinian sovereignty, will you accept Israeli sovereignty over West Jerusalem? Yes 21.1 no 74.3 not sure 4.6

3. Do you believe that peace is possible between Palestinians and Israelis if Israel does not recognize the right of Palestinian refugees to return? Yes 4.9 no 91.5 not sure 3.5

4. Do you think that there is a real chance that all refugees will return from abroad? Yes 44.4 no 44.5 not sure 11.2

5. Do you think that the peace process that started in 1993 will lead to a sovereign Palestinian state? Yes 33.7 no 50.8 not sure 15.5

6. Have your living conditions improved or deteriorated since the start of the peace process in 1993? Improve 14.3 deteriorate 45.0 no change 40.8

7. Do you think that the Oslo Accords and the subsequent agreements have lead to positive changes that benefit Palestinians? Yes 16.5 fair 24.2 no 54.9 not sure 4.3

8. Do you think that there is a chance for peaceful coexistence between Palestinians and Israelis? Yes 32.6 no 60.2 not sure 7.2

9. Do you support or oppose the continuation of the peace process between Palestinians and Israelis on the basis of the UN resolutions (including 242 and 33)? I support 57.8 I oppose 34.8 not sure 7.4
> 10. If negotiations continue, who should guide and watch over them? 
> USA 3.2 UN 38.9 Others 39.9 not sure 18.0
> 
> 11. Do you think Ehud Barak is a leader the Palestinian leadership 
> can negotiate with? Yes 8.8 no 84.9 not sure 6.3
> 
> 12. Do you support or oppose military attacks against American 
> targets in the region? Support 72.9 oppose 21.7 not sure 5.4
> 
> 13. In the case of establishing an independent Palestinian State, 
> would you view a friendship between a Palestinian and an Israeli 
> positively? Yes 30.7 no 64.8 not sure 4.5 The current Intifada
> 
> 1. Do you support the continuation of the current Intifada? Yes 75.1 
> no 20.6 not sure 4.3
> 
> 2. What means should the intifada adopt if it is to be successful? 
> Peaceful means 24.2 military means 32.2 a combination 38.9 not sure 
> 4.8
> 
> 3. Do you support or oppose the participation of children (under 18 
> in the confrontations? Support 23.5 oppose 74.1 not sure 2.3
> 
> 4. In your opinion, what is the ultimate goal of the current 
> Intifada? 10.1 reinforce the position of Palestinian negotiators 68.3 
> liberation an independent state 16.3 there is no clear goals 5.3
> others ( specify -------------------------- )
> 
> 5. In general, do you think that the current Intifada will contribute 
> positively to achieving Palestinian national goals? Yes 76.7 no 13.8 
> not sure 9.5
> 
> 6. Do you think that the current Intifada will continue for -------? 
> Days 7.8 months 29.8 years 24.4 don't know 38.0
> 
> 7. Do you think that Palestinian society is ready for a long-term and 
> intensifying conflict? Yes 54.9 no 37.7 not sure 7.4
> 
> 8. Do you support or oppose military attacks against Israeli targets 
> at the present time? Support 80.0 oppose 15.1 not sure 4.9
> 
> 9. If you support military attacks, what should be the target of 
> these attacks? 11.7 Support only against military targets 03.0 support 
> only against settlers 33.1 against both military & settlers 00.4 
> against civilians in the 1948 proper 62.3 against all Israelis 
> regardless
> 
> Team leader: Dr. Nader Said. Research team: Ayman Abdul-Majid, Ayoub 
> Mustapha, Maisa Jayousi, Ghassan Abu Hatab, Rania al- Asmar.
> 
> Technical and administrative team: Noran Nassif, Raqia Abu Ghouse, 
> 
> * Translation: Vera Noufal; English Editing: Peter Leckman. Steering 
> Committee: Ramzi Rihan; Vice-President for Planning and Development 
> (Birzeit University) Jamil Hillal:
An alternative approach would be to keep the current NY Times wording but for them to make available to the reader a way to access (via the Internet) a more comprehensive, in depth discussion of the methodology employed. While I find most of James Murphy's suggestions both interesting and constructive, the resulting content with respect to others may be a bit overkill for the majority of readers. The worst thing would be to turn readers off with complicated explanations of statistical methodology that they can't understand without advanced training. This might leave some with the impression that pollsters are engaged in some sort of voodoo science. Some already believe this and I should think we would want to keep that in mind whenever methodological intricacies are discussed with the general public.

Dick Halpern

Hi, Miki,

It would be great to see Kathie if she has time. Su has a couple of events to go to but just let us know when y'all can come.

So, you know how smart Jakie is -- well Paula has taught him to play poker.
So I see her playing Poker with Jakie and Karen and Jakie is doing pretty good. "God, that's one smart dog," I say. "Oh," she says, "he's not that smart. Every time he gets a good hand he wags his tail."

Albert
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Mail forwarding from my university is not working for some reason. Please type
in my EarthLink address to send me mail or to reply. Please re-send to <abider@earthlink.net> any mail you tried to send me since Nov. 30. It's hard to get anything done at AU on the weekend, so I don't know when my regular address will be restored.

Albert

Albert D. Biderman
abider@earthlink.net
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Hello:

Mr. Maulllin, I saw your request for full time Research Analysts on the AAPORnet site. I'm a member of AAPOR and I've attached a copy of my vita. I have taught statistics for 29 years, Public Finance for the
same time, and I was involved in the creation of the Survey Research Center at California State University, Chico in the early 1980's. I can give you references about my skills and my capabilities. You can see for yourself the number of reports, contracts and social scientific work that I've done in my academic career by inspecting my vita. I am a full professor here, but am looking for other work as I find the work in outside fields more stimulating. Feel free to contact me or to call me at the numbers I've listed on the vita. I think, my vita is quite impressive in terms of the types of research experience you may be looking for.

Please let me know if you receive this properly.

thanks for your interest.

Jon S. Ebeling, Ph.D.

ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu

Richard wrote:

> Full Time Research Analyst
> Established opinion research public policy, elections, and market analysis company seeks Research Associate for Santa Monica office. Strong quantitative analysis and excellent writing/verbal skills are a prerequisite. Research Associate will work with others and independently for election oriented clients and public and private sector entities. Salary commensurate with skills/experience.
> Send resume to:
> Research Position
> Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates
> 2425 Colorado Avenue, Suite 180
> Santa Monica, CA 90404
> richard@fmma.com
> 310-453-6562 Fax
I was dreaming I guess this morning when I read this job posting. I was raised in Santa Monica and I was thinking of those days. Sorry I did this.

My apologies to all AAPORneters.

jon ebeling
ebeling@mail.csuchico.edu
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-- Jim
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IF THE VOTE WERE FLAWLESS...

Gore would have had the edge in glitch-free Florida balloting, based on a Herald analysis

BY ANABELLE de GALE, LILA ARZUA AND CURTIS MORGAN <cmorgan@herald.com>

If no one had ever heard of hanging chads, if the butterfly ballot had never flown, if no voter had bungled in the booth, who would have won Florida and the presidency of the United States?

In a race so tight, it may never be known for certain. But an analysis commissioned by The Herald of voting patterns in each of the state's 5,885 precincts suggests that Florida likely would have gone to Al...
Gore -- by a slim 23,000 votes -- rather than George W. Bush, the officially certified victor by the wispy margin of 537.

It's a hypothetical result derived from something that clearly doesn't exist in Florida or anywhere else in the nation -- an election where every ballot is fully filled out and every one of those ballots gets counted, an elusive ideal going these days by the buzzword "the will of the people.''

But it is also as close as anyone is likely to get to the statewide manual recount that some people say is the only way to fairly assess who should be awarded Florida's 25 Electoral College votes. Reaction to the analysis from the two camps locked in an exhausting and tense legal battle was radically different. The Gore campaign called it "compelling evidence,'' and the Bush campaign dismissed it as "statistical voodoo.''

One fundamental flaw, Republicans argued, was an assumption that every voter actually intended to cast a vote in the presidential race. A large majority of ballots in the disputed counties of Palm Beach and Duval didn't even have a dimple on them, said Bush spokesman Tucker Eskew. "If you want to divine voters' intent when there isn't even a mark on the ballot, you'd do better to hire a palm reader than a statistical analyst,'' he said.

But Stephen Doig, a professor at Arizona State University who crunched the numbers for The Herald, defended the analysis. For example, he said, even if the analysis were adjusted to include the remote possibility that 90 percent of voters whose ballots were discarded actually intended to skip the race, the margin still would make a decisive difference for Gore -- about 1,400 votes.

Doig described it as a matter of analyzing extremes. In his, he started with the assumption that every one of the 185,000 discarded ballots represented an intent to vote in the presidential race. The other extreme, he said, is the Bush contention that none of them should count.

"That extreme is the reality that we have, that Gov. Bush won by a razor-thin 500 votes,'' Doig said. "I'm no psychic. I don't know what they really intended to do, but I do know that almost anywhere in that margin, Gore wins. You can argue about where in the point it should be.''

Political analysts were mixed on what the numbers mean. Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Governmental Studies, said he considered the analysis open to questions. "That is a reasonable assumption for the purposes of analysis,'' he said.
"For the purposes of politics, it's highly questionable. In most precincts, that may well be true, but in some precincts it may not be, and that's a critical difference.'" Still, Sabato said he found the end result "perfectly reasonable.'"

``What you're providing evidence for, however speculative, is that more people showed up on election day for Al Gore,'" he said. "'But I'd also state that in our system, woulda, shoulda, coulda doesn't matter. Only legal votes matter.'"

And all statistical and anecdotal evidence he'd seen, he said, indicated Bush probably collected more of those -- the ones that counted.

Susan MacManus, a political science professor at the University of South Florida, said there were too many variables in the analysis "to feel comfortable.'"

``Inferring what the voters' intent was, I have a real problem with people who can say they can do that,'" she said.

No one, of course, can accurately assess what 185,000 voters intended to do with their discarded ballots, but in purely statistical terms, there are consistent trends.

The results, derived from precinct returns Herald researchers collected from the state's 67 counties, were determined using this formula:

Statewide, at least 185,000 ballots were discarded, rejected as either undervotes (failing for whatever reason to successfully mark a ballot or punch out a chad) or overvotes (selecting more than one candidate for whatever reason). That number includes rejected absentee ballots.

If those ballots had been included and those voters behaved like their neighbors in the same precincts, Bush would have gotten about 78,000 (42 percent) of the uncounted votes and Gore would have gotten more than 103,000 (56 percent). The remaining 4,000 or so would have gone to the minor candidates.

That assumption of voting patterns is based on a concept long accepted by pollsters -- that the opinions of a small percentage of people can be extrapolated to project the views of a larger group. In this case, however, the projection uses a larger group, generally from 90 to 98 percent of the successful votes in precincts, to project the intent of a few.

The result: Gore ahead by 23,000 votes, a comfortable lead in comparison with the official statistical toss-up, though still narrow enough to trigger the state's automatic recount, which kicks in when elections finish closer than one-half of one percent.

The analysis also confirmed that the voters in Democratic precincts had a
far greater chance of having their ballots rejected. Only 1 in every 40 ballots were rejected in precincts Bush won, while 1 of every 27 ballots were rejected in precincts Gore won.

In addition, Doig, a former Herald research editor who now holds the Knight chair at the Cronkite School of Journalism specializing in computer-assisted reporting, found a number of interesting other trends:

Voting machinery played a large role in rejections. Of the 51 precincts in which more than 20 percent of ballots were rejected, 45 of them used punch cards -- 88 percent. Of the 336 precincts in which more than 10 percent were tossed, 277 used punch cards -- 78 percent.

The overall rejection rate for the 43 optical counties was 1.4 percent. The overall rejection rate for the 24 punch-card counties was 3.9 percent. That means that voters in punch-card counties, which included urban Democratic strongholds such as Broward and Palm Beach counties, were nearly three times as likely to have their ballots rejected as those in optical counties.

In dozens of Florida precincts, at least one out of every four ballots was discarded as having no vote or too many votes for president.

Nearly half of Gore's margin, more than 11,000 extra votes, would come from Palm Beach alone. The other counties that would give him more than 1,000 new votes are Broward, Miami-Dade, Duval and Pinellas. Of those, Bush carried only Duval in the official tabulation.

Palm Beach, home of the infamous butterfly ballot, and Duval, where candidate's names were spread across two pages, had 31 percent of the uncounted ballots, but only 12 percent of the total votes cast.

More than 11 percent of precincts statewide recorded no discarded ballots.

Attesting to how close things were, the analysis shows only one county that would actually switch preferences for president -- tiny Madison, which officially went to Bush, but would go to Gore under The Herald's projections. More than 10 percent of Madison's 4,000-plus ballots were rejected.

Doug Hattaway, a spokesman for the vice president's campaign, said the results bolstered Gore's contention that the official results did not fairly and accurately reflect the vote.

``The outcome of the presidential election rests on determining the will of the voters of Florida and this new evidence makes it extremely hard for the Bush forces to ignore the people's will,'' he said.

Eskew, the spokesman for the Texas governor, flatly rejected it as ``hocus pocus' and `an utterly unfounded scientific
In addition to mistakenly assuming that voters handing in undervotes intended to vote, he said, the analysis also ignores the notion that many of the double-punched ballots may have been "protest votes," intentionally spoiled.

"That is a deeply flawed model that suggests statistical voodoo," he said.

There are, however, ways of analyzing the data that attempt to account for the possibility of protest votes and deliberate non-participation in the presidential balloting. Even so, Gore hypothetically still would have collected enough votes to change the outcome of the election.

Historically, about 2 percent of votes in presidential races don't count — most often because voters either skipped the race or their marks weren't recorded by counting machines. Florida's rejection rate this year, however, was higher — about 2.9 percent.

The analysis tested even higher percentages of non-votes, ranging from 10 to 90 percent of the 185,000 discarded ballots. In each instance, Gore still earned more votes.

The analysis also attempted to discard all undervotes as intentional non-votes, counting only overvotes. That analysis was hampered by the fact that 37 counties did not differentiate in their reports between ballots discarded as undervotes and those discarded as overvotes.

But based on results from the 30 counties that did, 43 percent of the uncounted votes were undervotes. If that pattern held statewide and every undervote was tossed, ignoring the entire chad issue, Gore still would have a 13,000-vote margin.

"One thing I would note is that there were other opportunities for protest votes, one of whom was at last widely seen as a legitimate protest vote and in fact styled himself as that [Ralph Nader]," Doig said.

The results also would seem to challenge Bush camp assertions that the Texas governor would prevail in a statewide recount. But Republicans and some analysts didn't think they were strong enough to stand up.

MacManus, the USF political scientist echoed Eskew's concerns about protest and apathetic votes, and said there were such wide variances in the size and social and economic mix of precincts that it would be too difficult to extrapolate accurate results.

"In polls, you're used to a margin of error," she said. "Here, there's no room for margins of error."
Others saw more validity in the analysis.

Alan Agresti, a professor of statistics at the University of Florida, reviewed the methodology and called it "overall reasonable."

"You can always raise criticisms. You can never know for sure," he said. "But I think when you do it at a very fine level like this, at the precinct level, it's very interesting, a good projection of what could have happened."

Jim Kane, an independent pollster based in Fort Lauderdale, agreed the analysis contained many uncertainties, what statisticians call "ecological inference" -- a false assumption that voting patterns would be systematic within precincts. In reality, the small percentage of voters whose ballots were discarded might be the most unpredictable group of all.

But he also said "I'm not shocked that Gore would have won."

"All of the evidence points to that, if every single ballot would have been cast correctly, Gore would have won the state," he said. "I don't think anyone with any reasonableness would dispute that."

In fact, Kane, Agresti and Doig agreed that the formula probably was conservative, awarding Bush too large a share of the pie. The biggest problems with rejected ballots were in low-income, mostly minority neighborhoods statewide -- areas that voted heavily Democratic. That could suggest that the same group, which included a larger percentage of first-time and less educated voters, might have made similar errors in all precincts.

Stephen Hess, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a Washington, D.C., think tank, also found the numbers persuasive.

"If you did this at the county level, you'd have too many variables," Hess said. "You can't get any smaller than precincts."

"It's perfectly scientific if it's presented in a sense as the most massive statewide poll in Florida," he said. "Sure, it's fun and games, but it says something about what would have happened if everybody knew how to vote. The problem is that all of those people whose votes were not counted, they were not counted in part for perfectly good reasons. It wasn't all shenanigans. In some cases, they didn't choose to vote, or they were too dumb, or they just didn't follow instructions."

http://www.herald.com/content/archive/news/elect2000/decision/104268.htm
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In October I forwarded AAPOR a student inquiry about "cognitive mapping of emotive concepts." Many people requested that I summarize replies. Below is my belated summary, starting with the original question. Because it is long, I have deleted non-essential words, email characters, etc.

On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, Patricia Gwartney wrote:
Below is a question that I could not readily answer from a student in my Soc613 Survey Methods & Design course.
***********
Hi Professor Gwartney,

As I was doing the reading for this week, Schuman et al. referred to a study done in the late 70s, in which a doctoral student conducted a survey to determine what various definitions Americans had of "concept words" such as "Big Business," "Liberal," or "Democrat." She argued that respondents often answer survey questions using quite different definitions of such key words than the researchers intended. A lesson drawn was that surveys should not use such vague, emotive terms in their questions.

I'm very interested in this subject -- not just for its methodological impact on surveys, but even more for its impact on national debates about issues. For example, what do Americans think "global warming" means conceptually, as well as affectively? Or "environmentalism"? Or "liberal" and "conservative" etc. The fact that these terms are ambiguous, yet often highly emotive may not make them great for survey questions, but does make them important to study (e.g. when George W. Bush says Al Gore is for "big government" what different meanings does this term evoke in the public?).

Do you know of any research that attempts to "map" the different meanings Americans have for various key words using the survey approach?

Thanks!
Cheers,
Tony
ecotone@darkwing.uoregon.edu "Anthony Allen Leiserowitz"

***********
Dear Professor Schuman,

My deepest apologies, I got my readings confused! (we've had a lot) The actual reference is from _Asking Questions_ (1982) by Sudman and Bradburn, p. 123. They reference a 1979 dissertation by Joan Fee which: 

"investigated the meanings of some common political symbols used in public opinion studies. Adopting a variant of Belson's method, she asked respondents to elaborate on their understandings of particular symbols, such as 'federal government' and 'big business.' She found, for example, that at least nine different meanings were attached to the term 'energy crisis.' . . . Without knowing which of the images respondents held, a researcher might not be able to interpret their responses to questions about 'big government.'"

Tony

hschuman@umich.edu, Howard Schuman

No problem, I understand. My memory is that someone did this with NES data at one point, finding, for example, that for some people the word "conservative" meant frugal, as in conserving string or food, etc. May possibly have been Phil Converse, though I'm not at all sure. If you are interested in the general issue of important discrepant meanings, my 1972 AJS article on Vietnam focused on the two different meanings the word "mistake" had within the majority of those who called the Vietnam War a mistake. HS

rusciano@rider.edu "Frank Rusciano"

There actually is a story I heard while a graduate student at the University of Chicago about the term "social class." It seemed one researcher had correlated income with respondents' self reported social class, and found that the relationship was not as strong as they expected. After much follow up analysis, they discovered that if one controlled for race, the correlation was quite high for white respondents and nearly non-existent for black respondents. Subsequent research concluded that for white respondents, social class was an economic term, while for black respondents, it was a moral term. Black respondents tended to describe someone as of high social class if they had a standing in the community, if they were generally respected, if they had good manners, and so on.

The unfortunate part of this story is that I have tried to trace it back to Chicago, and have yet not been able to find its source. If anyone knows about it, it would be interesting to see if this is just a folk tale, and also if the same relationship still exists.

One other story, that sounds funny, but had serious financial repercussions for the survey institution. There was a survey that used
ethnicity as a critical variable in the analysis; one of the ethic categories (after Irish, Italian, German, etc.) was "Native American", referring to ancestors of the indigenous peoples of the United States. Well, it seems they had about half of their surveys coming back with a "Native American" ethnicity, even though this group constituted only about .6% of the total population. Upon callbacks, it was found that respondents were saying "Of course I'm native American-- I was born here!" The survey directors almost cried over this one.

*********
pmoy@u.washington.edu, Patricia Moy
Richard Carter, Professor Emeritus at Washington, developed something called "Cognigraphics" that your student might find useful. Keith Stamm, who is also in Communications, has worked with Cognigraphics in a number of contexts.

*********
RFremontCa@aol.com, Richard F. Carter, Prof. emeritus, U Washington You might want to look at the use of Cognigraphics, as reported in Communication Research, Vol. 21, No.3 (June 1994). With particular regard to the emotive aspect, see "How we thought about the Gulf War" in B. Greenberg and W. Gantz: _Desert Storm and the Mass Media_ (Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ. 1993)

*********
kstamm@u.washington.edu, Keith Stamm
Carter and Stamm have published papers in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Communication Research, and a volume by B. Greenberg on the mass media and the gulf war. The specific citations are below.


One of our doctoral students, Fiona Clark, did an interesting M.S. thesis on word associates and their cognitive relationship with "global warming." She has written a conference paper she could mail to you. Contact her at "fionac@u.washington.edu"

*********
beniger@rcf.usc.edu, James Beniger
Well, Schuman et al., their doctoral student, and Tony are all certainly correct. The one problem is that, were this idea pushed very far at all, human language itself would begin to dissolve completely. Here I write, in hopes that you will read, but what you make of what I write, or what I made of what you read, must remain forever a mystery to me and to you, respectively. We are human, we have language, and there's nothing much we can do about it--other than continue to use language, and hope for the best. If
language were not highly ambiguous, we would have no poetry, no effective advertising or salesmanship, and our species would have died out long ago due to a failure to procreate.

sullivan@fsc-research.com, MJS
I interviewed a job candidate about 6 months ago who specialized in Cognitive Testing - an approach to survey instrument design which focuses on carefully crafting survey questions so that the meanings used by respondents of survey concepts are well understood and interpretable. It was very exciting work and we offered him a job. Alas his current employer sweetened the deal and he stayed put. His name is Roger Levine and he is at the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto. If I were you, I would give him a call.

J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz, Janet Hoek
Earlier this year Phil Gendall and I supervised a student who examined interpretations of a question used in a national referendum held in 1999, together with the last NZ General Election. The referendum question read:

"Should there be a reform of our justice system placing greater emphasis on the needs of victims, providing restitution and compensation for them and imposing minimum sentences and hard labour for all serious violent offences?"

As you can see, the question contains several components, thus voters could agree with one aspect, yet disagree with others. The student has not yet analysed the data in full, however, we are hoping to present a paper outlining the findings at next year's AAPOR conference, and I would be happy to send you details of our findings prior to AAPOR, if you felt they might be of interest to you or your student.

ARCCGS@langate.gsu.edu, Charlotte G. Steeh
I know of several attempts to determine what meanings people attach to "concept" words. Sometime in the late 1980s or early 1990s the National Election Study asked respondents to define what liberal or conservative meant to them. I don't know if anyone published the results from this open-ended question, but the data are available from ICPSR. In addition, a 1995 CBS/New York Times poll asked respondents what they thought of when they heard the term "affirmative action." The striking finding here was that large percentages of respondents (as high as 55% of those without a high school diploma) could not think of a definition. This is a fascinating topic that does have broader applications than just writing good survey questions. Good luck to your student.

c_helmstetter@hotmail.com, Craig Helmstetter (UOregon Socio grad student) I have a partial answer for Tony's question concerning "cognitive mapping" of ambiguous terms. Zaller (1992:55-) speaks to this a little. In an NES pilot respondents were asked what they were thinking about either just prior to or immediately after answering each
in a series of opinion questions. Zaller doesn't really get into the "cognitive maps" or definitions used by each respondent -- he is more concerned with addressing attitude (in)stability (it turns out that the things people are taking into consideration when opining are more ideologically consistent for more "politically aware" respondents). The issue is also addressed in Converse's 1964 article, which suggests that a relatively small proportion of the "mass public" defines terms like "liberal" and "conservative" with the same definition/ level of sophistication as professors, pundits, and politicians. Again, Converse characterizes the open-ended responses in terms of sophistication rather than "type of map."

**********
snobrid@louisiana.edu <JANET A. BRIDGES
Pedhauzer and Schmelkin mention the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory -- 50 items, although they have some problems with the instrument. <Can you give me more of a citation?> I used Elazar J. Pedhauzer and Liora Pedhazur Schmelkin, _Measurement, Design and Analysis: An Integrated Approach_, Erlbaum, 1991, pp. 62-63. They list several items, but not all 50. Apparently the WPAI was reviewed in the Buros, _The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook_, vol. 1 (1150-52); Gryphon Press. Another cite they gave was: Wilson, G. D., _Manual for the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory (WPAI)_.

**********
MILTGOLD@aol.com, Milton R. Goldsamt
Regarding the question raised, I always remembered a principle, from my questionnaire design training and from a lot of experience since then--- always use terms that are uniformly clear and do not mean different things to different people, including in this case, subsets of voters.

Thus in educational research, if you asked about parents and "how many times have you visited the school this year" it would be best to exclude (if suitable) "for conferences with your child's teacher" since the perception of the overall topic could mean include that to some respondents among other reasons for coming to school, and only that to other respondents.

As such, I would say that the more multidimensional or complex a term is when used in a question stem, the less likely that everyone will respond in terms of understanding it the same way. I can't state some research on this topic, other than it seems to come out of gestalt research in psychology, and how an entity is perceived.

**********
BMcCready@knowledgenetworks.com, Bill McCready
The study you are referring to was done on my watch as Director of the Center for the Study of American Pluralism at NORC under a Markle Foundation grant, and I think the student was Joan Fee. We didn't call it cognitive mapping at the time, we were interested in how people from various backgrounds interpreted the terms frequently used during the evening news.
Joan is out of academe now and actually lives in my community, Oak Park. I'll get the citations of her work from NORC and send them to you. I don't know if she still interacts with the research world anymore, but I'll find out and let you know. I really didn't pick up on Tony's mistaken reference, I just couldn't imagine that there was another study asking those questions, and if there had been I would have been most interested. We actually did the work as a "pilot" project from Markle and they were so happy with the results that they never funded the "full" study!! I learned then to make "pilot projects" truly incomplete and 'teasers'! [never heard back from Bill]

*********
gso-gso@att.net, Gary Siegel
Quite a bit of research was done by Woelfel, Fink, Barnett, et al in the 70s & 80s. They used metric multidimensional scaling to map attitudes. I don't know if they did research on the concepts that you refer to. But check out some of their work. Woelfel & Barnett are sociologists, but most of their work was published in communications journals.

*********
holptj@alltel.net, Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
I am in the field with a state wide poll asking about "growth" or "sprawl" and I had to struggle with this very issue. The findings from our poll will be used to open up discussion about growth policy in the state- a process that I'm sure will be very emotional and will result in great miscommunication. Because of this potential for miscommunication, I wanted to explore the cognitive process. I thought about open-ended questions in order to try and "map" the meanings people assign to "growth," but the budget was too tight.

Thank you for posting this wonderful question.

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor                            Founding Director
Department of Sociology              Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon            5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR  97403-1291 USA            Eugene OR  97403-5245  USA
E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu   http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026
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** CONFERENCE ON THE QUANTITATIVE INTERVIEW **

A Conference on Questions, Comprehension and Interaction for People who Design, Analyse and Communicate Questionnaire-based Interview Research

** PLACE: University of Southern Denmark, Odense, Denmark  
** DATE: January 11-12th, 2001  
** WEBSITE: http://www.sdu.dk/Hum/MOVIN/confindex.html

** OBJECTIVES: The aim of this conference is to exchange insights and experiences between applied questionnaire research and recent linguistic, sociological and psychological research in interview-interaction and questionnaire methodology.

The invited speakers will present new research into what happens when questionnaire questions are enacted into interviews. The objective is to discuss research findings, methodological issues and practical problems, and to formulate research questions for future studies and development of the quantitative interview.

*WHO should participate?: Researchers and professionals in applied questionnaire based research; linguists, psychologists and sociologists with interests in interview-methodology; and journalists who communicate questionnaire based research.

** INVITED SPEAKERS:

Charles Antaki (Psychology, Loughborough, UK):  
Editing Questions to Cope with Respondents' Perceived Difficulties

Douglas Maynard (Sociology, Wisconsin, USA):  
The Ethnography of Survey Research: Variation in Practices & Refusal Conversation

Hanneke Houtkoop-Steenstra (Linguistics, Utrecht, NL):  
The Structure of Questioning Turns in Questionnaire Questions

Hanne-Pernille Stax (Kommunication, Odense, DK):  
Respondents Comprehension of Scripted Interviews
Fla. Ballot Spoilage Likelier For Blacks
By John Mintz and Dan Keating
Washington Post Staff Writers
Heavily Democratic and African American neighborhoods in Florida lost many more presidential votes than other areas because of outmoded voting machines and rampant confusion about ballots, a precinct-by-precinct analysis by The Washington Post shows. As many as one in three ballots in black sections of Jacksonville, for example, did not count in the presidential contest. That was four times as many as in white precincts elsewhere in mostly Republican Duval
County. According to the Post analysis, in Miami-Dade
County precincts where fewer than 30 percent of the voters are black, about 3
percent of ballots did not register a vote for
president. In precincts where more than 70 percent of the voters are African
American, it was nearly 10 percent. Such patterns have
helped fuel questions in the black community about whether the vote was fair
on Election Day. A number of African American leaders
say faulty ballot machines and long lines at polling places sowed confusion
among many black voters and ended up nullifying many of
their votes. Aides to Texas Gov. George W. Bush say the kinds of errors
Florida voters made are typical of elections across the
nation. Vice President Gore, by contrast, has placed allegations concerning
disqualified black votes at the center of his appeal to
hold recounts in Miami-Dade County, and he is making his case with rhetoric
reminiscent of civil rights struggles. Democrats say the
errors suggest a manual recount of ballots would show that Gore won Florida.
A
computer analysis of election returns suggests there
were anomalies in the Florida vote, particularly in African American areas.
The more black and Democratic a precinct, the more
likely it was to suffer high rates of invalidated votes. Some 40 percent of
the state's black voters were new voters, and election
experts say they were the most vulnerable to confusion about oddly designed
ballots. Moreover, a higher percentage of blacks than
whites live in counties with voting machines more prone to not registering a
vote. And similarly, African American voters are
somewhat more likely to live in areas where poll workers do not immediately
check ballots for errors--so blacks were less likely
than whites to get a chance to correct their ballots if they messed them up.
"We keep talking about 'every vote counts,' and, boy, I
feel like mine doesn't count," said Lon Fanniel, 40, a retired Marine captain
from Jacksonville. He fears that confusion over the
ballot led him to accidentally leave two marks for president, invalidating
his
vote for Gore. Florida was one of the nation's most
viciously fought battleground states, with both parties pouring in millions
of
dollars during the final days to get their core
supporters to the polls. It turns out that one reason for the high rate of
invalidated votes this election was the NAACP's massive
get-out-the-vote effort in Florida, which brought many inexperienced or
first-
time voters to the polls. Black turnout in Florida set
records--893,000 African Americans cast ballots on Nov. 7, a 65 percent jump
over 1996. At times--especially when polling places
were crowded and voters felt rushed to mark their votes--it appears large
numbers of these new or infrequent voters were confounded
by technical problems in the ballot. Florida listed an unusually high 10
presidential tickets, which contributed to confusing ballot
designs in some counties. A prime example is Duval, a north Florida county
that hosts thousands of naval aviators. A ballot that
perplexingly spread presidential names over two pages led to many accidental
double votes, which are automatically voided. Although
Bush carried the county 58 percent to 41 percent, the spoiled ballots were
concentrated in African American sections of downtown
Jacksonville. In the most heavily white precincts, about 1 in 14 ballots were
thrown out, but in largely black precincts more than 1
in 5 ballots were spoiled—and in some black precincts it was almost one-third. (By comparison, in the District of Columbia, fewer than 1 in 50 ballots were not counted as votes for president.) There are several reasons why a voting machine would not record a vote. A voter may have intentionally abstained. Or the voter could have tried to vote but messed up the ballot—either by mistakenly voting for two candidates, which automatically disqualifies a ballot and is called an "overvote," or by failing to mark the ballot cleanly (which, along with the ballots deliberately left unmarked, is known as an "undervote"). Gore wants the undervotes recounted, and because so many of them took place in pro-Gore precincts, his advisers are confident they could overturn Bush's lead if a court permitted such a recount. Bush allies say most undervotes were intentional. "We believe that in most if not virtually all so-called undervotes, individuals didn't intend to vote for president," said Bush spokesman Ray Sullivan. He also said Bush did not ask for a statewide hand recount because recounts are "flawed and inaccurate," as he said was shown in manual recounts in Broward and Palm Beach counties that showed Gore picking up votes. Republicans note that Florida's rate of failed ballots is lower than four other states among 35 states for which the GOP has examined data—Idaho, Illinois, Georgia and Wyoming. In those states, the spoiled ballots represent a small fraction of the winning margin for president, but in Florida the 180,000 invalid ballots were 335 times Bush's margin. The GOP says recounts are not needed because voting mistakes occur everywhere. Voting expert Curtis Gans said about 2.5 million voters across the nation cast presidential ballots that didn't register as votes. Given these large numbers outside Florida, and what he believes are the inequities in all types of ballot recounting, Gans said "it's an irrelevant exercise" to recount votes in Florida. The Bush campaign's Sullivan added that some of the Florida counties with high rates of invalidated ballots—he cited Hamilton, Hendry and Lafayette—were won by Bush. But Democrats point out those counties are sparsely populated and had a total of only 1,310 votes thrown out. The three counties Gore asked be recounted—Palm Beach, Broward and Miami-Dade—had 72,000 invalidated ballots. Senior GOP strategists say privately that a key reason the Bush campaign did not ask for a statewide recount was it feared that Gore would pick up more votes than Bush, because of the high rate of ballot spoilage in black precincts.

"The NAACP did a tremendous job of turnout in Florida," one Republican strategist said. "But in a way they overachieved, and got people out who couldn't follow instructions." The irony is that in Duval, the sample ballot designed by the Republican election supervisor explicitly instructed people to "vote all pages" on the ballot—which led thousands of people to invalidate their ballots because the list of presidential candidates was spread over two pages. The rule of thumb in election administration is that candidates for a single office should be listed in one column on one page to avoid confusion. A case in point: Sharon Lewis of Jacksonville, who brought her 18-year-old son Ernest to their polling place. The high school senior had just registered to vote. But she was mortified when he, upon leaving the booth, told her proudly, "I voted
on every page." She said they complained to the poll workers but "they said there's nothing we could do about it." "He had that 'I Voted' sticker on his shirt--the only kid at his school who voted," she said. "But his vote didn't count." "I'm proud of the turnout we had in Florida," said Anita Davis, the NAACP's state president. But she added, "I'm very concerned that so many of our votes were being disenfranchised. . . . In a lot of Florida counties, these [black] votes have been thrown out for years, and we had no idea about it." The NAACP has filed formal allegations with the Justice Department saying some blacks were discouraged from voting by unfair demands for identification or long lines. But a Justice Department official said so far investigators have not found enough evidence to justify a full-fledged investigation. "I fought for the right to have a good vote," said Fanniel, the retired Marine captain who fought in the Persian Gulf War. "I feel like that was taken away from me." Election experts say inexperienced voters are the most likely to be confused when a ballot contains more than about six names for one office. Beyond that, confoundment rises exponentially with each name added to the ballot. Florida's ballots listed 10 presidential candidates—which tied for the most with four states. Black Floridians also were more likely to face unforgiving voting equipment. About 26 percent of black voters live in counties that verify ballots as valid in precincts as soon as they're cast—so poll workers can immediately tell voters they disqualified ballots, and voters have a second chance to vote a valid ballot. By comparison, 34 percent of white voters live in these areas. That means white voters are more likely to have their votes counted than blacks—a point made by Gore. "These cheap and unreliable machines are much more likely to be found in areas of low-income people and minorities and seniors," Gore said in an interview on CBS last week. Voters whose ballots were checked right away were using cutting-edge optical scanners, which read pen marks. The other voters were using either optical scanners that don't check ballots instantly, or punch-card machines in which voters punch out "chads," tiny cardboard rectangles, to make a selection. In the 23 counties that check a ballot as soon as the voter completes it—all using optical scan gear—fewer than 1 percent of ballots did not register a choice for president, said Ion Sanchez, Leon County election supervisor. By contrast, in the 26 punch-card counties, none of which perform the instant check, about 4 percent failed to register a presidential selection, Sanchez said. "The only difference is the technology," said Sanchez. "That's the dirty little secret about election machines." "Poor people are more likely to invalidate ballots" because of difficulty mastering punch-card systems, said Herb Asher, an Ohio State University balloting expert who studied the issue in 1978, when Ohio first used the machines. Voters in prosperous suburbs invalidated their ballots 2 percent of the time, he said, while voters in Dayton's poor areas did so by up to 20 percent. For decades, 2 percent of ballots cast nationally have traditionally not recorded a presidential vote. But in Florida this year, it was 2.9 percent. In 21 of Florida's 67 counties, the ratio of disqualified votes to total votes cast was more than 6 percent. Those with the largest numbers of both disqualified and double votes were largely Democratic and black areas. Double votes are not reviewed in
hand recounts, because there is no way to discern a voter's intent. Gadsden
County, a largely poor black rural area, had a 12
percent spoilage rate, mostly because presidential candidates were listed in
two columns—and the great majority were overvotes.
Almost 2,000 voters nullified their ballots by double-voting on a ballot that
listed the first eight presidential candidates in one
column, and a second column listing Constitution Party or Workers World Party
candidates, in what could be mistaken for a second
election. Denny Hutchinson, Gadsden's election administrator, blamed voters,
not the ballot. "Some of our high rate of presidential
overvotes was attributable to so many names on that ballot," he said. "Some
people voted for every candidate... People didn't
prepare themselves to come to the polls." But Rep. Alcee L. Hastings, a black
Florida Democrat, said Bush's claim that almost all
undervotes were intentional is "pure hogwash." "We've designed a voting
system
not understandable to many voters," Hastings said,
"and it takes fair-minded people to design one ensuring every vote counts."
Staff writer Thomas B. Edsall contributed to this
report. Tossed-Out Ballots Ballots were tossed out at a much higher rate in
predominantly black precincts in Duval and Miami-Dade
counties. Duval County
(Jacksonville)
Black voter Ballots Total ballots
population Precincts cast invalidated
Under 30% 195 239,555 16,621 6.9%
30%-50% 12 10,517 1,634 15.5%
51%-70% 17 9,953 1,834 18.4%
Over 70% 44 31,01 6,820 21.6%
Miami-Dade County
Black voter Ballots Total ballots
population Precincts cast invalidated
Under 30% 486 490,863 16,459 3.4%
30%-50% 30 29,102 2,027 7.0%
51%-70% 26 22,115 1,754 7.9%
Over 70% 72 68,601 6,540 9.5%
SOURCE: Washington Post analysis of Florida state election data
(c) 2000 The Washington Post

Everyone missed something that is used by market researchers and that sounds
very much like what the student was seeking. It is
called Multidimensional Scaling, and the output is a "map," usually of perceptions of objects in terms of two (or more?) dimensions. I suppose a map could be prepared for each of various population sub-categories.


Patricia Gwartney wrote:

> In October I forwarded AAPOR a student inquiry about "cognitive mapping of emotive concepts." Many people requested that I summarize replies. Below is my belated summary, starting with the original question. Because it is long, I have deleted non-essential words, email characters, etc.

> On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, Patricia Gwartney wrote:
> Below is a question that I could not readily answer from a student in my Soc613 Survey Methods & Design course.
> ********************
> Hi Professor Gwartney,
>
> As I was doing the reading for this week, Schuman et al. referred to a study done in the late 70s, in which a doctoral student conducted a survey to determine what various definitions Americans had of "concept words" such as "Big Business," "Liberal," or "Democrat." She argued that respondents often answer survey questions using quite different definitions of such key words than the researchers intended. A lesson drawn was that surveys should not use such vague, emotive terms in their questions.
>
> I'm very interested in this subject -- not just for its methodological impact on surveys, but even more for its impact on national debates about issues. For example, what do Americans think "global warming" means conceptually, as well as affectively? Or "environmentalism"? Or "liberal" and "conservative" etc. The fact that these terms are ambiguous, yet often highly emotive may not make them great for survey questions, but does make them important to study (e.g. when George W. Bush says Al Gore is for "big government" what different meanings does this term evoke in the public?).
>
> Do you know of any research that attempts to "map" the different meanings Americans have for various key words using the survey approach?
>
> Thanks!
> Cheers,
> Tony
> ecotone@darkwing.uoregon.edu "Anthony Allen Leiserowitz"
>
> ********************
> hschuman@umich.edu, Howard Schuman
> Assuming the reference is to me, can you give me the page number?
>
> ********************
> Dear Professor Schuman,
My deepest apologies, I got my readings confused! (we've had a lot)
The actual reference is from *Asking Questions* (1982) by Sudman and Bradburn, p. 123. They reference a 1979 dissertation by Joan Fee which:

"investigated the meanings of some common political symbols used in public opinion studies. Adopting a variant of Belson's method, she asked respondents to elaborate on their understandings of particular symbols, such as 'federal government' and 'big business.' She found, for example, that at least nine different meanings were attached to the term 'energy crisis.' ... Without knowing which of the images respondents held, a researcher might not be able to interpret their responses to questions about 'big government.' " Tony

hschuman@umich.edu, Howard Schuman

No problem, I understand. My memory is that someone did this with NES data at one point, finding, for example, that for some people the word "conservative" meant frugal, as in conserving string or food, etc. May possibly have been Phil Converse, though I'm not at all sure. If you are interested in the general issue of important discrepant meanings, my 1972 AJS article on Vietnam focused on the two different meanings the word "mistake" had within the majority of those who called the Vietnam War a mistake. HS

rusciano@rider.edu "Frank Rusciano"

There actually is a story I heard while a graduate student at the University of Chicago about the term "social class." It seemed one researcher had correlated income with respondents' self reported social class, and found that the relationship was not as strong as they expected. After much follow up analysis, they discovered that if one controlled for race, the correlation was quite high for white respondents and nearly non-existent for black respondents. Subsequent research concluded that for white respondents, social class was an economic term, while for black respondents, it was a moral term. Black respondents tended to describe someone as of high social class if they had a standing in the community, if they were generally respected, if they had good manners, and so on.

The unfortunate part of this story is that I have tried to trace it back to Chicago, and have yet not been able to find its source. If anyone knows about it, it would be interesting to see if this is just a folk tale, and also if the same relationship still exists.

One other story, that sounds funny, but had serious financial repercussions for the survey institution. There was a survey that used ethnicity as a critical variable in the analysis; one of the ethnic categories (after Irish, Italian, German, etc.) was "Native American", referring to ancestors of the indigenous peoples of the United States. Well, it seems they had about half of their surveys coming back with a "Native American" ethnicity, even though this group constituted only about .6% of the total population. Upon callbacks, it was found that respondents were saying "Of course I'm native American-- I was born here!" The survey directors almost cried over this one.
Richard Carter, Professor Emeritus at Washington, developed something called "Cognigraphics" that your student might find useful. Keith Stamm, who is also in Communications, has worked with Cognigraphics in a number of contexts.

RFremontCa@aol.com, Richard F. Carter, Prof. emeritus, U Washington
You might want to look at the use of Cognigraphics, as reported in Communication Research, Vol. 21, No.3 (June 1994). With particular regard to the emotive aspect, see "How we thought about the Gulf War" in B. Greenberg and W. Gantz: _Desert Storm and the Mass Media_ (Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ. 1993)

kstamm@u.washington.edu, Keith Stamm
Carter and Stamm have published papers in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Communication Research, and a volume by B. Greenberg on the mass media and the gulf war. The specific citations are below.


One of our doctoral students, Fiona Clark, did an interesting M.S. thesis on word associates and their cognitive relationship with "global warming." She has written a conference paper she could mail to you. Contact her at "fionac@u.washington.edu"

beniger@rcf.usc.edu, James Beniger
Well, Schuman et al., their doctoral student, and Tony are all certainly correct. The one problem is that, were this idea pushed very far at all, human language itself would begin to dissolve completely. Here I write, in hopes that you will read, but what you make of what I write, or what I made of what you read, must remain forever a mystery to me and to you, respectively. We are human, we have language, and there's nothing much we can do about it--other than continue to use language, and hope for the best. If language were not highly ambiguous, we would have no poetry, no effective advertising or salesmanship, and our species would have died out long ago due to a failure to procreate.

sullivan@fsc-research.com, MJS
I interviewed a job candidate about 6 months ago who specialized in Cognitive Testing - an approach to survey instrument design which focuses on carefully crafting survey questions so that the meanings used by respondents of survey concepts are well understood and interpretable. It was very exciting work and we offered him a job. Alas his current employer sweetened the deal and he stayed put. His
name is Roger Levine and he is at the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto. If I were you, I would give him a call.

*********
J.A.Hoek@massey.ac.nz, Janet Hoek
Earlier this year Phil Gendall and I supervised a student who examined interpretations of a question used in a national referendum held in 1999, together with the last NZ General Election. The referendum question read:

"Should there be a reform of our justice system placing greater emphasis on the needs of victims, providing restitution and compensation for them and imposing minimum sentences and hard labour for all serious violent offences?"

As you can see, the question contains several components, thus voters could agree with one aspect, yet disagree with others. The student has not yet analysed the data in full, however, we are hoping to present a paper outlining the findings at next year's AAPOR conference, and I would be happy to send you details of our findings prior to AAPOR, if you felt they might be of interest to you or your student.

*********
ARCCGS@langate.gsu.edu, Charlotte G. Steeh
I know of several attempts to determine what meanings people attach to "concept" words. Sometime in the late 1980s or early 1990s the National Election Study asked respondents to define what liberal or conservative meant to them. I don't know if anyone published the results from this open-ended question, but the data are available from ICPSR. In addition, a 1995 CBS/New York Times poll asked respondents what they thought of when they heard the term "affirmative action." The striking finding here was that large percentages of respondents (as high as 55% of those without a high school diploma) could not think of a definition. This is a fascinating topic that does have broader applications than just writing good survey questions. Good luck to your student.

*********
c_helmstetter@hotmail.com, Craig Helmstetter (UOregon Socio grad student) I have a partial answer for Tony's question concerning "cognitive mapping" of ambiguous terms. Zaller (1992:55-) speaks to this a little. In an NES pilot respondents were asked what they were thinking about either just prior to or immediately after answering each in a series of opinion questions. Zaller doesn't really get into the "cognitive maps" or definitions used by each respondent -- he is more concerned with addressing attitude (in)stability (it turns out that the things people are taking into consideration when opining are more ideologically consistent for more "politically aware" respondents). The issue is also addressed in Converse's 1964 article, which suggests that a relatively small proportion of the "mass public" defines terms like "liberal" and "conservative" with the same definition/ level of sophistication as professors, pundits, and politicians. Again, Converse characterizes the open-ended responses in terms of sophistication rather than "type of map."

*********
snobrid@louisiana.edu <JANET A. BRIDGES
Pedhauzer and Schmelkin mention the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory — 50 items, although they have some problems with the instrument.

<Can you give me more of a citation?>

They list several items, but not all 50. Apparently the WPAI was reviewed in the Buros, _The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook_, vol. 1 (1150-52); Gryphon Press. Another cite they gave was: Wilson, G. D., _Manual for the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory (WPAI)_._ London: NFER, 1975._

*********
MILTGOLD@aol.com, Milton R. Goldsamt

Regarding the question raised, I always remembered a principle, from my questionnaire design training and from a lot of experience since then--- always use terms that are uniformly clear and do not mean different things to different people, including in this case, subsets of voters.

Thus in educational research, if you asked about parents and "how many times have you visited the school this year" it would be best to exclude (if suitable) "for conferences with your child's teacher" since the perception of the overall topic could mean include that to some respondents among other reasons for coming to school, and only that to other respondents.

As such, I would say that the more multidimensional or complex a term is when used in a question stem, the less likely that everyone will respond in terms of understanding it the same way. I can't state some research on this topic, other than it seems to come out of gestalt research in psychology, and how an entity is perceived.

*********
BMcCready@knowledgenetworks.com, Bill McCready

The study you are referring to was done on my watch as Director of the Center for the Study of American Pluralism at NORC under a Markle Foundation grant, and I think the student was Joan Fee. We didn't call it cognitive mapping at the time, we were interested in how people from various backgrounds interpreted the terms frequently used during the evening news.

Joan is out of academe now and actually lives in my community, Oak Park. I'll get the citations of her work from NORC and send them to you. I don't know if she still interacts with the research world anymore, but I'll find out and let you know. I really didn't pick up on Tony's mistaken reference, I just couldn't imagine that there was another study asking those questions, and if there had been I would have been most interested. We actually did the work as a "pilot" project from Markle and they were so happy with the results that they never funded the "full" study!! I learned then to make "pilot projects" truly incomplete and 'teasers'! [never heard back from Bill]

*********
gso-gso@att.net, Gary Siegel

Quite a bit of research was done by Woelfel, Fink, Barnett, et al in the 70s & 80s. They used metric multidimensional scaling to map...
attitudes. I don't know if they did research on the concepts that you refer to. But check out some of their work. Woelfel & Barnett are sociologists, but most of their work was published in communications journals.

**********
holptj@alltel.net, Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
I am in the field with a state wide poll asking about "growth" or "sprawl" and I had to struggle with this very issue. The findings from our poll will be used to open up discussion about growth policy in the state- a process that I'm sure will be very emotional and will result in great miscommunication. Because of this potential for miscommunication, I wanted to explore the cognitive process. I thought about open-ended questions in order to try and "map" the meanings people assign to "growth," but the budget was too tight.

Thank you for posting this wonderful question.

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA
E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

Some useful if somewhat older (sorry) sources on multidimensional scaling are:

Multidimensional Scaling: Theory and Applications in the Behavioral Sciences (2 vols.), edited by A. Kimball Romney, Roger N. Shepard and Sara Beth Nerlove (Academic Press, 1972);

Chapter on Multidimensional Scaling in Theory and Methods of Scaling by Warren S. Torgerson (John Wiley, 1958);
Also see just about any of the several editions of market research textbooks by Paul E. Green and Donald S. Tull for an introduction and discussion of applications. Many papers were published by Green and Frank Carmone.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Monday, December 04, 2000 6:22 PM
Subject: Re: Summary of replies to inquiry about cognitive mapping of emotiveconcepts

>Everyone missed something that is used by market researchers and that sounds very
>much like what the student was seeking. It is called Multidimensional Scaling, and
>the output is a "map," usually of perceptions of objects in terms of
>two
>(or more?)
dimensions. I suppose a map could be prepared for each of various population
>sub-categories.
>
The only exact reference I can give is Hair, J., R.E. Anderson, R.L
>Tatham,
>and W.C.
>Hall.,
>See
>pp.488-9.
>
>Patricia Gwartney wrote:
>
>> In October I forwarded AAPOR a student inquiry about "cognitive
>> mapping of emotive concepts." Many people requested that I summarize
>> replies. Below is my belated summary, starting with the original
>> question. Because it is long, I have deleted non-essential words,
>> email characters, etc.
>>
>> On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, Patricia Gwartney wrote:
>> Below is a question that I could not readily answer from a student in
>> my Soc613 Survey Methods & Design course.
>> ***************
>> Hi Professor Gwartney,
>>
>> As I was doing the reading for this week, Schuman et al. referred to
>> a study done in the late 70s, in which a doctoral student conducted a
>> survey to determine what various definitions Americans had of
>> "concept words" such as "Big Business," "Liberal," or "Democrat." She
>> argued that respondents often answer survey questions using quite
>> different definitions of such key words than the researchers
intended. A lesson drawn was that surveys should not use such vague, emotive terms in their questions.

I'm very interested in this subject -- not just for its methodological impact on surveys, but even more for its impact on national debates about issues. For example, what do Americans think "global warming" means conceptually, as well as affectively? Or "environmentalism"? Or "liberal" and "conservative" etc. The fact that these terms are ambiguous, yet often highly emotive may not make them great for survey questions, but does make them important to study (e.g. when George W. Bush says Al Gore is for "big government" what different meanings does this term evoke in the public?).

Do you know of any research that attempts to "map" the different meanings Americans have for various key words using the survey approach?

Thanks!
Cheers,
Tony
ecotone@darkwing.uoregon.edu "Anthony Allen Leiserowitz"

Assuming the reference is to me, can you give me the page number?

Dear Professor Schuman,

My deepest apologies, I got my readings confused! (we've had a lot) The actual reference is from _Asking Questions_ (1982) by Sudman and Bradburn, p. 123. They reference a 1979 dissertation by Joan Fee which:

"investigated the meanings of some common political symbols used in public opinion studies. Adopting a variant of Belson's method, she asked respondents to elaborate on their understandings of particular symbols, such as 'federal government' and 'big business.' She found, for example, that at least nine different meanings were attached to the term 'energy crisis.' ... Without knowing which of the images respondents held, a researcher might not be able to interpret their responses to questions about 'big government.' "

No problem, I understand. My memory is that someone did this with NES data at one point, finding, for example, that for some people the word "conservative" meant frugal, as in conserving string or food, etc. May possibly have been Phil Converse, though I'm not at all sure. If you are interested in the general issue of important discrepant meanings, my 1972 AJS article on Vietnam focused on the two different meanings the word "mistake" had within the majority of those who called the Vietnam War a mistake. HS
There actually is a story I heard while a graduate student at the University of Chicago about the term "social class." It seemed one researcher had correlated income with respondents' self reported social class, and found that the relationship was not as strong as they expected.

After much follow up analysis, they discovered that if one controlled for race, the correlation was quite high for white respondents and nearly non-existent for black respondents. Subsequent research concluded that for white respondents, social class was an economic term, while for black respondents, it was a moral term. Black respondents tended to describe someone as of high social class if they had a standing in the community, if they were generally respected, if they had good manners, and so on.

The unfortunate part of this story is that I have tried to trace it back to Chicago, and have yet not been able to find its source. If anyone knows about it, it would be interesting to see if this is just a folk tale, and also if the same relationship still exists.

One other story, that sounds funny, but had serious financial repercussions for the survey institution. There was a survey that used ethnicity as a critical variable in the analysis; one of the ethic categories (after Irish, Italian, German, etc.) was "Native American," referring to ancestors of the indigenous peoples of the United States. Well, it seems they had about half of their surveys coming back with a "Native American" ethnicity, even though this group constituted only about .6% of the total population. Upon callbacks, it was found that respondents were saying "Of course I'm native American-- I was born here!" The survey directors almost cried over this one.

pmoy@u.washington.edu, Patricia Moy
Richard Carter, Professor Emeritus at Washington, developed something called "Cognigraphics" that your student might find useful. Keith Stamm, who is also in Communications, has worked with Cognigraphics in a number of contexts.

RFremontCa@aol.com, Richard F. Carter, Prof. emeritus, U Washington
You might want to look at the use of Cognigraphics, as reported in Communication Research, Vol. 21, No.3 (June 1994). With particular regard to the emotive aspect, see "How we thought about the Gulf War" in B. Greenberg and W. Gantz: _Desert Storm and the Mass Media_ (Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ. 1993)
Carter and Stamm have published papers in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Communication Research, and a volume by B. Greenberg on the mass media and the gulf war. The specific citations are below.


One of our doctoral students, Fiona Clark, did an interesting M.S. thesis on word associates and their cognitive relationship with "global warming." She has written a conference paper she could mail to you. Contact her at "fionac@u.washington.edu"

Well, Schuman et al., their doctoral student, and Tony are all certainly correct. The one problem is that, were this idea pushed very far at all, human language itself would begin to dissolve completely. Here I write, in hopes that you will read, but what you make of what I write, or what I made of what you read, must remain forever a mystery to me and to you, respectively. We are human, we have language, and there's nothing much we can do about it—other than continue to use language, and hope for the best. If language were not highly ambiguous, we would have no poetry, no effective advertising or salesmanship, and our species would have died out long ago due to a failure to procreate.

I interviewed a job candidate about 6 months ago who specialized in Cognitive Testing – an approach to survey instrument design which focuses on carefully crafting survey questions so that the meanings used by respondents of survey concepts are well understood and interpretable. It was very exciting work and we offered him a job. Alas his current employer sweetened the deal and he stayed put. His name is Roger Levine and he is at the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto. If I were you, I would give him a call.

Earlier this year Phil Gendall and I supervised a student who examined interpretations of a question used in a national referendum held in 1999, together with the last NZ General Election. The
referendum question read:

"Should there be a reform of our justice system placing greater emphasis on the needs of victims, providing restitution and compensation for them and imposing minimum sentences and hard labour for all serious violent offences?"

As you can see, the question contains several components, thus voters could agree with one aspect, yet disagree with others. The student has not yet analysed the data in full, however, we are hoping to present a paper outlining the findings at next year's AAPOR conference, and I would be happy to send you details of our findings prior to AAPOR, if you felt they might be of interest to you or your student.

*********

ARCCGS@langate.gsu.edu, Charlotte G. Steeh
I know of several attempts to determine what meanings people attach to "concept" words. Sometime in the late 1980s or early 1990s the National Election Study asked respondents to define what liberal or conservative meant to them. I don't know if anyone published the results from this open-ended question, but the data are available from ICPSR. In addition, a 1995 CBS/New York Times poll asked respondents what they thought of when they heard the term "affirmative action." The striking finding here was that large percentages of respondents (as high as 55% of those without a high school diploma) could not think of a definition. This is a fascinating topic that does have broader applications than just writing good survey questions. Good luck to your student.

*********

c_helmstetter@hotmail.com, Craig Helmstetter (UOregon Socio grad student) I have a partial answer for Tony's question concerning "cognitive mapping" of ambiguous terms. Zaller (1992:55-) speaks to this a little. In an NES pilot respondents were asked what they were thinking about either just prior to or immediately after answering each in a series of opinion questions. Zaller doesn't really get into the "cognitive maps" or definitions used by each respondent -- he is more concerned with addressing attitude (in)stability (it turns out that the things people are taking into consideration when opining are more ideologically consistent for more "politically aware" respondents). The issue is also addressed in Converse's 1964 article, which suggests that a relatively small proportion of the "mass public" defines terms like "liberal" and "conservative" with the same
definition/ level of sophistication as professors, pundits, and politicians.
Again, Converse characterizes the open-ended responses in terms of sophistication rather than "type of map."

*********
snobrid@louisiana.edu <JANET A. BRIDGES
Pedhauzer and Schmelkin mention the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory
-- 50 items, although they have some problems with the instrument.
<Can you give me more of a citation?>
I used Elazar J. Pedhazur and Liora Pedhazur Schmelkin, _Measurement, Design and Analysis: An Integrated Approach_, Erlbaum, 1991, pp. 62-63. They list several items, but not all 50. Apparently the WPAI was reviewed in the
Buros, _The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook_, vol. 1 (1150-52); Gryphon Press. Another cite they gave was: Wilson, G. D., _Manual for the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory (WPAI)_. London: NFER, 1975.

*********
MILTGOLD@aol.com, Milton R. Goldsamt
Regarding the question raised, I always remembered a principle, from my questionnaire design training and from a lot of experience since then--- always use terms that are uniformly clear and do not mean different things to different people, including in this case, subsets of voters.

Thus in educational research, if you asked about parents and "how many times have you visited the school this year" it would be best to exclude (if suitable) "for conferences with your child's teacher" since the perception of the overall topic could mean include that to some respondents among other reasons for coming to school, and only that to other respondents.

As such, I would say that the more multidimensional or complex a term is when used in a question stem, the less likely that everyone will respond in terms of understanding it the same way. I can't state some research on this topic, other than it seems to come out of gestalt research in psychology, and how an entity is perceived.

*********
BMcCready@knowledgenetworks.com, Bill McCready
The study you are referring to was done on my watch as Director of
>> the Center for the Study of American Pluralism at NORC under a Markle Foundation
>> grant, and I think the student was Joan Fee. We didn't call it
cognitive
mapping
>> at the time, we were interested in how people from various
>> backgrounds interpreted the terms frequently used during the evening
>> news.
>>
>> Joan is out of academe now and actually lives in my community, Oak
>> Park. I'll get the citations of her work from NORC and send them to
>> you. I
don't
>> know if she still interacts with the research world anymore, but I'll find
>> out and let you know. I really didn't pick up on Tony's mistaken
reference,
>> I just couldn't imagine that there was another study asking those
questions,
>> and if there had been I would have been most interested. We actually
>> did
the
>> work as a "pilot" project from Markle and they were so happy with the
>> results that they never funded the "full" study!! I learned then to
>> make "pilot projects" truly incomplete and 'teasers'! [never heard
>> back from
Bill]
>>
>><
>> *********
gso-gso@att.net, Gary Siegel
>> Quite a bit of research was done by Woelfel, Fink, Barnett, et al in
>> the
>> 70s &
>> 80s. They used metric multidimensional scaling to map attitudes. I
don't
>> know
>> if they did research on the concepts that you refer to. But check out
some of
>> their work. Woelfel & Barnett are sociologists, but most of their
>> work
was
>> published in communications journals.
>>
>> *********
holptj@alltel.net, Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
>> I am in the field with a state wide poll asking about "growth" or
"sprawl"
>> and I had to struggle with this very issue. The findings from our
>> poll
will
>> be used to open up discussion about growth policy in the state- a
>> process
that
>> I'm sure will be very emotional and will result in great
miscommunication.
>> Because of this potential for miscommunication, I wanted to explore
>> the cognitive process. I thought about open-ended questions in order
to try and "map" the meanings people assign to "growth," but the budget was too tight.

Thank you for posting this wonderful question.

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.

Professor
Department of Sociology
1291 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA

E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

School of Journalism -- Middle Tennessee State University. Growing graduate program in mass communication with commitment to diverse approaches to scholarship seeks candidates for director of graduate studies. Successful candidate should have established record of scholarship, a strong commitment to teaching, and a Ph. D. in a mass communication-related field. Professional experience in journalism or other media-related fields is a plus. Rank at associate or full professor level.

The graduate program is broadly professional in orientation and requires a year of professional experience for admission. The program, however, provides a broad educational experience with coursework in theory, cultural studies, and quantitative and qualitative methods in addition to courses in management. Faculty is made up principally from within the School of Journalism with some support from other college programs. Director is responsible for the administering of the program with particular attention to recruiting and admissions, advising, and setting standards. In addition to administrative role, the director is expected to teach
a half-time schedule for the School and contribute to the undergraduate curriculum.

Located 30 miles southeast of Nashville, a national media and publishing center, MTSU is Tennessee's fastest-growing university with 19,000 students. The School of Journalism is part of one of the nation's largest mass communication colleges with the latest state-of-the-art reporting, editing, and design labs and tools for instruction and research. College also holds Seigenthaler Chair of Excellence, which sponsors conferences, lectures, and visiting faculty appointments, and the Office of Communication Research, which conducts a regional poll twice a year. College also houses Departments of Recording Industry and Radio-TV.

Please send a letter of application, vita/resume, and names/addresses/phone numbers of three references to David Eason, Chair, Search Committee, School of Journalism, Box X073, MTSU, Murfreesboro, TN 37132 or email <deason@mtsu.edu>. Women and minority candidates especially encouraged to apply. MTSU is an EO/AA educator and employer. Appointment start date is August 2001.

(POSITION # 143060)

Robert Wyatt
Professor of Journalism
Middle Tennessee State University, Box 391
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

e-mail: rwyatt@mtsu.edu
web: www.mtsu.edu/~rwyatt
voice: 615-898-2335;
fax: 503-905-8077

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of James P. Murphy
Sent: Monday, December 04, 2000 7:38 PM
To: ande271@attglobal.net; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Summary of replies to inquiry about cognitive mapping of emotiveconcepts

Some useful if somewhat older (sorry) sources on multidimensional scaling are:

Multidimensional Scaling: Theory and Applications in the Behavioral Sciences (2 vols.), edited by A. Kimball Romney, Roger N. Shepard and Sara Beth Nerlove (Academic Press, 1972);

Chapter on Multidimensional Scaling in Theory and Methods of Scaling by Warren S. Torgerson (John Wiley, 1958);

Also see just about any of the several editions of market research textbooks
Everyone missed something that is used by market researchers and that sounds very much like what the student was seeking. It is called Multidimensional Scaling, and the output is a "map," usually of perceptions of objects in terms of two (or more?) dimensions. I suppose a map could be prepared for each of various population sub-categories.


Patricia Gwartney wrote:

In October I forwarded AAPOR a student inquiry about "cognitive mapping of emotive concepts." Many people requested that I summarize replies. Below is my belated summary, starting with the original question. Because it is long, I have deleted non-essential words, email characters, etc.

On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, Patricia Gwartney wrote:

Below is a question that I could not readily answer from a student in my Soc613 Survey Methods & Design course.

Hi Professor Gwartney,

As I was doing the reading for this week, Schuman et al. referred to a study done in the late 70s, in which a doctoral student conducted a survey to determine what various definitions Americans had of "concept words" such as "Big Business," "Liberal," or "Democrat." She argued that respondents often answer survey questions using quite different definitions of such key words than the researchers intended. A lesson drawn was that surveys should not use such vague,
emotive terms in their questions.

I'm very interested in this subject -- not just for its methodological impact on surveys, but even more for its impact on national debates about issues. For example, what do Americans think "global warming" means conceptually, as well as affectively? Or "environmentalism"? Or "liberal" and "conservative" etc. The fact that these terms are ambiguous, yet often highly emotive may not make them great for survey questions, but does make them important to study (e.g. when George W. Bush says Al Gore is for "big government" what different meanings does this term evoke in the public?).

Do you know of any research that attempts to "map" the different meanings Americans have for various key words using the survey approach?

Thanks!
Cheers,
Tony
ecotone@darkwing.uoregon.edu "Anthony Allen Leiserowitz"

***************
hschuman@umich.edu, Howard Schuman
Assuming the reference is to me, can you give me the page number?

***************
Dear Professor Schuman,
My deepest apologies, I got my readings confused! (we've had a lot) The actual reference is from _Asking Questions_ (1982) by Sudman and Bradburn, p. 123. They reference a 1979 dissertation by Joan Fee which:

"investigated the meanings of some common political symbols used in public opinion studies. Adopting a variant of Belson's method, she asked respondents to elaborate on their understandings of particular symbols, such as 'federal government' and 'big business.' She found, for example, that at least nine different meanings were attached to the term 'energy crisis.' . . . . Without knowing which of the images respondents held, a researcher might not be able to interpret their responses to questions about 'big government.' " Tony

***************
hschuman@umich.edu, Howard Schuman
No problem, I understand. My memory is that someone did this with NES data at one point, finding, for example, that for some people the word "conservative" meant frugal, as in conserving string or food, etc. May possibly have been Phil Converse, though I'm not at all sure. If you are interested in the general issue of important discrepant meanings, my 1972 AJS article on Vietnam focused on the two different meanings the word "mistake" had within the majority of those who called the Vietnam War a mistake. HS
There actually is a story I heard while a graduate student at the University of Chicago about the term "social class." It seemed one researcher had correlated income with respondents' self reported social class, and found that the relationship was not as strong as they expected.

After much follow up analysis, they discovered that if one controlled for race, the correlation was quite high for white respondents and nearly non-existent for black respondents. Subsequent research concluded that for white respondents, social class was an economic term, while for black respondents, it was a moral term. Black respondents tended to describe someone as of high social class if they had a standing in the community, if they were generally respected, if they had good manners, and so on.

The unfortunate part of this story is that I have tried to trace it back to Chicago, and have yet not been able to find its source. If anyone knows about it, it would be interesting to see if this is just a folk tale, and also if the same relationship still exists.

One other story, that sounds funny, but had serious financial repercussions for the survey institution. There was a survey that used ethnicity as a critical variable in the analysis; one of the ethic categories (after Irish, Italian, German, etc.) was "Native American", referring to ancestors of the indigenous peoples of the United States. Well, it seems they had about half of their surveys coming back with a "Native American" ethnicity, even though this group constituted only about .6% of the total population. Upon callbacks, it was found that respondents were saying "Of course I'm native American-- I was born here!" The survey directors almost cried over this one.

pmoy@u.washington.edu, Patricia Moy
Richard Carter, Professor Emeritus at Washington, developed something called "Cognigraphics" that your student might find useful. Keith Stamm, who is also in Communications, has worked with Cognigraphics in a number of contexts.

RFremontCa@aol.com, Richard F. Carter, Prof. emeritus, U Washington
You might want to look at the use of Cognigraphics, as reported in Communication Research, Vol. 21, No.3 (June 1994). With particular regard to the emotive aspect, see "How we thought about the Gulf War" in B. Greenberg and W. Gantz: _Desert Storm and the Mass Media_ (Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ. 1993)
Carter and Stamm have published papers in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Communication Research, and a volume by B. Greenberg on mass media and the gulf war. The specific citations are below.


One of our doctoral students, Fiona Clark, did an interesting M.S. thesis on word associates and their cognitive relationship with "global warming." She has written a conference paper she could mail to you. Contact her at "fionac@u.washington.edu"

Well, Schuman et al., their doctoral student, and Tony are all certainly correct. The one problem is that, were this idea pushed very far at all, human language itself would begin to dissolve completely. Here I write, in hopes that you will read, but what you make of what I write, or what I made of what you read, must remain forever a mystery to me and to you, respectively. We are human, we have language, and there's nothing much we can do about it--other than continue to use language, and hope for the best. If language were not highly ambiguous, we would have no poetry, no effective advertising or salesmanship, and our species would have died out long ago due to a failure to procreate.

I interviewed a job candidate about 6 months ago who specialized in Cognitive Testing – an approach to survey instrument design which focuses on carefully crafting survey questions so that the meanings used by respondents of survey concepts are well understood and interpretable. It was very exciting work and we offered him a job. Alas his current employer sweetened the deal and he stayed put. His name is Roger Levine and he is at the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto. If I were you, I would give him a call.

Earlier this year Phil Gendall and I supervised a student who examined interpretations of a question used in a national referendum held in 1999, together with the last NZ General Election. The referendum question read:
"Should there be a reform of our justice system placing greater emphasis on the needs of victims, providing restitution and compensation for them and imposing minimum sentences and hard labour for all serious violent offences?"

As you can see, the question contains several components, thus voters could agree with one aspect, yet disagree with others. The student has not yet analysed the data in full, however, we are hoping to present a paper outlining the findings at next year's AAPOR conference, and I would be happy to send you details of our findings prior to AAPOR, if you felt they might be of interest to you or your student.

*******
ARCCGS@langate.gsu.edu, Charlotte G. Steeh
I know of several attempts to determine what meanings people attach to "concept" words. Sometime in the late 1980s or early 1990s the National Election Study asked respondents to define what liberal or conservative meant to them. I don't know if anyone published the results from this open-ended question, but the data are available from ICPSR. In addition, a 1995 CBS/New York Times poll asked respondents what they thought of when they heard the term "affirmative action." The striking finding here was that large percentages of respondents (as high as 55% of those without a high school diploma) could not think of a definition. This is a fascinating topic that does have broader applications than just writing good survey questions. Good luck to your student.

*******
c_helmstetter@hotmail.com, Craig Helmstetter (UOregon Socio grad student) I have a partial answer for Tony's question concerning "cognitive mapping" of ambiguous terms. Zaller (1992:55-) speaks to this a little. In an NES pilot respondents were asked what they were thinking about either just prior to or immediately after answering each in a series of opinion questions. Zaller doesn't really get into the "cognitive maps" or definitions used by each respondent -- he is more concerned with addressing attitude (in)stability (it turns out that the things people are taking into consideration when opining are more ideologically consistent for more "politically aware" respondents). The issue is also addressed in Converse's 1964 article, which suggests that a relatively small proportion of the "mass public" defines terms like "liberal" and "conservative" with the same definition/ level of sophistication as professors, pundits, and
politicicans.

Again, Converse characterizes the open-ended responses in terms of sophistication rather than "type of map."

Pedhauzer and Schmelkin mention the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory

-- 50 items, although they have some problems with the instrument.


Regarding the question raised, I always remembered a principle, from my questionnaire design training and from a lot of experience since then--- always use terms that are uniformly clear and do not mean different things to different people, including in this case, subsets of voters.

Thus in educational research, if you asked about parents and "how many times have you visited the school this year" it would be best to exclude (if suitable) "for conferences with your child's teacher" since the perception of the overall topic could mean include that to some respondents among other reasons for coming to school, and only that to other respondents.

As such, I would say that the more multidimensional or complex a term is when used in a question stem, the less likely that everyone will respond in terms of understanding it the same way. I can't state some research on this topic, other than it seems to come out of gestalt research in psychology, and how an entity is perceived.

The study you are referring to was done on my watch as Director of the Center for the Study of American Pluralism at NORC under a Markle...
Foundation
>> grant, and I think the student was Joan Fee. We didn't call it
cognitive
mapping
>> at the time, we were interested in how people from various
>> backgrounds interpreted the terms frequently used during the evening
>> news.
>>
>> Joan is out of academe now and actually lives in my community, Oak
>> Park. I'll get the citations of her work from NORC and send them to
>> you. I
don't
>> know if she still interacts with the research world anymore, but I'll find
>> out and let you know. I really didn't pick up on Tony's mistaken
reference,
>> I just couldn't imagine that there was another study asking those
questions,
>> and if there had been I would have been most interested. We actually
>> did the
>> work as a "pilot" project from Markle and they were so happy with the
>> results that they never funded the "full" study!! I learned then to
>> make "pilot projects" truly incomplete and 'teasers'! [never heard
>> back from
Bill]
>>
>> *********
>> gso-gso@att.net, Gary Siegel
>> Quite a bit of research was done by Woelfel, Fink, Barnett, et al in
>> the
>> 70s &
>> 80s. They used metric multidimensional scaling to map attitudes. I
>> don't
know
>> if they did research on the concepts that you refer to. But check out
some of
>> their work. Woelfel & Barnett are sociologists, but most of their
>> work
was
>> published in communications journals.
>>
>> *********
>> holptj@alltel.net, Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
>> I am in the field with a state wide poll asking about "growth" or
"sprawl"
>> and I had to struggle with this very issue. The findings from our
>> poll
will
>> be used to open up discussion about growth policy in the state- a
>> process
that
>> I'm sure will be very emotional and will result in great
miscommunication.
>> Because of this potential for miscommunication, I wanted to explore
>> the cognitive process. I thought about open-ended questions in order
>> to try and "map" the meanings people assign to "growth," but the
Another area that goes hand-in-hand with multidimensional scaling is item response theory (IRT). IRT "consists of a family of models that have been demonstrated to be useful in the design, construction and evaluation of educational and psychological tests," (Hambleton, Swaminathan & Rogers, 1991). The same principles might apply in this case. IRT is particularly useful for using item statistics to construct tests that meet content and technical specifications, evaluate the statistical consequences of changing items in a test, assess the relative utility of different tests that are measuring the same construct, detect the presence of potentially biased items, and place test item statistics obtained from nonequivalent samples of examinees on a common scale.

Check out the following references:


-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Anderson Research [mailto:ande271@attglobal.net]
Everyone missed something that is used by market researchers and that sounds very much like what the student was seeking. It is called Multidimensional Scaling, and the output is a "map," usually of perceptions of objects in terms of two (or more?) dimensions. I suppose a map could be prepared for each of various population sub-categories.


Patricia Gwartney wrote:

> In October I forwarded AAPOR a student inquiry about "cognitive mapping of emotive concepts." Many people requested that I summarize replies. Below is my belated summary, starting with the original question. Because it is long, I have deleted non-essential words, email characters, etc.
> On Tue, 10 Oct 2000, Patricia Gwartney wrote:
> Below is a question that I could not readily answer from a student in my Soc613 Survey Methods & Design course.
>Hi Professor Gwartney,
>
>As I was doing the reading for this week, Schuman et al. referred to a study done in the late 70s, in which a doctoral student conducted a survey to determine what various definitions Americans had of "concept words" such as "Big Business," "Liberal," or "Democrat." She argued that respondents often answer survey questions using quite different definitions of such key words than the researchers intended. A lesson drawn was that surveys should not use such vague, emotive terms in their questions.
>
>I'm very interested in this subject -- not just for its methodological impact on surveys, but even more for its impact on national debates about issues. For example, what do Americans think "global warming" means conceptually, as well as affectively? Or "environmentalism"? Or "liberal" and "conservative" etc. The fact that these terms are ambiguous, yet often highly emotive may not make them great for survey questions, but does make them important to study (e.g. when George W. Bush says Al Gore is for "big government" what different meanings does this term evoke in the public?).
>
>Do you know of any research that attempts to "map" the different meanings Americans have for various key words using the survey approach?
>
>Thanks!
>Cheers,
Dear Professor Schuman,

My deepest apologies, I got my readings confused! (we've had a lot)
The actual reference is from _Asking Questions_ (1982) by Sudman and Bradburn, p. 123. They reference a 1979 dissertation by Joan Fee which:

"investigated the meanings of some common political symbols used in public opinion studies. Adopting a variant of Belson's method, she asked respondents to elaborate on their understandings of particular symbols, such as 'federal government' and 'big business.' She found, for example, that at least nine different meanings were attached to the term 'energy crisis.' . . . Without knowing which of the images respondents held, a researcher might not be able to interpret their responses to questions about 'big government.' " Tony

Hschuman@umich.edu, Howard Schuman

No problem, I understand. My memory is that someone did this with NES data at one point, finding, for example, that for some people the word "conservative" meant frugal, as in conserving string or food, etc. May possibly have been Phil Converse, though I'm not at all sure. If you are interested in the general issue of important discrepant meanings, my 1972 AJS article on Vietnam focused on the two different meanings the word "mistake" had within the majority of those who called the Vietnam War a mistake. HS

rusciano@rider.edu "Frank Rusciano"

There actually is a story I heard while a graduate student at the University of Chicago about the term "social class." It seemed one researcher had correlated income with respondents' self reported social class, and found that the relationship was not as strong as they expected. After much follow up analysis, they discovered that if one controlled for race, the correlation was quite high for white respondents and nearly non-existent for black respondents. Subsequent research concluded that for white respondents, social class was an economic term, while for black respondents, it was a moral term. Black respondents tended to describe someone as of high social class if they had a standing in the community, if they were generally respected, if they had good manners, and so on.

The unfortunate part of this story is that I have tried to trace it back to Chicago, and have yet not been able to find its source. If anyone
knows about it, it would be interesting to see if this is just a folk tale, and also if the same relationship still exists.

One other story, that sounds funny, but had serious financial repercussions for the survey institution. There was a survey that used ethnicity as a critical variable in the analysis; one of the ethnic categories (after Irish, Italian, German, etc.) was "Native American", referring to ancestors of the indigenous peoples of the United States. Well, it seems they had about half of their surveys coming back with a "Native American" ethnicity, even though this group constituted only about .6% of the total population. Upon callbacks, it was found that respondents were saying "Of course I'm native American-- I was born here!" The survey directors almost cried over this one.

pmoy@u.washington.edu, Patricia Moy
Richard Carter, Professor Emeritus at Washington, developed something called "Cognigraphics" that your student might find useful. Keith Stamm, who is also in Communications, has worked with Cognigraphics in a number of contexts.

RFremontCa@aol.com, Richard F. Carter, Prof. emeritus, U Washington
You might want to look at the use of Cognigraphics, as reported in Communication Research, Vol. 21, No.3 (June 1994). With particular regard to the emotive aspect, see "How we thought about the Gulf War" in B. Greenberg and W. Gantz: Desert Storm and the Mass Media (Hampton Press, Cresskill, NJ. 1993)

kstamm@u.washington.edu, Keith Stamm
Carter and Stamm have published papers in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, Communication Research, and a volume by B. Greenberg on the mass media and the gulf war. The specific citations are below.


One of our doctoral students, Fiona Clark, did an interesting M.S. thesis on word associates and their cognitive relationship with "global warming." She has written a conference paper she could mail to you. Contact her at "fionac@u.washington.edu"
Well, Schuman et al., their doctoral student, and Tony are all certainly correct. The one problem is that, were this idea pushed very far at all, human language itself would begin to dissolve completely. Here I write, in hopes that you will read, but what you make of what I write, or what I made of what you read, must remain forever a mystery to me and to you, respectively. We are human, we have language, and there's nothing much we can do about it—other than continue to use language, and hope for the best. If language were not highly ambiguous, we would have no poetry, no effective advertising or salesmanship, and our species would have died out long ago due to a failure to procreate.

I interviewed a job candidate about 6 months ago who specialized in Cognitive Testing—an approach to survey instrument design which focuses on carefully crafting survey questions so that the meanings used by respondents of survey concepts are well understood and interpretable. It was very exciting work and we offered him a job. Alas his current employer sweetened the deal and he stayed put. His name is Roger Levine and he is at the American Institutes for Research in Palo Alto. If I were you, I would give him a call.

Earlier this year Phil Gendall and I supervised a student who examined interpretations of a question used in a national referendum held in 1999, together with the last NZ General Election. The referendum question read:
"Should there be a reform of our justice system placing greater emphasis on the needs of victims, providing restitution and compensation for them and imposing minimum sentences and hard labour for all serious violent offences?"

As you can see, the question contains several components, thus voters could agree with one aspect, yet disagree with others. The student has not yet analysed the data in full, however, we are hoping to present a paper outlining the findings at next year's AAPOR conference, and I would be happy to send you details of our findings prior to AAPOR, if you felt they might be of interest to you or your student.

I know of several attempts to determine what meanings people attach to "concept" words. Sometime in the late 1980s or early 1990s the National Election Study asked respondents to define what liberal or conservative meant to them. I don't know if anyone published the results from this open-ended question, but the data are available from ICPSR. In addition, a 1995 CBS/New York Times poll asked respondents what they thought of when they heard the term "affirmative action."
The striking finding here was that large percentages of respondents (as high as 55% of those without a high school diploma) could not think of a definition. This is a fascinating topic that does have broader applications than just writing good survey questions. Good luck to your student.

*********
c_helmstetter@hotmail.com, Craig Helmstetter (UOregon Socio grad student) I have a partial answer for Tony's question concerning "cognitive mapping" of ambiguous terms. Zaller (1992:55-) speaks to this a little. In an NES pilot respondents were asked what they were thinking about either just prior to or immediately after answering each in a series of opinion questions. Zaller doesn't really get into the "cognitive maps" or definitions used by each respondent -- he is more concerned with addressing attitude (in)stability (it turns out that the things people are taking into consideration when opining are more ideologically consistent for more "politically aware" respondents). The issue is also addressed in Converse's 1964 article, which suggests that a relatively small proportion of the "mass public" defines terms like "liberal" and "conservative" with the same definition/ level of sophistication as professors, pundits, and politicians. Again, Converse characterizes the open-ended responses in terms of sophistication rather than "type of map."

*********

snobrid@louisiana.edu <JANET A. BRIDGES>
Pedhauzer and Schmelkin mention the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory -- 50 items, although they have some problems with the instrument. <Can you give me more of a citation?> I used Elazar J. Pedhazur and Liora Pedhazur Schmelkin, _Measurement, Design and Analysis: An Integrated Approach_, Erlbaum, 1991, pp. 62-63. They list several items, but not all 50. Apparently the WPAI was reviewed in the Buros, _The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook_, vol. 1 (1150-52); Gryphon Press. Another cite they gave was: Wilson, G. D., _Manual for the Wilson-Patterson Attitude Inventory (WPAI)_ . London: NFER, 1975.

*********

MILTGOLD@aol.com, Milton R. Goldsamt
Regarding the question raised, I always remembered a principle, from my questionnaire design training and from a lot of experience since then--- always use terms that are uniformly clear and do not mean different things to different people, including in this case, subsets of voters.

Thus in educational research, if you asked about parents and "how many times
> have you visited the school this year" it would be best to exclude (if
suitable)
> "for conferences with your child's teacher" since the perception of
> the overall topic could mean include that to some respondents among
> other reasons for coming to school, and only that to other
> respondents.
>
> As such, I would say that the more multidimensional or complex a term
> is when
> used in a question stem, the less likely that everyone will respond in
terms of
> understanding it the same way. I can't state some research on this
> topic,
> other
> than it seems to come out of gestalt research in psychology, and how
> an entity is perceived.
>
> *********
> BMcCready@knowledgenetworks.com, Bill McCready
> The study you are referring to was done on my watch as Director of the
> Center for the Study of American Pluralism at NORC under a Markle
> Foundation
> grant, and I think the student was Joan Fee. We didn't call it
cognitive
> mapping
> at the time, we were interested in how people from various backgrounds
interpreted the terms frequently used during the evening news.
>
> Joan is out of academe now and actually lives in my community, Oak
> Park. I'll get the citations of her work from NORC and send them to
> you. I don't know if she still interacts with the research world
> anymore, but I'll find out and let you know. I really didn't pick up
> on Tony's mistaken
> reference,
> I just couldn't imagine that there was another study asking those
questions,
> and if there had been I would have been most interested. We actually
> did
> the
> work as a "pilot" project from Markle and they were so happy with the
> results that they never funded the "full" study!! I learned then to
> make "pilot projects" truly incomplete and 'teasers'!! [never heard
> back from
> Bill]
> >
> > *********
> gso-gso@att.net, Gary Siegel
> Quite a bit of research was done by Woelfel, Fink, Barnett, et al in
> the
> 70s &
> 80s. They used metric multidimensional scaling to map attitudes. I
> don't
> know
> if they did research on the concepts that you refer to. But check out
> some
> of
their work. Woelfel & Barnett are sociologists, but most of their work was published in communications journals.

**********
holptj@alltel.net, Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
I am in the field with a state wide poll asking about "growth" or "sprawl" and I had to struggle with this very issue. The findings from our poll will be used to open up discussion about growth policy in the state - a process that I'm sure will be very emotional and will result in great miscommunication. Because of this potential for miscommunication, I wanted to explore the cognitive process. I thought about open-ended questions in order to try and "map" the meanings people assign to "growth," but the budget was too tight.

Thank you for posting this wonderful question.

Patricia A. Gwartney, Ph.D.
Professor Founding Director
Department of Sociology Oregon Survey Research Laboratory
1291 University of Oregon 5245 University of Oregon
Eugene OR 97403-1291 USA Eugene OR 97403-5245 USA
E-mail: pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~osrl
Telephone: (541) 346-5007
Facsimile: (541) 346-5026

Adding to the ever-growing array of deceptive survey practices is the current scheme from AOL which they call their AutoAdvantage Gold Survey. The member receives a check in the amount of $2.50 as a "thank you" in advance for answering six simple questions about automobile ownership and maintenance. The problem is that when you cash or deposit the check you are automatically enrolled in their roadside assistance program ($79.95 billed to the credit card you use to pay your monthly AOL bill) which they have the nerve to call a "free trial membership" (you can get out at no cost during an initial period -- that is, if you actually know you joined). Discouraging to see cheap stuff like this coming from one of the icons of the
new electronic age. And a further assault on the public's perception of the legitimacy of surveys.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

RTI has job openings for survey methodologists, survey directors, and survey specialists. Please see the job descriptions below for more details.

Survey Methodologists

We currently have career opportunities for Survey Methodologists at all levels within the Survey Research Methods Program (SMRP). Minimum qualifications for the entry_level positions are a Masters degree in survey methodology, sociology, psychology, statistics or other related field; course work in survey methods; and 1+ year of post_degree experience in the design and implementation of surveys. Senior_level positions require 5+ years of post_degree experience in survey methods research. Strong oral and written communications skills are required at all levels.

SMRP is engaged in a variety of research areas that would interest survey methodologists including:

* comparisons of data quality by mode of interview;
* the application of cognitive interview methods for improving questionnaires;
* the application of usability testing for improving computerized survey applications;
* studies of the impact of nonresponse on survey estimates;
* estimation of reliability and validity in the absence of criterion measures;
and methods for improving response rates and response quality.

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for Survey Methodologist positions, please use job reference number 30659 and apply at our web-site at www.rti.org or E-mail your resume to jobs@rti.org. Or, mail your resume and cover letter to Research Triangle Institute, Office of Human Resources, P.O. Box 12194, RTP, NC 27709-2194. We are committed to diversity in the workplace. AA/EOE/M/F/V/D

Senior Survey Director

We currently have career opportunities for Senior Survey Directors in each of our office locations.

Minimum Qualifications: The most successful candidates have 10+ years experience:

C working with clients as a project director, principal investigator, or in other senior management or scientific roles
C managing contract research
C working closely with staff across a wide variety of substantive and technical fields (epidemiologists, survey methodologists, statisticians, health and social policy, survey operations, and computer applications and design)
C gaining recognition from peers and clients for technical expertise
C authoring articles published in peer-reviewed scientific journals

Responsibilities: Responsibilities of a Senior Survey Director include:

C Working with study collaborators to develop, implement, and monitor research designs
C Managing day_to_day activities of ongoing research studies
C Preparing and presenting research reports to clients
C Make positive contributions to marketing and business development activities
C Contributing to and directing the preparation, presentation, and follow-up of research proposals

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for Senior Survey Director positions, please use job reference number 30666 and apply at our web-site at www.rti.org or E-mail your resume to jobs@rti.org. Or, mail your resume and cover letter to Research Triangle Institute, Office of Human Resources, P.O. Box 12194, RTP, NC 27709-2194. We are committed to diversity in the workplace. AA/EOE/M/F/V/D

Survey Specialist

We currently have career opportunities for entry-level and mid-level Survey Specialists in each of our office locations.
Minimum Qualifications - The most successful candidates have:

C B.S. or B.A. degree with a background in social science research methods (entry-level and mid-level candidates)
C Strong writing and oral communications, interpersonal, word processing, organizing, and computer spreadsheet skills (entry-level and mid-level)
C Mid-level candidates must have 3+ years of post-graduate experience with survey research, research design, client interaction, management of day-to-day activities of ongoing research tasks and studies, budget development, cost control, report writing, and presentation

Responsibilities: The responsibilities of a survey specialist include:

C Working with study collaborators to develop, implement, and monitor research designs
C Overseeing data collection operations (field or phone)
C Training data collectors
C Implementing quality control procedures
C Scheduling and delegating of study tasks
C Traveling periodically overnight
C Documenting study procedures
C Contributing to the preparation of research proposals

RTI offers competitive salary and excellent benefits. To apply for Survey Specialist positions, please use job reference number 30799 and apply at our web-site at www.rti.org or E-mail your resume to jobs@rti.org. Or, mail your resume and cover letter to Research Triangle Institute, Office of Human Resources, P.O. Box 12194, RTP, NC 27709-2194. We are committed to diversity in the workplace. AA/EOE/M/F/V/D

========================================================================
Date: Tue, 05 Dec 2000 16:00:13 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Links to Election Information
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

For those still interested a complete set of election links can be found here: (Courtesy of the Red Rock News Eater Service)

    http://dlis.gseis.ucla.edu/people/pagre/florida.html

========================================================================
Date: Tue, 05 Dec 2000 16:13:34 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: Statistical Analysis Would Cheer Gore
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary=""=""=_4167517==_.ALT"

For those still interested a complete set of election links can be found here: (Courtesy of the Red Rock News Eater Service)
Hard to believe that statistical analysis can really help Gore at this point but miracles have been known to happen. Problem that Bush faces is that when and if a total recount is conducted (weeks, maybe months from now) and if Gore is ultimately found to be the winner, the mandate that Bush may think he now has will become more elusive than ever. Governance will be tough in any event.

Dick Halpern

Statistical Analysis Would Cheer Gore

By Dan Keating
Washington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, December 5, 2000; Page A26

As his chances of claiming the presidency become slimmer, can Vice President Gore go down believing that in a world of perfect voters, he would have won?

Yes, according to a study done of uncounted ballots in every precinct in Florida by an Arizona State University professor on behalf of the Miami Herald.

The study by journalism professor Stephen Doig, a former Pulitzer Prize winner at the Herald, looked at more than 185,000 ballots that did not register a presidential choice, either because no vote was detected on the ballot or because the voter selected two presidential candidates, which voids any vote in that race. He assumed that those uncounted ballots would have fallen to Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush in the same pattern as the ballots that were counted in the same precinct.

Doig found, as other studies have noted, that a preponderance of the uncounted ballots were in Gore strongholds. So, if they had counted as votes, Gore would have won Florida.

If every single one of the ballots were a vote, Gore would have won by around 23,000 votes—a victory of less than one-half of one percent. But since Bush's 537-vote majority is so slim and the miscast ballots were skewed to Democratic precincts, not all the ballots would have to count to make Gore the winner, Doig said.

He said yesterday that critics of his study have attacked the extreme possibility that every single voter intended to express a choice for president. But even at the other extreme—that less than 10 percent of the miscast ballots were intended to be votes—Gore would still have won, he said.

Doig found the uncounted ballots were more likely in counties that use punch-card machines, and especially in the two punch-card counties that had the most famously confusing ballots: Palm Beach
County's butterfly ballot and Duval County's list of presidential candidates spread over two successive pages.

"All I've really done with my study is underscore how flawed and fragile the voting systems in a lot of Florida counties were," he said. "They had always been that way, we just never knew it until we had an election that was this important and this close."

Critics of the study for the Herald said that some voters intentionally leave their ballots blank and other intentionally vote for more than one candidate as a form of protest. They also complained that the behavior of other voters is insufficient to guess the intentions of a blank ballot, and that pretend scenarios about invalid ballots are meaningless.

Bush spokesman Tucker Eskew was quoted by the Miami Herald calling the study "statistical voodoo," "hocus pocus" and "an utterly unfounded statistical process."

One aspect of Doig's analysis may buoy Voters News Service, the news organization cooperative whose Election Day exit polling indicated that Gore won the state.

"What my data shows is actually what VNS found," Doig said. "Exit polling was based on people coming out of the precinct saying, 'I voted for so-and-so.' Those people didn't know their vote really didn't count."

---

Hard to believe that statistical analysis can really help Gore at this point but miracles have been known to happen. Problem that Bush faces is that when and if a total recount is conducted (weeks, maybe months from now) and if Gore is ultimately found to be the winner, the mandate that Bush may think he now has will become more elusive than ever. Governance will be tough in any event.

Dick Halpern

Statistical Analysis Would Cheer Gore

By Dan Keating

Washington Post Staff Writer

Tuesday, December 5, 2000; Page A26

As his chances of claiming the presidency become slimmer, can Vice President Gore go down believing that in a world of perfect voters, he would have won? Yes, according to a study done of uncounted ballots in every precinct in Florida by an Arizona State University professor on behalf of the Miami Herald. The study by journalism professor Stephen Doig, a former Pulitzer Prize winner at the Herald, looked at more than 185,000 ballots that did not register a presidential choice, either because no vote was detected on the ballot or because the voter selected two
presidential candidates, which voids any vote in that race. He assumed that those uncounted ballots would have fallen to Gore and Texas Gov. George W. Bush in the same pattern as the ballots that were counted in the same precinct. Doig found, as other studies have noted, that a preponderance of the uncounted ballots were in Gore strongholds. So, if they had counted as votes, Gore would have won Florida. If every single one of the ballots were a vote, Gore would have won by around 23,000 votes—a victory of less than one-half of one percent. But since Bush's 537-vote majority is so slim and the miscast ballots were so skewed to Democratic precincts, not all the ballots would have to count to make Gore the winner, Doig said. He said yesterday that critics of his study have attacked the extreme possibility that every single voter intended to express a choice for president. But even at the other extreme—that less than 10 percent of the miscast ballots were intended to be votes—Gore would still have won, he said.

Doig found the uncounted ballots were more likely in counties that use punch-card machines, and especially in the two punch-card counties that had the most famously confusing ballots: Palm Beach County's butterfly ballot and Duval County's list of presidential candidates spread over two successive pages. &quot;All I've really done with my study is underscore how flawed and fragile the voting systems in a lot of Florida counties were,&quot; he said. &quot;They had always been that way, we just never knew it until we had an election that was this important and this close.&quot; Critics of the study for the Herald said that some voters intentionally leave their ballots blank and other intentionally vote for more than one candidate as a form of protest. They also complained that the behavior of other voters is insufficient to guess the intentions of a blank ballot, and that pretend scenarios about invalid ballots are meaningless. Bush spokesman Tucker Eskew was quoted by the Miami Herald calling the study &quot;statistical voodoo,&quot; &quot;hocus pocus;&quot; and &quot;an utterly unfounded statistical process.&quot; One aspect of Doig's analysis may buoy Voters News Service, the news organization cooperative whose Election Day exit polling indicated that Gore won the state.

&quot;What my data shows is actually what VNS found,&quot; Doig said. &quot;Exit polling was based on people coming out of the precinct saying, 'I voted for so-and-so.' Those people didn't know their vote really didn't count.&quot; Critics of the study for the Herald said that some voters intentionally leave their ballots blank and other intentionally vote for more than one candidate as a form of protest. They also complained that the behavior of other voters is insufficient to guess the intentions of a blank ballot, and that pretend scenarios about invalid ballots are meaningless. Bush spokesman Tucker Eskew was quoted by the Miami Herald calling the study &quot;statistical voodoo,&quot; &quot;hocus pocus;&quot; and &quot;an utterly unfounded statistical process.&quot; One aspect of Doig's analysis may buoy Voters News Service, the news organization cooperative whose Election Day exit polling indicated that Gore won the state.

"What my data shows is actually what VNS found,&quot; Doig said. &quot;Exit polling was based on people coming out of the precinct saying, 'I voted for so-and-so.' Those people didn't know their vote really didn't count.&quot; Critics of the study for the Herald said that some voters intentionally leave their ballots blank and other intentionally vote for more than one candidate as a form of protest. They also complained that the behavior of other voters is insufficient to guess the intentions of a blank ballot, and that pretend scenarios about invalid ballots are meaningless. Bush spokesman Tucker Eskew was quoted by the Miami Herald calling the study &quot;statistical voodoo,&quot; &quot;hocus pocus;&quot; and &quot;an utterly unfounded statistical process.&quot; One aspect of Doig's analysis may buoy Voters News Service, the news organization cooperative whose Election Day exit polling indicated that Gore won the state.

="4167517=" A9 2000 The Washington Post
Dear AAPORites,

I would appreciate being contacted by anyone who has noted any unexpected change in their survey response rates since the election.

By "unexpected," I mean different from what one might expect in November and/or different from what one might expect following a "typical" general election. If you have experienced different-than-expected response rates since the election, I'd also appreciate learning your thinking about why it has happened.

Please respond privately to me (pjlavrakas@tvratings.com) and I will gladly post a synthesis to AAPORnet of the responses.

Thanks!

*********************************************************************
Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Vice President & Senior Research Methodologist
NIELSEN MEDIA RESEARCH
299 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10171
OFFICE/VOICE: 212-708-7002
FAX: 212-708-7013
HOME: 740-587-0223
*********************************************************************
AAPOR netters,

I am forwarding this request for Christine Bachan, Department of Communication, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA. Please respond directly to her at <cbachen@scu.edu>:

"I'm looking for how many minutes/hours the average adult watches TV or videos, talks on the phone, uses a computer, is online, reads magazines, books or newspapers and plays videogames. I'm also trying to find a source for how many American households have cellular phones and pagers. Thanks so much for any help you (AAPOR) can give."

She probably will summarize the responses she receives to interested AAPOR members...

Robert Mason
Department of Statistics
Oregon State University
masonr@stat.orst.edu
Marist College invites applications for three tenure-track or tenured faculty positions in the Communication Department to begin September 2001. Communication is the largest major on campus. Our faculty seek new colleagues who are committed to developing a graduate program and excited about both the pedagogical promise of new technology and the profound change new technology will have on communication.

1. Communication Theory and Research Methods Including Public Opinion and/or media Management (2 positions)- Includes teaching selected courses from: core communication courses (Communication Principles, Communication Research, Communication and Society, Communication Ethics, Public Presentations), Public Opinion, and other courses in the candidate's area of expertise.

2. Journalism, Ethics, and Multimedia. Includes teaching: Introduction to Journalism, Ethics, Advanced Journalism, Desk-Top Publishing and Editing for World Wide Web, and Specialized Reporting, core communication courses (see above), and other courses in the candidate's area of expertise.

Responsibilities include teaching 4 classes/semester (some teaching assignments may involve distance education via the Internet), student advising, scholarly activity commensurate with the teaching load, and institutional and professional service. Minimum qualifications include a PhD in Communication or a closely related field completed by Fall 2001, (Masters in hand or completed by Fall 2001 plus significant professional journalism experience will be considered for position #2), continued scholarly activity, a strong commitment to developing in students a sense of ethical responsibility in the practice of communication, a strong commitment to student-centered education, outstanding teaching skills, professional experience, and a strong interest and record in the pedagogical uses of technology. Familiarity with technology-based, Knowledge Management research and practice is highly desired.

Marist College is a nationally recognized, comprehensive, independent, liberal arts institution known for its excellence in teaching and for its use of information technology. It is located in Poughkeepsie, New York on the banks of the historic Hudson River, midway between Albany and New York City. The College enrolls 3,800 full-time traditional undergraduate and 600 graduate students. Marist was recognized by CAUSE as one of the top four colleges and universities in the US for its innovative use of technology.
technology and excellence in campus networking. The College seeks to explore ways in which academic excellence may be enhanced by state-of-the-art information and communication technology.

Review of applications will begin immediately and continue until the positions are filled. Please submit a letter of application, curriculum vitae, a statement of teaching philosophy, one copy of scholarly research (or creative work for position #2), and five names and phone numbers of references to: Office of Human Resources, Marist College, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601. An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer

Guy Lometti, PhD
Dean
School of Communication and The Arts
Marist College
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Voice: (845) 575-3650
Fax: (845) 575-3645
Email: Guy.Lometti@Marist.Edu
Web: www.academic.marist.edu/commarts/

Date: Wed, 6 Dec 2000 07:24:51 -0500
From: "Marcello, Melissa" <mmarcello@swrworldwide.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Media use estimates
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

I think many of these questions cld be answered by the GSS (General Social Survey). Perhaps she cld visit the NORC website. Good luck.

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert Mason [mailto:masonr@STAT.orst.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 05, 2000 7:27 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Cc: cbachen@scu.edu
Subject: Media use estimates

AAPOR netters,

I am forwarding this request for Christine Bachan, Department of Communication, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA. Please respond directly to her at <cbachen@scu.edu>: 

```
"I'm looking for how many minutes/hours the average adult watches TV or videos, talks on the phone, uses a computer, is online, reads magazines, books or newspapers and plays videogames. I'm also trying to find a source for how many American households have cellular phones and pagers. Thanks so much for any help you (AAPOR) can give."

She probably will summarize the responses she receives to interested AAPOR members...

Robert Mason
Department of Statistics
Oregon State University
masonr@stat.orst.edu

========================================================================
Date: Wed, 6 Dec 2000 08:58:08 -0500
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-ID: <852569AD.004CBC41.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: Request for references
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

Dear AAPOR colleagues,

An associate of mine is looking for some references to the following:

"Are any of you aware of any articles or textbook references on the impact of having an overall evaluation rating (e.g., overall liking, satisfaction, Purchase Intent) before versus after an attribute battery?"

If any of my colleagues out there can point me to a reference from any professional or academic source, it would be appreciated. Please e-mail me directly at bthompson@directionsrsch.com.

Many thanks.

Bill Thompson
Senior Account Manager
Directions Research, Inc.
401 East Court Street, Suite 200
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
513-651-2990

========================================================================
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Peter Miller <p-miller@nwu.edu>
Subject: Re: conf chairs or discussants
In-Reply-To: <Pine.A41.4.21.0012051620510.121988-100000@homer07.u.washington.edu>
References: <4.1.20001130153135.00c87d30@casbah.acns.nwu.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

not too early, kurt. thanks to you and gladys. will find a slot for you. P

At 04:22 PM 12/5/00 -0800, you wrote:
>Dear Peter -
>It's probably a bit early on your calendar but Gladys and I both want
>to offer ourselves as possible chairs or discussants before we go away
>until mid-January.
>
>Best,
>Kurt

Kurt Lang, Prof. emeritus
Dept. of Sociology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3340
Home Address:
  1249 20th Ave. E.
  Seattle, WA 98112-3530
  Tel. (206) 325-4569
  FAX (at UW) 206-543-2516

========================================================================

Date: Thu, 7 Dec 2000 08:03:27 -0500
From: "Santos, Robert" <RSantos@ui.urban.org>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Jennifer Reed (E-mail)" <TSCJReed@aol.com>,
   " (E-mail)"
Subject: DC/AAPOR: Coding Open Ended Reports (Dec. 11) -- LAST CALL!
Mime-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

Greetings, DC-AAPOR Members!

Here is the "Last Call" for RSVPs to attend a very interesting seminar!

Send your RSVPs to audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com
or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Thursday, December 7.
Happy holiday season, AAPONETTERS!

Rob Santos
Chapter Prez & Local Grinch

*********

Topic: Classifying Open Ended Reports: Coding Occupation in the Current Population

When: Monday, December 11th, 2000, 12:30 - 2:00 p.m.

Speakers: Frederick G. Conrad, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Mick P. Couper, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

Location: BLS Conference and Training Center (basement level) Room #9, Postal Square Building, 2 Massachusetts Ave., NE, Washington, DC (Enter on First St., NE, and bring a photo ID)

Metro: Union Station, Red Line

RSVP: To be placed on the visitors list, send e-mail to audrey.kindlon@us.pwcglobal.com or dc-aapor.admin@erols.com or call Audrey Kindlon at 301-897-4413 by Thursday, December 7.


Abstract: An overlooked source of survey measurement error is the misclassification of open-ended responses. This seminar reports on efforts to understand the misclassification of occupation descriptions in the Current Population Survey (CPS). Actual CPS descriptions were analyzed to identify which features vary with intercoder reliability.

An experiment was conducted to test how these features interact with each other to affect reliability. Finally the presenters observed and interacted with coders at work to help explain the experimental results.

First a set of occupation descriptions (n=32,362) reported by CPS respondents and entered by interviewers was analyzed; each description was classified by two independent coders. One factor that was strongly related to reliability was the length of the occupation description: contrary to our intuitions, longer descriptions were less reliably coded than shorter ones. This was followed with an experimental study of occupation descriptions (n=800) that was constructed to vary on key features (e.g. specific terms led to low or high reliability in study one); these descriptions were again "double-coded." The effect of description length depended on the difficulty of primary occupation terms. Difficult occupation terms led to a strong length effect; easy occupation terms led to virtually no length effect. Finally, coders classifying 50
experimental descriptions were observed and asked about their reasoning. This qualitative study produced a possible explanation for the lower reliability of longer descriptions: inconsistent application of informal coding rules.

Date: Thu, 07 Dec 2000 15:31:34 -0500
From: Marlene Bednarz <mbednarz@umich.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Quote Info (source) Request
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

If you know the answer -- please email Adam Clymer. adclym@nytimes.com

Source, history etc. of the following (more or less) quote has been requested:
"The only poll that counts is the poll taken on election day."

Thanks.

Date: Thu, 7 Dec 2000 15:53:40 -0500
From: "Beatty, Paul C." <pbb5@cdc.gov>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: 2001 Conference in Montreal
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

A number of AAPOR members have asked how to make hotel reservations for the 2001 Conference in Montreal.

We are glad to see people planning ahead-- it certainly helps us plan conference logistics when people make their reservations early. However, we'd like to ask you to hold off for a little while before booking a room at the conference hotel. In late January or early February, we will distribute reservation information that will provide all the details you'll need.

Hotels increasingly employ off-site "reservations centers" rather than handling bookings through their own staffs (even if you call the hotel directly, you are often routed to such a center during your call). Supposedly, this is more efficient for hotels. But it also means that reservations are taken by people who handle a variety of properties
and may have little knowledge of our hotel or the unique
classics of our group. Some of you experienced complications
due to similar circumstances when making reservations in Portland
early this year. Imagine some novice interviewers conducting a CATI
survey when they were poorly trained on the questionnaire and study
topic, and you get the idea.

Shap Wolf and I will be visiting the hotel next month to work on
conference logistics. Shortly thereafter, the hotel should be
prepared to take everyone's reservations—hopefully with a minimum of
difficulties. Look for more information on AAPORNNET sometime next
month for more details.

Thanks for your patience— we know everyone is looking forward to
coming together for another great conference.

Paul Beatty
Conference Operations Chair

*******************************
Paul C. Beatty
Cognitive Methods Staff
National Center for Health Statistics
6525 Belcrest Road, Room 915
Hyattsville, MD 20782
phone: 301-458-4090
fax: 301-458-4031
email: pbeatty@cdc.gov

=========================================================================
As the election contest has continued, Americans have become increasingly disenchanted with the presidential selection process. They also increasingly believe that the electoral system has failed them.

The latest Shorenstein Center weekly national poll indicates that 66% of Americans now say that the 2000 campaign has been "depressing," up from 46% in the week before Election Day. Fewer than one in five Americans describe the campaign as "uplifting." Democrats (69%) and Independents (69%) are more critical of the campaign, but even a majority of Republicans (59%) say it has been depressing. "While most Americans say they are paying reasonably close attention to the Florida developments, a stunning 66% say the 2000 election campaign has been 'depressing' -- a huge leap from the 46% in the last week of the campaign," says Marvin Kalb, executive director of the Shorenstein Center's Washington Office. "Paying attention to politics these days may lead to being depressed about politics."

Most Americans also think the election has been "unfair to the voters." Fifty-seven percent of Americans hold this view, although there are major differences of opinion on this issue. Compared with 71% of Democrats and 64% of Independents, only 30% of Republicans claim the election has been "unfair" to the voters. African Americans are particularly likely to think the voters have been shortchanged. Eighty-six percent of them say the election has been "unfair" to the voters, up from 64% the week of November 19.

African Americans' general opinion of American politics has also soured. On October 24, 49% of African Americans were "very" or "fairly" satisfied with "the way politics is being conducted in the country these days." That fraction has now plummeted to 13%. Among Americans as a whole, satisfaction with politics has declined from 43% to 25% in the past six weeks.

Many Americans also question whether either candidate has earned the presidential office. Thirty-five percent describe George W. Bush as "undeserving" of the presidency. Forty-two percent hold this view of Al Gore. "Whichever candidate emerges as president will have a lot of work to do -- and should hope that the economy doesn't falter -- if he is to gain Americans' trust and restore their confidence in the political process," says Thomas Patterson, Shorenstein Center survey director and Bradlee Professor of Government & the Press at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.

VOTER INVOLVEMENT INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 29 - Dec 3</td>
<td>59 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 22 - 26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 15 - 19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 8 - 12</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1 - 5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Vanishing Voter Project is a study by the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. Funding for the project is provided by The Pew Charitable Trusts. The project is co-directed by Thomas E. Patterson, Bradlee Professor of Government & the Press at the Shorenstein Center at Harvard, and by Marvin Kalb, Executive Director of the Shorenstein Center's office in Washington. More results are available on the project's web site at http://www.vanishingvoter.org/. The results reported here are from nationwide telephone surveys of approximately 1,000 adults conducted November 14, 1999 - December 3, 2000. The surveys have a sampling error of plus or minus 3%.

If you wish to unsubscribe from this mailing list, you may do so at http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/vvoter/unsubscribe.html.

[I'm passing this on to the list, from Jim Dannemiller at info@smshawaii.com - Earl]

This is a response from someone long out of university who does survey work on a daily basis. I think most of the responses are accurate. It might be helpful, however, if they are considered as parts of a unified research approach. I will focus of three aspects of the strategy: (1) social scientific theory; (2) survey instrumentation; and (3) analytical methods.

1. Theory

A useful theoretical approach is to consider issues like 'the gulf war',

Oct 25 - 29 45
Source: Shorenstein Center Poll for the Vanishing Voter Project
Sampling error: +/- 3%

The Vanishing Voter Project is a study by the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government. Funding for the project is provided by The Pew Charitable Trusts. The project is co-directed by Thomas E. Patterson, Bradlee Professor of Government & the Press at the Shorenstein Center at Harvard, and by Marvin Kalb, Executive Director of the Shorenstein Center's office in Washington. More results are available on the project's web site at http://www.vanishingvoter.org/. The results reported here are from nationwide telephone surveys of approximately 1,000 adults conducted November 14, 1999 - December 3, 2000. The surveys have a sampling error of plus or minus 3%.

If you wish to unsubscribe from this mailing list, you may do so at http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/vvoter/unsubscribe.html.
"global warming", "liberal", or "loyalty" to be constructs rather than concepts. The difference is one of complexity - concepts are singular or simple elements/topics, constructs are complex or multi-faceted ones.

Constructs are not amenable to single-question inquiry, regardless of how precisely written. Because of their inherent nature, or the way they are perceived, they have many parts. A construct cannot be adequately measured without measuring all if its parts. Latent construct theory is applicable since we might reasonably consider the construct to be a weighted combination of all its manifestations in the minds of the target population. So the "wording problem" posed by the student may be one of specification rather than semantics.

2. Instrumentation

The measurement issue is still a problem. The theory replaces the need for a single precise verbal stimulus to the need for a set of stimuli that are independent of one another and describe the full scope of the construct. On question wording I agree with all responders and with textbooks on questionnaire construction. In addition, I recommend that you use your word processor's spell checker to make sure you are writing at an 8th grade level. We do that in the research business NOT because our respondents aren't very smart (an all too common misunderstanding), but because words we learn before grade eight have widely shared connotations. Words we learn after grade eight may have agreed upon definitions, but connote very different things to different people.

Pre-survey focus groups to get a list of issues related to the construct, and to identify the vocabulary used by "the people" rather than "the experts", are often very useful.

Finally, it is a good idea to at least speculate about what the "construct map" looks like before you start writing questions. Back in graduate school we used a technique called Facet Theory to do that (Thank you Louis Guttman, et. al.). I still find it a useful tool.

3. Analytical Methods

Two methods that are useful in the kind of research described in the "summary of replies" are multidimensional scaling analysis (MDS) and structural equation models (SEM). They are useful because they are consistent with concept mapping and latent construct theory. MDS uses a geometric model to draw concept maps based on similarity/dissimilarity of responses. SEM uses an algebraic model to estimate parameters of complex models involving latent constructs. Both are sophisticated procedures that require some background and practice to master. Both are
readily available. In SPSS, MDS is called ALSCAL and SEM is called AMOS4. Caveat: Both models are for interval scaled data and our data are often less rigorously measured. Guttman's Smallest Space Analysis handles nominal and ordinal data for MDS, and Jay Magneson's Latent Gold is an about-to-be-released procedure for non-interval latent class analysis.

This research approach can often avoid the pitfalls (and resulting criticism) of research on complex issues. The theory is well known and appropriate to the task. The questions can be developed to be consistent with the theory. The analytical methods are isomorphic to the theory and data. Together they provide the scientific rigor needed for such research. The results tend to be fairly easy to understand, and the latent constructs define the issue as a combination of semantic stimuli. As such they are often less subject to criticism on the basis of language. Thank you for the opportunity to comment

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/

A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.

Date: Thu, 07 Dec 2000 16:27:21 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>
Subject: Trimming sample weights
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

A common practice in constructing sample weights is to trim the weights. This reduces variation in the weights which in turn increases the efficiency of statistical analyses performed on the data. The tradeoff is the potential for increased bias.

I have had difficulty finding statistical literature discussing this practice and would appreciate references. Under what circumstances is this practice justifiable? Are there well-regarded "rules of thumb" on how much to trim and at what point in the weight construction?

Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH
KIIS UKRAINE OMNIBUS SURVEY

Dear Colleagues,

The Kiev International Institute of Sociology informs that in the period of 3 January -- 17 January, 2001 it will conduct an omnibus survey of the adult population of Ukraine.

SAMPLE:

2,000 respondents aged 16 years and older, living in Ukraine. Sample is based on random selection of 200 sampling points (post-office districts) all over Ukraine (in all 24 oblasts of Ukraine and Crimea). The sampling process consists of random selection of streets, buildings and apartments inside each post-office district. The last stage is the random selection of respondents from households.

Our sample has more respondents and more sampling points than any other sample for omnibuses in Ukraine, it is representative not only for Ukraine as a whole but for separate regions and groups of regions. It includes about 1,350 urban interviews.

You can choose to buy half a sample (1,000 respondents) for lower price and it will be done also in all 200 sampling points. The number of sampling points influences greatly on the sample error (if for example for cluster sample of 1,000 respondents and 100 sampling points sample error is 5%, the sample error for the same 1,000 respondents, but 200 sampling points is 3.5%)

DEADLINES:
- The deadline to provide questions is 23th December, 2000

FIELDWORK:
- 3-17 January, 2001

RESULTS AVAILABLE:
- 25th January, 2001
COST PER ONE QUESTION:

FULL SAMPLE (2,000)
- Closed (pre-coded) question (one variable in SPSS)
  or closed (pre-coded) question with multiple choice
  (up to 5 variables in SPSS)
  - $260
- Closed (pre-coded) question with multiple choice
  (k variables in SPSS, k>5)
  - $260 + $50*(k-5)
- Open-ended question
  - $460
- Closed question in the battery of 3 and more questions
  - $190

HALF SAMPLE (1,000) OR URBAN SAMPLE (1,350)
- Closed (pre-coded) question (one variable in SPSS) or
  closed (pre-coded) question with multiple choice (up to
  5 variables in SPSS)
  - $130
- Closed (pre-coded) question with multiple choice (k
  variables in SPSS, k>5)
  - $130 + $25*(k-5)
- Open-ended question
  - $240
- Closed question in the battery of 3 and more questions
  - $110

DISCOUNTS:
- For clients who will purchase more than 10 questions - 10% discount;
- For clients who participated in one of previous omnibus surveys - 20% discount.

DEMOGRAPHICS INCLUDED:
- Sex
- Age
- Education
- Place of residence (oblast, urban or rural)
- Ethnicity

OTHER DEMOGRAPHICS AVAILABLE:
- Socio-economic status
- Income
- Language
- Religiousness
- Size of settlement

The cost of every additional demographics question is $55 for 2,000 respondents sample and $30 for 1,000 sample

COMMENTS FOR OUR REGULAR CLIENTS:
1) We would like to pay your attention, that our regular prices became lower
   - the same price for 2,000 interview instead of 1,600;
2) We refused from $370 entry fee as it was before, and have instead payment for additional demography questions, it's much more comfortable for the lients, who included just a few questions
HOW TO JOIN OUR MAILING LIST OR TO BE REMOVED FROM IT:

Subscription to our mailing list means that you will receive regular omnibus announcements and major news updates. Signing up to our list is easy: just send an empty message to omnlist@kiis.com.ua with the subject "Subscribe_Omnlist". Similarly, send an empty message to omnlist@kiis.com.ua with the subject "Unsubscribe_Omnlist" and we will remove your name promptly. But do feel free to pass this announcement on to others if you find it interesting!

KIEV INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIOLOGY
8/5 Voloska str., 04070 Kiev, Ukraine
t/f: (380 44) 238-2567/2568, 463-5868
omnibus@kiis.com.ua
www.kiis.com.ua

******************************************************************************
Report problems to: <mailto:omnibus@kiis.com.ua>
Check the Omnibus web page: <http://kiis.com.ua/?omnibus>

To unsubscribe, click here:
<mailto:omnlist@kiis.com.ua?subject=Unsubscribe_Omnlist>
******************************************************************************

Volodimir Paniotto, Director of KIIS
(Kiev International Institute of Sociology)
Milchakova 1/18, kv.11, Kiev-02002, UKRAINE
Phone (380-44)-463-5868,238-2567,238-2568 (office)
Phone (380-44)-517-3949 (home)
Fax (380-44)-263-3458, phone-fax 463-5868
E-mail: paniotto@kmis.kiev.ua
http://www.kiis.com.ua
******************************************************************************

==========================================================================
Date: Fri, 08 Dec 2000 11:31:25 +0100
To: babbie@chapman.edu, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
From: Edith de Leeuw <edithl@xs4all.nl>
Subject: Re: Summary of replies to inquiry about cognitive mapping of emotiveconcepts
Cc: Jim Dannemiller <info@smshawaii.com>
In-Reply-To: <3A2FFF9C.4833E1C5@chapman.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Perhaps a nice addition to this excellent advice is the chapter of Joop Hox titled "From theoretical concept to survey question" in Lars Lyberg (et
1997, Survey measurement and process quality. In the Wiley series in
probability and statistics.

Warm regards, Edith de Leeuw
   At 01:22 PM 12/7/00 -0800, Earl Babbie wrote:
   >[I'm passing this on to the list, from Jim Dannemiller at
   >info@smshawaii.com -- Earl]
   >
   >This is a response from someone long out of university who does survey
   >work on a daily basis. I think most of the responses are accurate. It
   >might be helpful, however, if they are considered as parts of a unified
   >research approach. I will focus of three aspects of the strategy: (1)
   >social scientific theory; (2) survey instrumentation; and (3)
   >analytical methods.
   >
   >1. Theory
   
   A useful theoretical approach is to consider issues like 'the gulf
   >war',
   >
   >"global warming", "liberal", or "loyalty" to be constructs rather than
   >concepts. The difference is one of complexity - concepts are singular
   >or simple elements/topics, constructs are complex or multi-faceted
   >ones.
   >
   >Constructs are not amenable to single-question inquiry, regardless of
   >how precisely written. Because of their inherent nature, or the way
   >they are perceived, they have many parts. A construct cannot be
   >adequately measured without measuring all if its parts. Latent
   >construct theory is applicable since we might reasonably consider the
   >construct to
   >
   >be a weighted combination of all its manifestations in the minds of the
   >target population. So the "wording problem" posed by the student may
   >be one of specification rather than semantics.
   >
   >2. Instrumentation
   
   The measurement issue is still a problem. The theory replaces the need
   >for a single precise verbal stimulus to the need for a set of stimuli
   >that are independent of one another and describe the full scope of the
   >construct.
   >On question wording I agree with all responders and with textbooks on
   >questionnaire construction. In addition, I recommend that you use your
   >word processor's spell checker to make sure you are writing at an 8th
   >grade level. We do that in the research business NOT because our
   >respondents aren't very smart (an all too common misunderstanding), but
   >because words we learn before grade eight have widely shared
   >connotations.
   >Words we learn after grade eight may have agreed upon definitions, but
   >connote very different things to different people.
   >
   >Pre-survey focus groups to get a list of issues related to the
   >construct, and to identify the vocabulary used by "the people" rather
   >than "the experts",
   >are often very useful.
Finally, it is a good idea to at least speculate about what the "construct map" looks like before you start writing questions. Back in graduate school we used a technique called Facet Theory to do that (Thank you Louis Guttman, et al.). I still find it a useful tool.

3. Analytical Methods

Two methods that are useful in the kind of research described in the "summary of replies" are multidimensional scaling analysis (MDS) and structural equation models (SEM). They are useful because they are consistent with concept mapping and latent construct theory. MDS uses a geometric model to draw concept maps based on similarity/dissimilarity of responses. SEM uses an algebraic model to estimate parameters of complex models involving latent constructs. Both are sophisticated procedures that require some background and practice to master. Both are readily available. In SPSS, MDS is called ALSCAL and SEM is called AMOS4. Caveat: Both models are for interval scaled data and our data are often less rigorously measured. Guttman's Smallest Space Analysis handles nominal and ordinal data for MDS, and Jay Magneson's Latent Gold is an about-to-be-released procedure for non-interval latent class analysis.

This research approach can often avoid the pitfalls (and resulting criticism) of research on complex issues. The theory is well known and appropriate to the task. The questions can be developed to be consistent with the theory. The analytical methods are isomorphic to the theory and data. Together they provide the scientific rigor needed for such research. The results tend to be fairly easy to understand, and the latent constructs define the issue as a combination of semantic stimuli. As such they are often less subject to criticism on the basis of language. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.
Did anyone ever uncover the origin of the quote,

"The only poll that counts is the poll taken on election day."

for Clymer? I looked for a while myself and found a million uses of the quote, none of them original. I'd love to know, now, who said it first.

____________

Barry Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA  30602
706.542.5027

e-mail:  barry@arches.uga.edu
web:   http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander

=========================================================================
Did anyone ever uncover the origin of the quote, 
"The only poll that counts is the poll taken on election day."

for Clymer? I looked for a while myself and found a million uses of the quote, none of them original. I'd love to know, now, who said it first.

Barry Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
706.542.5027
email: barry@arches.uga.edu
web: http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander

It doesn't appear in Bartlett's (14th Edition) or in any of the quotation searchers I could find on the net.

The oldest usage I could find was in Time Magazine in 1994
#secrets
where it quotes a number of politicians say something very similar and title the article "SECRETS OF CAMPAIGN CONSULTANTS REVEALED!"

I like Boss Tweed's (perhaps by way of Nast) "As long as I count the votes, what are you going to do about it?" and "It's not the voting that's democracy, it's the counting." Tom Stoppard. I am somewhat dubious about the Stalin quote, however, since I have heard four or five different versions.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Didn't find this quote in the Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, but see
that Dean Inge (?) said, "Democracy is only an experiment in
government, and it has the obvious disadvantage of merely counting
votes instead of weighing them." Also, last night heard someone quote
Stalin as having said, "The only one who counts is the one who counts
the votes." mark

Did anyone ever uncover the origin of the quote,
"The only poll that counts is the poll taken on election day."
for Clymer? I looked for a while myself and found a million uses of
the quote, none of them original. I'd love to know, now, who said it
first.

Barry Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
706.542.5027
email: barry@arches.uga.edu
web: http://www.grady.uga.edu/faculty/~bhollander

whenever said it didn't anticipate this year.
Harry,
This is the best election we have had in years. It seems like the Florida Supreme Court finally remembered that part in the Constitution that says all citizens have the right to vote. I assume that also means "and have their vote counted." I wonder if there really are more votes for Gore or Bush in those uncounted ballots. I do not expect Gore to do that well in Miami-Dade. The problem that caused to ballots not to be counted is likely to be a random problem. In that case the uncounted ballots should be pretty much like the counted ballots. In Miami-Dade the vote was fairly even. We will see.

I am in Budapest. I need to get the Rasmussen vote to finish the chart. Can you call them and email it to me?

warren
Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 PAX

Fellow Travelers,

I've just now received the following spam, and pass it along for all of you not privileged to receive spam of your own. It's just another drop in the relentless torrent of information contributing to the decline in response rates, and to the increasing fear of all interaction with unseen strangers in any guise, including legitimate survey and market researchers.

My favorite line therein:

Harry,
This is the best election we have had in years. It seems like the Florida Supreme Court finally remembered that part in the Constitution that says all citizens have the right to vote. I assume that also means "and have their vote counted." I wonder if there really are more votes for Gore or Bush in those uncounted ballots. I do not expect Gore to do that well in Miami-Dade. The problem that caused to ballots not to be counted is likely to be a random problem. In that case the uncounted ballots should be pretty much like the counted ballots. In Miami-Dade the vote was fairly even. We will see.

I am in Budapest. I need to get the Rasmussen vote to finish the chart. Can you call them and email it to me?

warren
Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 PAX

Fellow Travelers,

I've just now received the following spam, and pass it along for all of you not privileged to receive spam of your own. It's just another drop in the relentless torrent of information contributing to the decline in response rates, and to the increasing fear of all interaction with unseen strangers in any guise, including legitimate survey and market researchers.

My favorite line therein:
Don't let suspicions become paranoia, uncover the truth now before it's too late!

The creative genius who decided to put that in the middle of this pitch could conquer the world, I have no doubt.

So have a nice day. -- Jim

*******

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Sat, 09 Dec 00 04:08:49 EST
From: iDetectAutoMessenger@hotmail.com
To: Friend@public.com
Subject: This is to Notify you of an Investigation on "YOU" by one of our users.

Now you can learn EVERYTHING about your friends, neighbors, enemies, employees, co-workers, your boss, even yourself!

Is there someone online that you want to find out more about?

Are they exploring areas of the internet that they shouldn't be?

It's time for you to see for yourself and find out what they are really doing online!

Don't let suspicions become paranoia, uncover the truth now before it's too late!

Many people hire a private investigator to observe, track and record what their husband, wife, boyfriend/girlfriend and children are doing. Be your own private investigator. Get the full details of the hidden truth. Now you can investigate anyone secretly, and in the privacy of your own home!

Get your hands on the most powerful IDetect ME ware available today! With it, you can find out who they are talking to and more importantly what they are talking about!

See and record every word typed in:

EMails
Private Messages
Chat Rooms
Message Boards
ICQ & IRC

Find out who they are talking to and what they are saying. Find out what type of chatrooms they are going in. Record and check out all the web sites they are visiting or searching for! Best of all, they don't have to be using the same computer as you! IDetect
ME can find all this out by using just their IP Address! And with all the
easy
to use tools, finding out an IP is one of the easiest
features!

Need to find out about someone who's not online? With Spy-Soft, you can
locate anyone by their name, phone number, state license
plate number, social security number, even
e-mail address. You can even find unlisted phone numbers!

Credit checks are easy and free with IDetect ME. Never pay again just to see
a copy of your's or anyone else's credit report!

Take a look at some of the other features packed into IDetect ME's powerful
tools...

- Look at anyone's criminal records
- Examine their driving record
- Locate people who have changed their name
- Locate birth parents and adoptees
- Anonymously surf the internet
- Locate long lost friends
- Locate e-mails, phone numbers, or addresses.
- Get a Copy of Your FBI file.
- FIND DEBTORS and locate HIDDEN ASSETS.
- Check DRIVING and CRIMINAL RECORDS.
- Locate old classmates, missing family member, or a LONG LOST LOVE.
- Do Background Checks on EMPLOYEES before you hire them.
- Investigate your family history, birth, death and SOCIAL SECURITY RECORDS!
- Discover how UNLISTED phone numbers are located.
- Check out your new or old LOVE INTEREST.
- Verify your own CREDIT REPORTS so you can correct WRONG information.
- Track anyone's Internet ACTIVITY; see the sites they visit.
- Explore SECRET WEB SITES that conventional search engines have never
  found.
- Discover little-known ways to make UNTRACEABLE PHONE CALLS.
- Check ADOPTION records; locate MISSING CHILDREN or relatives.
- Dig up information on your FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS, or BOSS!
- Discover EMPLOYMENT opportunities from AROUND THE WORLD!
- Locate transcripts and COURT ORDERS from all 50 states.
- CLOAK your EMAIL so your true address can't be discovered.
- Find out how much ALIMONY your neighbor is paying.
- Discover how to check your phones for WIRETAPS.

WARNING: You may be shocked or overwhelmed by the results of what you
find!!!

IDetect ME is simple to install and use and will work on any PC or Macintosh
that has an internet connection.

To order IDetect ME, send in the order form below.

               - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

               R-ID#:  154
Send To.......  

vCash  
7013 Foothill Blvd  
Tujunga Ca, 91042  

Your Name________________________________________________  
Address___________________________________________________  
City_____________________________State_________Zip__________  

[ ] Please rush me IDetect ME for just...$29.99.  
[ ] Include $8.00 for EXPRESS Shipping and handling.  
» Please make checks and money orders payable to vCash.  

Important! Please circle one:  
Is your computer a   [PC]   or a   [Macintosh]?  

*Note* After purchasing our program, we are not responsible for your use of it.  

*****

Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 11:10:56 -0800  
From: Earl Babbie <babbie@chapman.edu>  
Reply-To: babbie@chapman.edu  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; U; PPC)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: This is to Notify you of an Investigation on "YOU" by one of our users. (fwd)  
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012091022450.21742-100000@almaak.usc.edu>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit  

Why is everyone calling me paranoid?!  

Earl  

James Beniger wrote:  

> Fellow Travelers,  
>  
> I've just now received the following spam, and pass it along for all  
> of you not privileged to receive spam of your own. It's just another
drop in the relentless torrent of information contributing to the
decline in response rates, and to the increasing fear of all
interaction with unseen strangers in any guise, including legitimate
survey and market researchers.

My favorite line therein:

Don't let suspicions become paranoia, uncover the truth now
before it's too late!

The creative genius who decided to put that in the middle of this
pitch could conquer the world, I have no doubt.

So have a nice day.

Jim

******

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Sat, 09 Dec 00 04:08:49 EST
From: iDetectAutoMessenger@hotmail.com
To: Friend@public.com
Subject: This is to Notify you of an Investigation on "YOU" by one of our
     users.

Now you can learn EVERYTHING about your friends, neighbors, enemies,
employees, co-workers, your boss, even yourself!

Is there someone online that you want to find out more about?

Are they exploring areas of the internet that they shouldn't be?

It's time for you to see for yourself and find out what they are
really doing online!

Don't let suspicions become paranoia, uncover the truth now before
it's too late!

Many people hire a private investigator to observe, track and record
what their husband, wife, boyfriend/girlfriend and children are doing.
Be your own private investigator. Get the full details of the hidden
truth. Now you can investigate anyone secretly, and in the privacy of
your own home!

Get your hands on the most powerful IDetect ME ware available today!
With it, you can find out who they are talking to and more importantly
what they are talking about!

See and record every word typed in:

EMails
Private Messages
Chat Rooms
Message Boards
ICQ & IRC
Find out who they are talking to and what they are saying. Find out what type of chatrooms they are going in. Record and check out all the web sites they are visiting or searching for! Best of all, they don't have to be using the same computer as you! IDetect ME can find all this out by using just their IP Address! And with all the easy to use tools, finding out an IP is one of the easiest features!

Need to find out about someone who's not online? With Spy-Soft, you can locate anyone by their name, phone number, state license plate number, social security number, even e-mail address. You can even find unlisted phone numbers!

Credit checks are easy and free with IDetect ME. Never pay again just to see a copy of your's or anyone else's credit report!

Take a look at some of the other features packed into IDetect ME's powerful tools...

- Look at anyone's criminal records
- Examine their driving record
- Locate people who have changed their name
- Locate birth parents and adoptees
- Anonymously surf the internet
- Locate long lost friends
- Locate e-mails, phone numbers, or addresses.
- Get a Copy of Your FBI file.
- FIND DEBTORS and locate HIDDEN ASSETS.
- Check DRIVING and CRIMINAL RECORDS.
- Locate old classmates, missing family member, or a LONG LOST LOVE.
- Do Background Checks on EMPLOYEES before you hire them.
- Investigate your family history, birth, death and SOCIAL SECURITY RECORDS!
- Discover how UNLISTED phone numbers are located.
- Check out your new or old LOVE INTEREST.
- Verify your own CREDIT REPORTS so you can correct WRONG information.
- Track anyone's Internet ACTIVITY; see the sites they visit.
- Explore SECRET WEB SITES that conventional search engines have never found.
- Discover little-known ways to make UNTRACEABLE PHONE CALLS.
- Check ADOPTION records; locate MISSING CHILDREN or relatives.
- Dig up information on your FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS, or BOSS!
- Discover EMPLOYMENT opportunities from AROUND THE WORLD!
- Locate transcripts and COURT ORDERS from all 50 states.
- CLOAK your EMAIL so your true address can't be discovered.
- Find out how much ALIMONY your neighbor is paying.
- Discover how to check your phones for WIRETAPS.

WARNING: You may be shocked or overwhelmed by the results of what you find!!

IDetect ME is simple to install and use and will work on any PC or Macintosh that has an internet connection.

To order IDetect ME, send in the order form below.
R-ID#: 154

Send To.......  vCash
                7013 Foothill Blvd
                Tujunga Ca, 91042

Your Name________________________________________________

Address___________________________________________________

City_____________________________State_________Zip__________

[ ] Please rush me IDetect ME for just...$29.99.
[ ] Include $8.00 for EXPRESS Shipping and handling.
> Please make checks and money orders payable to vCash.
> Important! Please circle one:
> Is your computer a [PC] or a [Macintosh]?
> *Note* After purchasing our program, we are not responsible for your
> use of it.
> ******

--
kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie  Tel: 714-997-6565
babbie@chapman.edu  Fax: 714-281-6213
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
    A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.
BULLETIN: US Supreme Court grants Bush's request to stop recounts in Florida

A 5-4 ruling from the high court called for oral arguments Monday on underlying legal issues in recount case... Rehnquist and Kennedy, Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas and Sandra Day O'Connor all voted to halt the counts. Justices John Paul Stevens, Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and David Souter dissented... 'To stop the counting of legal votes, the majority today departs from' the rules of judicial restraint, Stevens wrote for dissenters...

-- Jim

*****

=========================================================================
Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 12:15:06 -0800
From: Earl Babbie <babbie@chapman.edu>
Reply-To: babbie@chapman.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; U; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: BULLETIN: US Supreme Court grants Bush request, stops Florida recounts
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012091210130.28022-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

And are they going to extend the deadline for certifying electors?

Or is that the whole point?

Earl

James Beniger wrote:

> BULLETIN: US Supreme Court grants Bush's request to stop recounts in Florida
> A 5-4 ruling from the high court called for oral arguments Monday on underlying legal issues in recount case... Rehnquist and Kennedy, Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas and Sandra Day O'Connor all voted to halt the counts. Justices John Paul Stevens, Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and David Souter dissented... 'To stop the counting of legal votes, the majority today departs from' the rules of judicial restraint, Stevens wrote for dissenters...
>
> -- Jim
>
> ******

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.
A day without cancer is like. . .a day without cancer.

==---------------------------------------------------------------==
Date: Sat, 9 Dec 2000 16:11:14 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Y1967-L@Aya. Yale. Edu" <y1967-l@aya.yale.edu>,
    "Susan Weber" <weber@troll.soc.qc.edu>,
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: FW: Counting Votes Irreparably Harms Bush
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPFJBPKELCCHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
    boundary="----=_NextPart_000_000E_01C061FA.A79238B0"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------- NextPart_000_000E_01C061FA.A79238B0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

A lawyer friend of mine sent me this!!!!!

I think it answers a number of questions, about recounting, about the Supreme
Court, and about where things are going.

We are living through history here, and we may look back on this as Plessy v.
Ferguson

Andy Beveridge

Original Message ------
From: Craig Gurian
To: letters@nytimes.com
Sent: Saturday, December 09, 2000 3:22 PM
Subject: Counting Votes Irreparably Harms Bush

To The Editor:

The stay issued by the United States Supreme Court (News Article, December
10th) neatly summarizes the actual concern of the Bush campaign since
Election Day: allowing the votes to be counted would irreparably harm Governor Bush. This is an understandable public relations worry, not a legal problem. As the 11th Circuit Court
of Appeals was able to discern in the decision it issued shortly before the Supreme Court acted, any concern about the propriety of using the results of a manual count was easily addressed by enjoining Florida officials from certifying such a count until the Supreme Court ruled. By preventing a count, the Supreme Court in one stroke permanently delegitimized a Bush presidency and gave up its own claims both as to judicial restraint and as to being an institution of law, not force.

Craig Gurian
New York, New York
would irreparably harm Governor Bush. This is an understandable public relations worry, not a legal problem. As the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals was able to discern in the decision it issued shortly before the Supreme Court acted, any concern about the propriety of using the results of a manual count was easily addressed by enjoining Florida officials from certifying such a count until the Supreme Court ruled. By preventing a count, the Supreme Court in one stroke permanently delegitimized a Bush presidency and gave up its own claims both as to judicial restraint and as to being an institution of law, not force.

---

December 9, 2000

THE SUPREME COURT

U.S. SUPREME COURT ORDERS FLORIDA RECOUNTS TO STOP

By LINDA GREENHOUSE

WASHINGTON, Dec. 9 -- In a sudden and devastating blow to Vice President Al Gore, the United States Supreme Court voted 5 to 4 today to stop the recount now going on in Florida and set Monday morning for arguments on Gov. George W. Bush's appeal of the
Florida Supreme Court ruling.

With the clock ticking inexorably toward a Dec. 12 deadline for certifying electors, the Supreme Court's order, issued shortly before 3 p.m., could have the effect of erasing the Democrat's chances that the Florida Supreme Court had revived barely 24 hours earlier.

Even if by some chance the Supreme Court eventually rules, in Vice President Gore's favor, the ruling could come too late. Briefs are due at 4 o'clock Sunday afternoon -- after the recount was supposed to have been completed -- with 90 minutes of argument set for 11 a.m. Monday.

The Justices who voted to grant the stay were Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist and his four conservative colleagues: Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Antonin Scalia, Anthony M. Kennedy, and Clarence Thomas.


The bitter division on the court, awkwardly papered over only last Monday with an order to the Florida Supreme Court to clarify an earlier ruling, burst into the open with the action this afternoon.

About 15 minutes before the Supreme Court order, the United States Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit, in Atlanta, denied a request by the Bush lawyers to halt the recount. But the court said that the Florida secretary of state could not certify the results of the recount until the Supreme Court ruled in the case.

The Supreme Court decision came just hours after lawyers for Mr. Gore had urged the United States Supreme Court to let the counting of Florida's presidential votes proceed while the court considers whether to hear Gov. George W. Bush's appeal of the Florida Supreme Court's latest ruling.

In a 25-page brief filed this morning, the vice president's lawyers called "remarkable" Governor Bush's urgent request for the justices to stop the counting, which was proceeding across the state even as motions and briefs piled up at the Supreme Court.

The Gore brief asked the justices to reject what it called the Bush brief's "surprising assertion" that "a candidate for public office can be irreparably harmed by the process of discerning and tabulating the will of the voters."

Although the Supreme Court was closed to the public today, there was highly unusual activity for a Saturday throughout the building. All nine justices were present. It was not known whether they were meeting together to discuss the case, or how quickly they might respond to the application for a stay that Governor Bush's legal team filed late Friday night.
Despite all the statutory and constitutional arguments contained in the various legal pleadings that kept arriving throughout the day, the legal battle had basically reduced itself to one simple question: would the justices allow the vote counting to continue before Vice President Gore's time ran out, or would they stop it.

With each passing hour representing a crucial opportunity for the vice president to erase his 154-vote deficit, Governor Bush's application asked the Supreme Court to stop the vote counting long enough to permit it to decide whether the Florida Supreme Court had made the right decision hours earlier in ordering a statewide recount of tens of thousands of ballots.

Governor Bush was due to file a formal Supreme Court appeal later today. Even if the justices grant that appeal and hear it on an expedited basis, the Gore legal team hopes that by the time of any hearing, Vice President Gore would have made enough progress in the new counting to make the Supreme Court justices extremely wary of appearing to snatch electoral victory from him.

Late this morning, to bolster their case following the Gore response, the Bush lawyers filed a supplemental memorandum arguing that events in Florida since late last night "powerfully demonstrate the need for a stay" even more than had at first been apparent.

The memorandum said that the refusal of both the Florida Supreme Court and of Judge Terry Lewis, the state circuit court judge in Leon County who is supervising the recount, to set standards for how the county canvassing boards should actually count the disputed votes had created an "indisputably inconsistent and unprecedented process."

"Each county, presumably, could have as many standards as it has counters," the Bush memorandum said, adding: "If this confusing, inconsistent and largely standardless process is not stayed pending this court's review, the integrity of this presidential election could be seriously undermined."

A party seeking a stay before a court has considered the merits of a case has to show "irreparable injury" as the basis for emergency intervention. In attempting to meet that standard, Governor Bush's lawyers told the court that the Florida Supreme Court's ruling "imperils Governor Bush's proper receipt of Florida's 25 electoral votes" by raising "a reasonable possibility that the Nov. 26 certification of Governor Bush as the winner of Florida's electoral votes will be called into doubt -- or purport to be withdrawn -- at a time when the Dec. 12 deadline for naming Florida's electors" would make any later judicial relief futile.

The Bush lawyers said in their 41-page brief that the Florida court had made "serious constitutional errors," including a failure to meet the standards the United States Supreme Court set on Monday when it vacated the earlier Florida decision that had extended the state's deadline for certifying votes.
The Florida Supreme Court has not yet responded to the justices' order remanding that Nov. 21 decision for clarification and has not indicated what the timetable for that might be. As a technical matter, the earlier decision, which related to the pre-certification "protest" phase of the vote-counting dispute, remains vacated; as a practical matter, the question may well have been overtaken by the state court's ruling Friday on the post-certification "contest" phase.

Vice President Gore's lawyers responded today to the voters' appeal, Touchston v. McDermott, No. 00-942. They said the state court's ruling on Friday had "rendered irrelevant" the federal appeals court case.

Further, the Gore brief said in the federal court case, "principles of comity and federalism counsel strongly against" Supreme Court intervention as a way of "indirectly challenging" the Florida Supreme Court's decision.

The Democratic legal team has not hesitated to point out the paradox of the Republican side, usually so solicitous of state sovereignty, seeking federal court intervention to stop the recounts. The Bush team was the first to bring a lawsuit in this case, filing an emergency motion on Nov. 11 in Federal District Court in Miami to stop the recounts that were then underway.

The Gore lawyers argued today in their response to the stay application that it would be the vice president, and not Governor Bush, who would suffer irreparable injury from a stay that would push a final count beyond the Dec. 12 date set in the law known as Section 5, which grants a "safe harbor" to electors chosen by that date.

"What a stay would do, of course," the Gore brief said, "is prevent Vice President Gore from ever gaining the benefit of the Section 5 presumption."

http://www.nytimes.com/2000/12/10/politics/10SCOT.html

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company

*****
My view is that no one wants to take responsibility for allowing\disallowing any particular ballot count. The Supreme Court will slowly inch away from any decision that impacts the election result. Somehow, however, they will allow the counting to continue, without committing to using the recount figures. The entire matter will be resolved by the Congress in order to avoid a decision within the judicial system that in effect selects a President of the United States.

Am not too sure of all the steps between the hearing on Monday and the vote in Congress, but will bet anyone a contribution to AAPOR Foundation that Gore will become the next President by vote of the House (or Senate -- forgot which one decides the Presidency and which one the Vice Presidency).

========================================================================= Date: Sat, 09 Dec 2000 17:39:54 -0500 From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu> X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U) X-Accept-Language: en MIME-Version: 1.0 To: aapornet@usc.edu Subject: Re: FW: Counting Votes Irreparably Harms Bush References: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGPFPFJBPKELCCHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Let me state this way a concurrence with the Gurian letter Beveridge has forwarded:

>From our professional standpoint, the standout aspect of what the SC has done is that public opinion was the standout aspect. The "irremediable harm" was the "cloud" in Scalia's concurrence that would be cast over Western Civilization and the American Way of Life if the count had been allowed to proceed. In pursuing this meteorological figure, the Justice might well consider how reversals figure in the electrification of clouds so as to produce violent thunderstorms.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
>
If Jeanne is willing. I will take up her bet for $50. What say you Jeanne?

Andy

A

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Jeanne Anderson Research
Sent: Saturday, December 09, 2000 8:04 PM
To: AAPORNET@usc.edu
Subject: RE; BULLETIN...

My view is that no one wants to take responsibility for allowing\disallowing any particular ballot count. The Supreme Court will slowly inch away from any decision that impacts the election result. Somehow, however, they will allow the counting to continue, without committing to using the recount figures. The entire matter will be resolved by the Congress in order to avoid a decision within the judicial system that in effect selects a President of the United States.

Am not too sure of all the steps between the hearing on Monday and the vote in Congress, but will bet anyone a contribution to AAPOR Foundation that Gore will become the next President by vote of the House (or Senate -- forgot which one decides the Presidency and which one the Vice Presidency).


How's the trip going? say hello to Uncle Ed. Maureen Dowd said today that this is a standoff between the Insufferable vs the Insufficient! That about says it!!!
null
If interested in how votes were counted in Maine, where there was no problem, see:

Because AAPORNET seems now to be on the topics of voting procedures and procedures for counting and tabulating votes, I forward the following message which just arrived (from tomorrow, as it were) from a
As an Australian, and therefore an outsider, may I make a few comments about the supposed value of machine counting. I've been working in polling booths for many years, and I've acted as scrutineer for many other elections, and all Australian ballots are hand-marked with pencil.

1. Objectivity is not the key requirement here, accuracy is. A machine can be as objective as all hell, and still be inaccurate.... which is obviously the problem being encountered with the chad problem.

And trust does not come from an objective-but-incorrect machine count.

Generally, trust comes from having scrutineers from both/all sides of the political fence/s who check which pile a ballot paper goes on. And when disputes occur, the ballots are put to one side to be arbitrated later. If necessary, a judge would review the disputed ballot papers.

2. Efficiency is not the key requirement either, and yet this is implied in the statement that "The major factor was time."

American's appear to have a quaint faith in machines and an obsession with the need for efficiency, even when slow and sure is better.

In Australia, we have:
a) compulsory attendance at the voting booth, so over 95% of all eligible voters, do actually vote.

b) an optional preferential system which allows people to:
   i. scrawl obscenities on the ballot, or leave it blank:
      - in which case it is not counted.
   ii. put a 1 a cross or a tick alongside just one name:
      - which means that it only counts as a primary vote.
   iii. number the ballot paper, from 1 to (whatever) in preferential order
      - in which case, the ballot is allocated to the primary candidate initially. Then if that candidate (say a Nader) is last in terms of primary numbers, the second preferences of this candidate are allocated
      -- and so on -- until
      In the final count, there are only two candidates with two
ballot piles, and therefore a clear preference.

This is clearly a way of ensuring that the candidate with the most public support wins. And despite claims to the contrary, a preferential system does not "give two votes" to minority supporters, but rather allows them to express their views, while still having their likes and dislikes reflected in the final decision.

 Preferential systems also ensure that fake third-candidates aren't introduced just to whittle away primary support for one major party (as often happens in first-past-the-post systems), or that effectively the same erosion of support for one side happens incidentally through third-party candidates who have a slightly different agenda (like a Nader) from one of the majors.

My real point, however, is that despite the higher percentage of voters, and the much more complex way of voting preferentially (always using paper and pencil), the vote in Australia is usually counted within a few hours of the poll closing, and the poll declared before people go to bed at night.

 Australians vote on a Saturday to ensure that everyone has a good chance of getting to the polls easily, and polling booths are usually at local schools or church halls, within walking distance.

 Polls usually close a 6pm, and by 9 or 10pm, we generally have a result. On a couple of occasions, when the elections were knife-edge (as you have in the current presidential ballot) the preferences in the remaining key electorates have been subject to a final recount the following day.

 I've never known a hand-marked, hand-counted, complex preferential ballot to elect members of the Australian Federal or State Government (House of Representatives) to take more than two days. Sometimes our Senate votes, with hundreds of candidates, take a few days longer.

 The idea that hand-counting is error-prone or time-consuming (beyond reason) is totally fallacious. Even in a complex optional-preferential system.

 With first-past-the-post systems it is a breeze.

------

*****
A great American ballot reform movement, after all, was for adoption of "the Australian ballot." It proved to be no panacea. If very strict explicit criteria were adopted of what marking on a ballot constituted a valid vote for a candidate, masses of ballot entries got rejected that represented actual attempts to cast a vote. If criteria were loose, endless arguments took place in precincts as to whether a mark was inadvertent or represented a clearly intended vote. In my youth, I worked paper ballot precincts under both kinds of criteria.

I was a Regular Organization precinct captain in Chicago for the '48 election and a reform captain in 1950 in wards that were still using "bedsheet" paper ballots. Contrary to rumors, strict ballot-marking rules were punctiliously observed under Clerk of the County Court Richard J. Daley. That punctiliousness was a source of strength for the political machines because voters that the organization cultivated (our "good guys") knew how to vote correctly more regularly than other voters did. For instance, in order for a vote to count, the circle next to the party or candidate's name had to be marked with an "X" with the intersection of its two strokes falling clearly within the circle. If it was not a clearly defined "X" within the circle, it was a non-vote. Vigilant judges and watchers also scrupulously rejected all check marks, dots, blackings of the circle, strokes, exclamation points, numerals, etc. Sometimes, fliers and signs produced by job shops for naive candidates would show the candidate's name with a huge check mark. The result could be large numbers of supporters misled into entering invalid check marks instead valid "X's" on their ballots. Reaction against such rules that ignored voter intent are the beginnings of a line of voting reform by courts and legislatures in a number of states against specifying that certain forms of marks are invalid "per se" as evidence of voter intent; a thread of opinions coming all the way down via Pullen to Judge Jorge Labarga's decision telling the Palm Beach County officials that they could not use the "per se" kind of criteria that Judge Burton and Supervisor LaPore favored. (The U. S. Supreme Court seems about to reverse these old reforms.)

There are no panaceas to be found in machines, either. Electronic systems may make very few errors but they are capable of making large systematic ones. In my Virginia precinct, for instance, a touch-sense machine at one elections some years ago had to be taken out of service because it was not recording votes. Misprogramming or miswiring may come to light rarely in part because there are
only so many careful investigations of contested outcomes.

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

James Beniger wrote:
> Because AAPORNET seems now to be on the topics of voting procedures
> and procedures for counting and tabulating votes, I forward the
> following message which just arrived (from tomorrow, as it were) from
> a friend in Australia.  
> --
> Jim
> ******
> -------- Forwarded message --------
> Date: Mon, 11 Dec 2000 10:08:56 +1100
> As an Australian, and therefore an outsider, may I make a few comments
> about the supposed value of machine counting.  I've been working in
> polling booths for many years, and I've acted as scrutineer for many
> other elections, and all Australian ballots are hand-marked with
> pencil.
> 1. Objectivity is not the key requirement here, accuracy is.  A
> machine can be as objective as all hell, and still be inaccurate....
> which is obviously the problem being encountered with the chad
> problem.
> And trust does not come from an objective-but-inaccurate machine
> count.
> Generally, trust comes from having scrutineers from both/all sides of
> the political fence/s who check which pile a ballot paper goes on.
> And when disputes occur, the ballots are put to one side to be
> arbitrated later.  If necessary, a judge would review the disputed
> ballot papers.
> 2. Efficiency is not the key requirement either, and yet this is
> implied in the statement that "The major factor was time."
> American's appear to have a quaint faith in machines and an obsession
> with the need for efficiency, even when slow and sure is better.
> In Australia, we have:
> a) compulsory attendance at the voting booth, so over 95% of all
> eligible voters, do actually vote.
> b) an optional preferential system which allows people to:
>  i. scrawl obscenities on the ballot, or leave it blank:
>      - in which case it is not counted.
>  ii. put a 1 a cross or a tick alongside just one name:
>      - which means that it only counts as a primary vote.
>  iii. number the ballot paper, from 1 to (whatever) in preferential order
- in which case, the ballot is allocated to the primary candidate initially. Then if that candidate (say a Nader) is last in terms of primary numbers, the second preferences of this candidate are allocated -- and so on -- until In the final count, there are only two candidates with two ballot piles, and therefore a clear preference.

This is clearly a way of ensuring that the candidate with the most public support wins. And despite claims to the contrary, a preferential system does not "give two votes" to minority supporters, but rather allows them to express their views, while still having their likes and dislikes reflected in the final decision.

Preferential systems also ensure that fake third-candidates aren't introduced just to whittle away primary support for one major party (as often happens in first-past-the-post systems), or that effectively the same erosion of support for one side happens incidentally through third-party candidates who have a slightly different agenda (like a Nader) from one of the majors.

My real point, however, is that despite the higher percentage of voters, and the much more complex way of voting preferentially (always using paper and pencil), the vote in Australia is usually counted within a few hours of the poll closing, and the poll declared before people go to bed at night.

Australians vote on a Saturday to ensure that everyone has a good chance of getting to the polls easily, and polling booths are usually at local schools or church halls, within walking distance.

Polls usually close a 6pm, and by 9 or 10pm, we generally have a result. On a couple of occasions, when the elections were knife-edge (as you have in the current presidential ballot) the preferences in the remaining key electorates have been subject to a final recount the following day.

I've never known a hand-marked, hand-counted, complex preferential ballot to elect members of the Australian Federal or State Government (House of Representatives) to take more than two days. Sometimes our Senate votes, with hundreds of candidates, take a few days longer.

The idea that hand-counting is error-prone or time-consuming (beyond reason) is totally fallacious. Even in a complex optional-preferential system.

With first-past-the-post systems it is a breeze.
As Howard Kurtz writes of John Ellis, head of the decision desk at Fox News on election night, and also a cousin of George W. Bush, in this morning's Washington Post:

Ellis doesn't defend himself in the first-person tale, except to say that the Texas governor "knew I would be fried if I gave him anything that [Voter News Service] deemed confidential, so he never asked for it. He made a point of getting the early exit poll data from other sources before talking to me."

At 5:30 p.m., with exit polls suggesting a Gore victory, Ellis writes, he stepped outside for a cigarette and called Bush, their second chat of the day.

"Is it really this close?" Bush asked. "Yeah, it's really close," Ellis said. "Well, what do you think?" Bush asked. "I have no idea," Ellis replied. "Well, keep in touch. Let me know if you hear anything good." Ellis "promised him I would."

Kurtz's complete story follows.

-- Jim
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Fox's Ellis, A Little Too Close To the Story

By Howard Kurtz
Washington Post Staff Writer

On the afternoon of Nov. 7, George W. Bush called his cousin John Ellis, head of the decision desk at Fox News.

"Ellis, Bush here," he drawled. "Here we go again. . . . Looks tight, huh?"

"I wouldn't worry about your early numbers," Ellis said. "Your dad had bad early numbers in '88 and he wound up winning by 7 [percentage points]. So who knows?"
"Okay, call me back when you can," Bush said.

Ellis has written his first account of that fateful day and submitted it to Inside magazine, which tentatively plans to publish it next week. The new magazine, a joint venture between Inside.com and the Industry Standard, has offered Ellis a $15,000 fee, insiders say.

The piece is remarkable because it shows just how deeply involved the Fox analyst was with both the Republican candidate and his other first cousin, Florida Gov. Jeb Bush, while simultaneously working for a major news organization. Indeed, Ellis's 2:16 a.m. projection that Bush had won Florida--and the presidency--kicked off the month-long impasse that deepened considerably with Friday's Florida Supreme Court order of a hand recount sought by Vice President Gore.

The network is investigating Ellis's conduct, and Fox News President Roger Ailes was said to be angry when he learned of the Inside article. The expectation within Fox is that Ellis, who already offered his resignation once, will be dropped.

Ellis doesn't defend himself in the first-person tale, except to say that the Texas governor "knew I would be fried if I gave him anything that [Voter News Service] deemed confidential, so he never asked for it. He made a point of getting the early exit poll data from other sources before talking to me."

At 5:30 p.m., with exit polls suggesting a Gore victory, Ellis writes, he stepped outside for a cigarette and called Bush, their second chat of the day.

"Is it really this close?" Bush asked. "Yeah, it's really close," Ellis said. "Well, what do you think?" Bush asked. "I have no idea," Ellis replied. "Well, keep in touch. Let me know if you hear anything good." Ellis "promised him I would."

Soon after 7:52, when Fox became the fourth network to call Florida for the vice president, Jeb Bush called Ellis. "Are you sure?" he asked.

"Jeb, I'm sorry. I'm looking at a screen full of Gore," Ellis said. "But the polls haven't closed in the Panhandle," Bush said. "It's not going to help. I'm sorry," said Ellis. He adds: "I felt terribly for him."

Later, "out of deference to Governor Jeb Bush," he checked the Florida numbers one more time and soon was persuaded to retract the call, despite the "near-total embarrassment and humiliation of screwing up in such spectacular fashion."

About 11 p.m., Ellis "reopened the line of communication" to George Bush at
the governor's mansion.

"George W. had been talking to governors across the country. Jeb was wired into Florida. Both gave us very useful information about what precincts in what counties had not yet reported."

At 1:50 a.m., confident that Gore could not win Florida, "I called Governor Bush and asked him what he thought," adding: "I think you've got it." Bush "was worried we might get beat on the call."

Ellis was nervous as he called Florida for Bush. A few minutes later, the phone rang. "Gore called and conceded," Bush said. "He was good, very gracious." Ellis congratulated his cousin and "breathed an enormous sigh of relief."

But then "the roof fell in," Florida shifted, and Fox, like the other networks, was left with two blown calls. Bush called back. "Gore unconceded," he said. "You've got to be kidding me," Ellis said.

Bush wasn't. "I hope you're taking all this down, Ellis. This is good stuff for a book."

But not good stuff for a network analyst. Ellis, who had stopped writing about Bush as a Boston Globe columnist because "I am loyal to my cousin," may well have committed no violation of the exit-poll rules. But Fox executives recognize that the appearance of their man working both sides of the street has damaged their credibility.

Live From the Court

Geraldo Rivera will be at the Supreme Court today, but not to check on any appeals from the Florida recount.

The CNBC talk show host is being admitted to the Supreme Court Bar, part of a group from Brooklyn Law School, where he endows a couple of scholarships. The lawyer, who hasn't represented a client since the early 1970s, says he's doing this not just for the ceremonial honor but "in contemplation of my next life."

What life would that be? Rivera, 57, has three years left on his NBC contract and says he doesn't plan to do a nightly show--perhaps just occasional specials--after that. "I really would like to become an appellate lawyer," he says. "I want to handle issues I feel strongly about, like death penalty cases."

Creative Writing

The New Yorker publishes some fine short stories, but Rodney Rothman's recent piece "My Fake Job"--about his 17-day infiltration of a Manhattan dot-com--was supposed to be in the nonfiction category. Turns out that Rothman said he received an in-office massage, which he now admits never happened. He also failed to tell the magazine that his mother had worked at the unnamed company.
"The hell of it is that this could easily have been fixed in the editing and by being straight with the reader in print so that an otherwise accomplished piece of writing could also have been honest with the reader," New Yorker Editor David Remnick told the Associated Press.

The San Jose Mercury News, meanwhile, says it has been unable to verify five of the 19 articles written or co-written by a reporting intern. More than a dozen people named or quoted in the stories do not show up in telephone directories, property records, motor vehicle databases or other sources.

The paper began investigating Eric Drudis, of Northwestern's Medill School of Journalism, after two of his articles for the college wire service could not be verified.

Managing Editor Susan Goldberg wrote to her staff: "Obviously, this is upsetting on a number of levels--personally, because we liked and respected Eric; professionally, because events such as this hurt our credibility with readers."

President's Press Picks

Rolling Stone is red-faced over this quote on gays in the military from its interviews with President Clinton: "I worked out with Colin Powell this dumb-ass 'don't ask, don't tell' thing." Turns out Clinton didn't use the cuss word; just a (dumb?) "transcription error," says the magazine.

Clinton also lavishes praise on columnists Tom Friedman of the New York Times ("the best foreign policy writer we have today"), Ron Brownstein of the Los Angeles Times ("truly extraordinary") and E.J. Dionne of The Washington Post ("very good" but should "write more columns").

Clinton also takes a swipe at the New York Times's Jeff Gerth, who broke the Whitewater story and, he notes, the Wen Ho Lee story that led to a lengthy editor's note. "I mean, the same guy got a story and it was kind of overwritten and dire things were predicted," the president says. Gerth says his work speaks for itself.

Gray Lady Rocks

What exactly was Times CEO Arthur Sulzberger Jr. doing, appearing tieless with his team at a Credit Suisse First Boston conference and playing a promotional video with a Ricky Martin soundtrack? Do Wall Street analysts award points for hipness?

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 2000 09:32:40 -0500
From: Nancy Clusen <NClusen@Mathematica-Mpr.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Question about study burden on youth
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)

Hello,

I'm posting this for a colleague. If you would like to reply directly, her contact information is below.

____________________________________________________________________________
________
> I'm working on a study that involves several data collection activities with middle school students. Are you familiar with any research that looks at the amount of burden imposed on young respondents across different data collection activities? Specifically, I'm trying to get a sense of the point at which introducing another data collection activity will adversely affect response rates on current ones. Thanks for any information you might have.
>
> Wendy Mansfield
Survey Researcher
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. wmansfield@mathematica-mpr.com

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 2000 10:58:06 -0500
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
Subject: Re: FW: Counting Votes Irreparably Harms Bush
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Message-id: <3A34F98E.F34F1EE2@rider.edu>
MIME-version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-Accept-Language: en
References: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCFFJBPKECLCCHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> <3A32B4BA.759C0917@american.edu>

I am not a constitutional scholar, but it seems to me that the "irreparable harm" Bush would suffer from the recount would be the possibility he would lose the Presidential race. One, of course, must balance that harm against the opposing principle that every vote must count under the law. One recalls the statement Archibald Cox made when he was fired for requesting the Watergate tapes:
"Now we will find if we are a government of laws, or a government of men." A government of men gives precedence to the "irreparable harm" one individual would suffer if another won an election; a government of laws rules that the law of considering every vote is paramount. The Supreme Court in Nixon's case ruled unanimously that he had to turn over the tapes; we were then a government of laws, and the prestige of the court (many of whose justices were appointed by Nixon) increased accordingly. What will this present court do in this case, and what will happen to its reputation, legitimacy, and historical representation as a result?

"Albert D. Biderman" wrote:

> Let me state this way a concurrence with the Gurian letter Beveridge has forwarded:
> > From our professional standpoint, the standout aspect of what the SC has done is that public opinion was the standout aspect. The "irremediable harm" was the "cloud" in Scalia's concurrence that would be cast over Western Civilization and the American Way of Life if the count had been allowed to proceed. In pursuing this meteorological figure, the Justice might well consider how reversals figure in the electrification of clouds so as to produce violent thunderstorms.
> > Albert D. Biderman
> > abider@american.edu
> >
> "Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
> > Part 1.1 Type: Plain Text (text/plain)
> > Encoding: 7bit

The Washington Post (print version is http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/print/) today has a couple of interesting stories I'll call to your attention. The federal funding of research to oust Milosevic through the electoral process is interesting. I've wondered about the role of message
research, etc., in the closeness of our Presidential race. Also, interesting to see that U.S. and France thought they had brokered a deal to postpone elections in Cote d'Ivoire to calm ethnic tensions (I went to high school there when it was among the most stable in that region-amazing how things change). Here is a nice thought from Montesquieu: "Whenever we shall find everyone at peace, in a State which calls itself a Republic, we can be sure that there is no liberty there. What we call union in a political body is a very ambiguous thing. True union is a union of harmony which causes all parties, however hostile they may seem to be, to contribute to the general good of the society, as dissonances in music contribute to the harmony of the whole." (From "Considerations on the Causes of the Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans")

--U.S. Advice Guided Milosevic Opposition: "While the broad outlines of the $41 million U.S. democracy-building campaign in Serbia are public knowledge, interviews with dozens of key players, both here and in the United States, suggest it was much more extensive and sophisticated than previously reported. In the 12 months following the strategy session, U.S.-funded consultants played a crucial role behind the scenes in virtually every facet of the anti-Milosevic drive, running tracking polls, training thousands of opposition activists and helping to organize a vitally important parallel vote count. U.S. taxpayers paid for 5,000 cans of spray paint used by student activists to scrawl anti-Milosevic graffiti on walls across Serbia, and 2.5 million stickers with the slogan "He's Finished," which became the revolution's catchphrase." ... http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A18395-2000Dec3.html


--The Dimpled Census, You may be sick of vote-counting disputes. You may be sick of legal fights, of legislatures threatening to intervene, of partisans intent on making numbers say what suits them. Well, there's bad news for you, my friend. Once we're done with counting votes, we'll have to count the voters. By the end of this month, the Census Bureau must release the first results of the decennial census. The numbers will give the population of each state, and these will be used to reapportion seats in the House. Growing states such as Arizona and Texas will gain a seat or two; shrinking ones such as New York and Pennsylvania will lose out; some may feel cheated. Already one state shows signs of demanding a recount. That state is Florida." http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A52924-2000Dec10.html

--Reneging on Pledge, Ivory Coast Government Holds Election, ABIDJAN, Ivory Coast, Dec. 10 -- The government went ahead with controversial parliamentary elections today, angering the United States and France, who thought they had brokered a deal to postpone the vote to calm ethnic tensions. Voting was largely peaceful, but turnout was light, due in part to an opposition boycott and fear of violence. Heavily armed troops guarded polling places in Abidjan, the country's commercial center, which has been wracked by
violence since an opposition leader was barred from running a week ago. Voting did not take place at all in a handful of towns in the north, where ethnic tensions are highest." http://washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/print/asection/index.html

This is curious:

>Australians vote on a Saturday to ensure that everyone has a good chance of getting to the polls easily, and polling booths are usually at local schools or church halls, within walking distance.

Voting on the weekend would very likely lower the response rate. People tend to cherish their weekend time and would not curtail a weekend trip to vote. In Russia it's the same thing. Many many people head out to their dachas for the weekend. In fact, when Yeltsin was running for re-election some years ago, he moved election day from a weekend to a weekday specifically to avoid losing the vote of the older generation who generally leave town on the weekend.

Richard Rands

Didn't the autoworkers negotiate a day off to vote in their collective bargaining agreement?
Yes. How convenient!

A ot of talking heads were wondering if their rank and file would actually vote or just go fishing or hunting!

Nancy,

Please tell Wendy that she ought to join AAPORNET (and AAPOR, if she doesn't now belong), so that we might—all 900 of us--profit from her experience, knowledge and wisdom, in exchange for our own. Although almost all of us are more than happy to help anyone we can, we can-- each one of us--only profit from expanding the pool of those who might help us in return.

-- Jim

I post this to the list to state something so obvious that we often tend to forget it.
On Mon, 11 Dec 2000, Nancy Clusen wrote:

> Hello,
> > I'm posting this for a colleague. If you would like to reply
> > directly, her contact information is below.
> > ___________________________________________________________
> > ______
> > ________
> > > I'm working on a study that involves several data collection
> > > activities with middle school students. Are you familiar with any
> > > research that looks at the amount of burden imposed on young
> > > respondents across different data collection activities?
> > > Specifically, I'm trying to get a sense of the point at which
> > > introducing another data collection activity will adversely affect
> > > response rates on current ones. Thanks for any information you
> > > might have.
> > > > Wendy Mansfield
> > > Survey Researcher
> > > Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. wmansfield@mathematica-mpr.com

Question: Do the punch-cards at issue in Florida have partially pre-cut holes
to make pushing out the chad easier, or are they like
the ordinary IBM cards we used to use? In the former case, rerunning or
handling might conceivably cause random dislodging of chads
(but without advantage to any candidate - just as likely to go to the Reform
or Socialist candidate as Bush or Gore.) In the latter case there is no way that rerunning or handling could poke out a hole - it
never happened in all the years I was running and
rerunning IBM cards. They just got dog-eared and gave trouble going through
the machine.

If they are not partially precut, those complaining that recounting
"degrades" the cards should be told authoritatively that this is
simply wrong. If they are partially precut, those complaining should be told that the error is random across all candidates listed and not biased, and the extent of such error could be checked by looking at the minor party vote on first vs. later machine tabulations.

Allen H. Barton
118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516 Allenbarton@mindspring.com

Dear Allen,
The few punch cards I've seen in the hands of counters in FL appear to be the old IBM-type punch cards, if not IBM punch cards themselves. You are absolutely right about the "indegradability" of those cards. But those people in FL appear to think that it a "hanging chad" comes loose through either handling or repeated running through the counting machine, that means the card has been "degraded." Seems to me that would make the intent of the voter clearer, not less clear.

Allen Barton wrote:

> Question: Do the punch-cards at issue in Florida have partially pre-cut holes to make pushing out the chad easier, or are they like the ordinary IBM cards we used to use? In the former case, rerunning or handling might conceivably cause random dislodging of chads (but without advantage to any candidate - just as likely to go to the Reform or Socialist candidate as Bush or Gore.) In the latter case there is no way that rerunning or handling could poke out a hole - it never happened in all the years I was running and rerunning IBM cards. They just got dog-eared and gave trouble going through the machine.
>
> If they are not partially precut, those complaining that recounting "degrades" the cards should be told authoritatively that this is simply wrong. If they are partially precut, those complaining should be told that the error is random across all candidates listed and not biased, and the extent of such error could be checked by looking at the minor party vote on first vs. later machine tabulations.
>
> Allen H. Barton
> 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516 Allenbarton@mindspring.com
Point well taken, Jim. And I will certainly share with the list the results of any input.

Thanks.

Wendy Mansfield

> -----Original Message-----
> From: James Beniger [SMTP:beniger@rcf.usc.edu]
> Sent: Monday, December 11, 2000 11:42 AM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: Re: Question about study burden on youth
> 
> Nancy,
> 
> Please tell Wendy that she ought to join AAPORNET (and AAPOR, if she doesn't now belong), so that we might--all 900 of us--profit from her experience, knowledge and wisdom, in exchange for our own. Although almost all of us are more than happy to help anyone we can, we can--each one of us--only profit from expanding the pool of those who might help us in return.
> 
> -- Jim
> 
> I post this to the list to state something so obvious that we often tend to forget it.
> 
> ******
> 
> On Mon, 11 Dec 2000, Nancy Clusen wrote:
> 
> Hello,
> 
> I'm posting this for a colleague. If you would like to reply directly, her contact information is below.

> I'm working on a study that involves several data collection activities with middle school students. Are you familiar with any research that looks at the amount of burden imposed on young respondents
across different data collection activities? Specifically, I'm trying to get a sense of the point at which introducing another data collection activity will adversely affect response rates on current ones. Thanks for any information you might have.

Wendy Mansfield
Survey Researcher
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. wmansfield@mathematica-mpr.com

There are different kinds of punch card ballots, but the ones in question are either Datavote or Votomatic, and both use pre-cut punch cards.

It is my experience from working with perforated punch cards that, short of actually creasing the card along a perforation, it is virtually impossible to push out a "punch" by bending or mishandling the card, but that it is very common for a chad to remain attached at one or more points, even when the stylus penetrates fully through the card. Depending on the direction the card moves in, such a hanging chad may be pulled off out when the card is removed from the template or it can be pushed back into the hole.

Unless perforations have changed a lot since I last worked with these kinds of cards, I don't believe that running them through a reader any number of times would cause any additional "punches", but it might well make it harder to dislodge any hanging chads that were pushed back in the first time.

Hanging chads are much less likely to happen with cards punched in a keypunch, which uses a die to cut a clean hole, but based on many years of experience in keypunching and handling punch cards, pushed in chads were still a frequent occurrence if either the card path was not kept clean or if the chad receptacle was allowed to get too full, which we are told was a systematic problem in some of the more populous precincts in Florida this year.

Anyone who has worked with punch cards extensively knows the importance of
fanning the cards vigorously before feeding them into a reader, specifically to remove chads that had not fallen out in the punching process. With pre-cut cards, it was my experience that no amount of fanning was ever enough to get rid of hanging chads, but I never saw any false punches added by the process.

Since there is no check in the Votomatic template to prevent anyone from punching more than one hole, I suspect that nearly all multiple punches came from voter error, not mechanical problems, but in any case, those votes have already been rejected and are not subject to recounts. The same cannot be said of undervotes, which should be examined by hand.

Jan Werner

Allen Barton wrote:
>
> Question: Do the punch-cards at issue in Florida have partially pre-cut holes to make pushing out the chad easier, or are they like the ordinary IBM cards we used to use? In the former case, rerunning or handling might conceivably cause random dislodging of chads (but without advantage to any candidate - just as likely to go to the Reform or Socialist candidate as Bush or Gore.) In the latter case there is no way that rerunning or handling could poke out a hole - it never happened in all the years I was running and rereunning IBM cards. They just got dog-eared and gave trouble going through the machine.
> If they are not partially precut, those complaining that recounting "degrades" the cards should be told authoritatively that this is simply wrong. If they are partially precut, those complaining should be told that the error is random across all candidates listed and not biased, and the extent of such error could be checked by looking at the minor party vote on first vs. later machine tabulations.
> Allen H. Barton
> 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516 Allenbarton@mindspring.com

Date: Mon, 11 Dec 2000 11:37:12 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Joel Moskowitz <jmm@uclink4.berkeley.edu>
Subject: Re: Trimming sample weights
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

My original query regarding trimming sample weights generated several responses; however, all but one were requests to post messages that I received as others are also interested in this topic. I received only one substantive response which appears below along with my original query.

To clarify my question, by "trimming" I mean limiting the size of weights such that extreme weights get set to some fixed value determined either a priori or empirically. This can occur at various stages in the calculation of sample weights.
I would be interested in any help others can provide on this topic.

Original query:

A common practice in constructing sample weights is to trim the weights. This reduces variation in the weights which in turn increases the efficiency of statistical analyses performed on the data. The tradeoff is the potential for increased bias.

I have had difficulty finding statistical literature discussing this practice and would appreciate references. Under what circumstances is this practice justifiable? Are there well-regarded "rules of thumb" on how much to trim and at what point in the weight construction?

Substantive response:

I did a literature search recently and came up with a series of papers by Frank J. Potter, RTI. I don't have the exact references but I think they all appeared in the ASA/SRM Proceedings. One is from 1988.

--------------------
Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
Director
Center for Family and Community Health
School of Public Health
University of California, Berkeley
WWW: http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~sph/CFCH
--------------------

================================================
Date: Mon, 11 Dec 2000 15:19:32 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Bill Williams <wwilliam@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu>
Subject: Re: Trimming sample weights

Interesting. I had not heard of this practice. Can you supply more details on how the weights are actually trimmed? Bill Williams

> A common practice in constructing sample weights is to trim the weights. This reduces variation in the weights which in turn increases the efficiency of statistical analyses performed on the data. The tradeoff is the potential for increased bias.
>
> I have had difficulty finding statistical literature discussing this practice and would appreciate references. Under what circumstances is this practice justifiable? Are there well-regarded "rules of thumb" on how much to trim and at what point in the weight construction?
>
>
> Joel M. Moskowitz, Ph.D.
> Director
> Center for Family and Community Health
> School of Public Health


Carolyn,

Did you receive any input from this inquiry? I'm in northern Virginia so if you can give me some directions, I'll search out what I can find. In the early '90s I did diversity work in Seattle and then moved overseas for years and am still doing international development work. Recently I've decided I really want to work on diversity issues with secondary students, and so I'm searching for what research has been done with this population group. Any leads you can offer will be appreciated. Beverly Jensen, Ph.D.

consultant, international development

----- Original Message -----
From: Carolyn White <cswhite@ux6.cso.uiuc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, November 08, 2000 1:33 PM
Subject: summary of Census Bureau Advisory Comm on Race and Ethnicity
Asst Professor, Sociology
University of Illinois

With the Supreme Court still debating the outcome of the Presidential race while the rest of are sitting on pins and needles awaiting the outcome, relieve the tension by listening to this song It's called the Banana Republicans.

Enjoy..................

You can play it at:

http://www.bluecanyonproductions.com/satire.html

Dick Halpern

With the Supreme Court still debating the outcome of the Presidential race while the rest of are sitting on pins and needles awaiting the outcome, relieve the tension by listening to this song It's called the <i>Banana Republicans</i>.


Dick Halpern

--=====================_7598171==_.ALT--
Nothing in this front-page Special Report in today's Los Angeles Times is breaking news, but many of the questions and issues it raises will likely be discussed in many nations with free elections for years to come.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times


Monday, December 11, 2000

A 'Modern' Democracy That Can't Count Votes

Special Report: What happened in Florida is the rule and not the exception. A coast-to-coast study by The Times finds a shoddy system that can only be trusted when the election isn't close.

By Times Staff Writers

Because ballots can be bought, stolen, miscounted, lost, thrown out or sent to Denmark, nobody knows with any precision how many votes go uncounted in American elections.

For weeks, Florida has riveted the nation with a mind-numbing array of failures: misleading ballots, contradictory counting standards, discarded votes--19,000 in one county alone. But an examination by The Times in a dozen states from Washington to Texas to New York shows that Florida is not the exception. It is the rule.

State and local officials give priority to curbing crime, filling potholes and picking up trash. That often leaves elections across the country underfunded, badly managed, ill equipped and poorly staffed. Election workers are temporaries, pay is a pittance, training is brief and voting systems are frequently obsolete.

"You know why we never paid attention to this until now?" asks Candy Marendt, co-director of the Indiana Elections Division. "I'll tell you: because we don't really want to know. We don't want to know that our democracy isn't really so sacred..."

"It can be very ugly."

The examination shows:

* New York City voters use metal lever-action machines so old they are no longer made, each with 27,000 parts. Similar machines in Louisiana are vulnerable to rigging with pliers, a screwdriver, a cigarette lighter and a Q-Tip.
* In Texas, "vote whores" do favors for people in return for their absentee ballots. Sometimes the canvassers or consultants, as they prefer to be called, simply buy the ballots. Failing all else, they steal them from mailboxes.

* Alaska has more registered voters than voting-age people. Indiana, which encourages voting with sign-ups by mail and at driver's license bureaus, has jammed its registration lists with hundreds of thousands of people who should not be on them. They include felons, the dead and many who have registered repeatedly.

* In Oregon, a preliminary survey indicates that more than 36,000 of the state's 1.5 million voters may have mailed in ballots this year that were signed by someone else. Some students in Wisconsin say they voted as many as four times.

* Louisiana's former election commissioner, Jerry Fowler, pleaded guilty 14 days ago to a kickback scheme with a voting machine dealer. Even when relationships are legal, lines of authority blur. In the state of Washington, dealers program vote counters. In Arizona, they go as far as to help feed in the ballots.

To many Americans, the right to vote is sacred, a hard-won legacy of the women's suffrage and civil rights movements. Memories of those 20th century struggles remain fresh among voters of the new century. Yet the system that counts their ballots has fallen into disarray and dysfunction.

About These Stories

These stories were reported by Michael Finnegan in New York; Claudia Kolker in Alice, Texas; Judy Pasternak and Alan C. Miller in Washington, D.C.; Stephanie Simon in St. Louis and Baton Rouge, La.; Eric Slater in Indianapolis; Kim Murphy in Seattle; Terril Yue Jones in Milwaukee and Madison, Wis.; Michael Krikorian in Cleveland; Robert J. Lopez in Phoenix and Yuma, Ariz.; Rich Connell in Portland and Salem, Ore.; William C. Rempel in New York and Philadelphia; Mark Arax in Fresno; Julie Cart in Denver; and Steve Berry, Nona Yates and Ray F. Herndon in Los Angeles. They were researched by Jacquelyn Cenacveira, Vicki Gallay, John Jackson, Janet Lundblad and Cary Schneider in Los Angeles, John Beckham in Chicago, Lynn Marshall in Seattle and Sunny Kaplan in Washington. They were written by David Ferrell and Richard E. Meyer in Los Angeles and Judy Pasternak in Washington.

The voting system is so troubled that the National Bureau of Standards, a federal agency now known as the National Institute of Standards and Technology, said 12 years ago that an election mainstay, prescored punch-card ballots, should be junked—but more than 500 counties throughout the nation still use them.

Federal standards for voting equipment took effect in 1990, but they are not mandatory. A number of states, including
Florida, have written some or all of the standards into their own codes. But all existing equipment was excepted, meaning that decades-old systems in Florida and elsewhere are exempt.

America has learned two things from the 2000 election, says Robert Richie, executive director of the Center for Voting and Democracy, a nonprofit, nonpartisan election watchdog group in the Washington suburb of Takoma Park, Md.: "Your vote certainly counts.

"On the other hand, your vote may not be counted."

Long-Term Neglect

If the problem were out-and-out fraud, many would recognize it as an object so familiar on the political landscape as to be a running joke. The late Earl Long used to say that he wanted to be buried in Louisiana so he could stay politically active.

This year's election did include corruption, but the real problem was less obvious: In almost innumerable ways, the election system that counts the votes has suffered from long-term neglect and mismanagement.

Much of the bumbling is caused by inexperience and lack of funding. "People ask, 'If we can put a man on the moon, why can't we have an election system that works?" says William Kimberling, a deputy director at the Federal Election Commission. "I say, 'Yes, and it will cost just about as much.'"

The Board of Elections in New York City, for instance, hired 25,000 temporary workers this year. The job pays $130 for a day that stretches from before 6 a.m. until after 9 p.m. "Would you sit there for 15 hours for $130?" asks Danny DeFrancesco, the board's executive director.

"Most of [the workers] can't read the manual," says Martin Connor, state Senate minority leader and one of New York's leading election lawyers. "You're not going to get bankers, businesspeople and teachers sitting there."

New York has trouble finding voting machine technicians who will start at $21,000 a year. "You make more money servicing laundry machines," says Douglas Kellner, a commissioner on the election board. As a result, machines break down, voting is delayed and people leave.

Some critics blame patronage. Election workers in New York get their job through political leaders. Former Mayor Edward I. Koch calls it "a terrible system."

But much is ineptitude. Four years ago, Susan Marler, the Yuma County, Ariz., recorder, enlisted two female inmates from the
Yuma jail to help send out ballots. Some were mailed more than two days late.
By that time, says County Supervisor Tony Reyes, many migrant laborers, mostly Latinos, had left to work on farms in California and could not vote.

Some places cannot even keep election directors. Several years ago, Tamira Bradley held the job in Longview, Wash. She was paid $1,800 a month. "I really felt that nobody took me seriously," she says, so she quit to become a waitress at a Sizzler. "I made more money."

Long-term neglect introduces so many errors into voting and counting ballots that it is impossible to know after an election exactly what the totals are and how many people may have been robbed of their votes.

Rebecca Mercuri, a computer scientist at Bryn Mawr College in Pennsylvania, and Curtis Gans, director of the nonpartisan Committee for the Study of the American Electorate, estimate that at least 2 million ballots did not get counted this year across the country.

That would disenfranchise a city the size of Houston.

But these estimates include deliberate race skipping, when voters do not like any of their choices. Experts do not know how much of that goes on.

The only mistakes that can be estimated with any confidence are those committed by vote-counting machines. Providers say the machines have error rates of 0.01% to 0.1%. If that is true, counting machines alone could have made as many as 100,000 mistakes this year--an average of 2,000 votes per state.

That is far more than Texas Gov. George W. Bush's margin in Florida for the presidency.

But machine counts do not differentiate race skipping, either, and that makes it impossible, even in the case of machines, to know with any certainty how many voters get robbed.

"Counting votes is like playing horseshoes," says Jim Mattox, a former Texas attorney general who investigated the voting machine industry in the 1980s. "You get points for being close."

Weak Equipment

Voting jurisdictions across the country use five varieties of lever-operated machines, six kinds of punch cards, 10 sorts of optical scanning systems and six types of touch-screen computers.
Every system has its weaknesses.

In 1998, the most recent year with records available, New York City reported trouble calls on 474—or nearly 8%—of the 6,221 metal lever-action machines that it deployed.

Each is a 900-pound hunk of metal parts crammed into a gray steel cabinet that stands 6 feet, 4 inches and looks like it dispenses cigarettes. Voters flip toggle switches to choose their candidates, then pull a big lever to record the choices on a mechanical counter.

The machines are called Shoups, after the Ransom Shoup family in Pennsylvania that began making them decades ago. They are stored in five warehouses and hauled each election day to 1,300 polling sites from the northern reaches of the Bronx to Rockaway Beach in Queens.

For 38 years, these clunky monsters have taken a pounding. "We had one that fell onto the hood of a Buick," says Richard Wagner, a voting machine technician since 1968. "An automobile has 5,000 parts; a voting machine has 27,000 parts. If a guy drops it from the moving truck, it goes out of alignment. If it's put out of alignment enough, it won't work."

The machines also are comparatively easy to rig. Louisiana changed to a Shoup competitor in lever machines several years ago after state Rep. Emile "Peppi" Bruneau showed fellow lawmakers, with coaching from a voting machine technician, how to steal a Shoup-equipped election.

With his cigarette lighter, Bruneau softened a lead plug that sealed the machine. With a pair of pliers, he removed a copper wire embedded in the plug. With a screwdriver, he took off the back cover and a Plexiglas lid protecting the vote counting mechanism. With a Q-Tip, he prodded the counter digit by digit, manipulating the vote total as easily as he might reset an alarm clock.

Punch card systems that produce chads are particularly prone to problems.

Sometimes the chads—tiny rectangular pieces of cardboard—are left hanging. Counting machines force them back into their holes and read what should be a vote as a non-vote.

Prompted by problems in last month's election, officials in Wisconsin have decided to scrap their chad-producing systems by the end of next year. The systems deliver votes at only 7 cents a ballot, however, and they remain popular in voting jurisdictions coast to coast. Nine are in California, including Los Angeles, San Diego and Alameda.
Optical scanners have their own special problems.

They require precisely printed ballots, and they cannot count ballots when voters mark them with Xs, circles or check marks instead of filling in ovals, boxes or arrows. When the scanners fail to count those ballots, election workers in some states may create duplicate ballots or enhance the originals with a small graphite stamp to clarify voter intentions. They are meant to work in pairs with members from competing political parties.

Election officials say this system works, but Shawn Newman, an attorney who represents Citizens for Leaders with Ethics and Accountability Now (CLEAN), based in Tacoma, Wash., considers the practice a sham. "Your ballot can be re-marked, remade totally," he says, "without your knowledge or permission. . . ."

More than 8% of counties nationwide have upgraded to fully computerized touch-screen systems, similar to automated teller machines at banks.

Apart from their expense—a estimated $100 million to outfit Los Angeles County, for instance—some election officials do not trust them. Some of these systems provide no paper records for recounts or disputed elections.

Even those that do, some experts say, might be programmed to lie.

Other security concerns are raised by Internet voting. Despite what Arizona Democrats regard as a successful experiment in their primary this year, William Kimberling, the Federal Election Commission deputy director, calls it "a breeding ground for fraud."

What is never trouble-free is the combination of computers and humans.

Four years ago in Yolo County, Calif., a system reversed results between the first- and last-place candidates in a City Council race.

"The [actual] winner knew something was wrong," says County Clerk-Recorder Tony Bernhard, "when he got one vote in the precinct where his mother and father lived."

Trouble With Rolls

Just as troubling is voter registration.

Alaska has 38,209 more names on its rolls than it has voting age.
population. Virginia Breeze, spokeswoman for the state Division of Elections, says the rolls are hard to purge because people come and go. "Alaska has always been boom or bust."

One of every five names on the Indiana rolls is bogus, according to Aristotle International, a Washington, D.C.-based firm that helps clean up registration rolls. Indiana officials dispute the number, but most agree it is somewhere between 10% and 20%.

Aristotle representatives say six other states have rolls with bogus names of 20% or higher: Arizona, Idaho, Texas, Oklahoma, Utah and Wisconsin. Officials in those states too believe the figure is inflated, but none denies that his or her state has serious problems.

In many cases, much of the blame rests with the so-called motor-voter law. Passed by Congress, its provisions were adopted by Indiana on Jan. 1, 1995. Under the law, Indiana makes it possible for voters to register by mail or by filling out a form at any of 3,000 state offices, including every branch of the Bureau of Motor Vehicles.

During the five years since the beginning of Indiana's motor-voter program, the number of new registrations has increased by 1 million. Tens of thousands, however, are the names of people who have registered more than once. Others are people who no longer live in Indiana. Still others are in prison--or dead.

To compound these troubles, Indiana makes it very difficult to remove voters from the rolls. One person might register six variations of his name. On the rolls, he would become six different people. Unless he got caught, he could vote six times.

Votes for Sale

Voting repeatedly is one kind of election fraud. Another, says Jack Compton, police chief in Alice, Texas, is hiring a "vote whore" to help you win.

While they prefer to be called political consultants or canvassers, vote whores are paid by campaigns to do favors for people in return for their absentee votes. "The last I heard," Compton says, "it was $20 a vote."

Alice is where operatives stuffed Ballot Box 13 with 200 votes to save Lyndon B. Johnson's political career. The extra ballots were cast in alphabetical order and marked in the same handwriting and with the same dark ink. Johnson had planned to abandon politics if he lost his second campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1948, but Box 13 gave him enough votes to win. He went on to become vice president and finally president.

Since the bad old days, much of Texas has gone straight, says Buck Wood, an Austin attorney who specializes in electoral law. But South Texas is distinctive, he says, because its vote whores are so
integral to its political system. "They're generally elderly. They're retired. You can make $6,000 or $7,000 a year. Of course, they don't pay income tax on it. That's a lot of money. It's kind of like a little part-time job."

Rick Sisson, an Alice businessman, pushed for a recent investigation. "They are paid to go out and solicit people for their mail-in ballots. [Sometimes] they actually pay people for these ballots. . . . The political prostitute comes to me and says, 'I will pay you $3, $5. You put your signature, I vote it the way I want. Here's your money.'"

Sometimes they steal votes outright. "My brother and a co-worker and a lady were stealing ballots from mailboxes to vote for [a candidate] in 1986," says an Alice resident, who declines to be identified. "My brother wasn't being paid; he just wanted [the candidate] to win. So they would take the ballots and give them [to him]. They'd put them in the microwave. The heat would open the envelope. They'd make the vote for whoever they wanted. . . .

"[My brother] knew when the mailman was coming by. They stole hundreds of ballots. My brother told me about it. He said he was scared."

One woman in the trade describes the people she solicits as "customers."

The woman, who requested anonymity but agreed to be called Anita, says she actually cares about her customers and does many small kindnesses for them throughout the year. In return, they permit her to request mail-in ballots for them and let her tell them how to vote. Many, she says, also give her "gifts" of votes for the candidates of her choice.

Anita says each of her candidates pays her $150 a week during the election season. "By the time the politics is over, you'll have $1,500. I have 167 people on my list."

"There's a girl in my neighborhood that I bring beer to. I see her three times a year. She says, 'Oh, it's you! It must be election time.' I go to get her mail-in ballot request, and she says, 'Do you have any money?' When I say yes, she says, 'Go get me a quart of beer.' So I do, and then I'll request her ballot. . . .

"You keep up with obituaries. If somebody dies, you get a new person."

Students are more straightforward. At Marquette University in Milwaukee, where the campus newspaper polled 1,000 of them, 174 said they voted two, three or four times.

One told The Times he voted twice for Bush--once at a polling place on the Marquette campus and then by absentee ballot in Florida, where he would have been among those who gave Bush his whisper-thin margin.
"It's easy to vote more than once," the student said. "No one seems to care."

By most accounts, however, the preferred way to cheat is with mail-in ballots. And that makes Oregon a target, as well.

This was the first presidential election in which all Oregon votes were cast by mail. The ease of send-in voting gave the state an 80% turnout—among the highest in the nation.

Part of the concern is about possible intimidation from family or friends when voters mark their ballots at home—or at "ballot parties," where group leaders might pressure others to vote as instructed. But a bigger worry is about forged signatures.

It is a felony to sign someone else's ballot. Workers try to match signatures on ballot envelopes with those on the voter rolls.

"I don't have much faith in that process," says Melody Rose, an assistant professor of political science at Portland State University. "I can forge my husband's signature perfectly."

In a pilot study, Rose gathered preliminary survey data this year on voters in Washington County, outside Portland. About 5% of 818 respondents said other people marked their ballots, and 2.4% said other people signed their ballot envelopes. Rose suspects the real number is higher, because people are reluctant to admit being party to a crime.

If the trend holds, it could mean that more than 36,000 of Oregon's 1.5 million voters submitted illegal ballots.

Bill Bradbury, the Oregon secretary of state, says it is troubling if some people are signing other people's ballots. But Bradbury maintains that he still has confidence in voting by mail.

An Oregon practice that many consider foolhardy is allowing anyone, including campaign workers, to collect ballots. Political operatives go door-to-door to gather them. In the crush of election day, people walked away with ballots collected from cars pulling to the curb outside the county clerk's office in Portland.

Vicki Ervin, the Multnomah County director of elections, says she has no idea where they were going, but she has no evidence of foul play.

Turned Away at Polls

While some people vote more than once, others are barred from voting at all.
Thousands on the mostly African American east side of Cleveland went to vote this year, only to be turned away.

Because of a 1996 state law cutting Cleveland precincts by a quarter, their polling places had been changed. The Cuyahoga County Board of Elections says it sent postcards to registered voters telling them of the switch.

But of 85 blacks who were asked about the postcards during 2 1/2 days of interviews in east Cleveland, only one said he received notification.

"I never got a card, never," says Francis Lundrum, an east side native. He says he bellowed at an election worker: "I am a veteran of the United States armed forces! I want to vote!"

It did no good.

Lundrum and the others who were turned away should have been given provisional ballots, to be certified later. Among those who did not get one was Chuck Conway Jr. "I think there was some stinky stuff going on."

Sometimes the post office robs people of their votes. In a few small counties in Oregon, long and heavy ballots were returned this year for postage due. But the most egregious postal failure came in Washington state.

Steven and Barbara Forrest and their 29-year-old son mailed in ballots from Bellevue on election day. Several days later, two of the ballots were found on the island of Fyn, 100 miles from Copenhagen, in Denmark.

Brian and Helle Kain of Odense, Denmark, discovered them in a large envelope containing navigational charts they had ordered from a company on Shaw Island, 50 miles north of Seattle. They called the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen, which told them not to worry because it was too late to count the ballots anyway.

A Danish reporter telephoned Forrest, and he called Julie Anne Kempf, the King County election superintendent. Kempf was miffed. She phoned the embassy. Her county, she said, was far from certifying its election.

At last notice, the two ballots were on their way home. But the Forrests have no idea what happened to their son's vote. "We hope it got counted," Forrest says. "We feel very strongly about voting."

"We told the department of elections that we are upset about it. But I guess if you're going to assess blame, it almost certainly has to go to the Postal Service."
Voluntary Standards

Some of this voting chaos is because there is actually no such thing in this country as a national election. Americans vote in a hodgepodge of 3,141 counties with 10,000 local jurisdictions.

Yet, election officials have never come up with uniform, binding rules for voting.

Federal standards, now in the process of being updated, are voluntary. Each state, for instance, decides which voting machine systems can be sold within its borders. Then, like patients in a health insurance network, counties and cities make their purchases from the state list.

Gary L. Greenhalgh says he favored "mandatory standards with teeth" when he directed the Federal Election Commission's national clearinghouse on election administration from 1975 to 1985, while election rules were under discussion.

But Congress did not want to impose new cost requirements on the states, he says, and the standards became voluntary.

The Federal Election Commission had no money to enforce standards, and vendors were wary of picking up the cost. So an association of state election directors hired a consultant to find laboratories to test voting systems. The group agreed to mediate among vendors, labs and authorities.

It became an example of interdependence between public election officials and private companies that critics say can grow too intimate. In this instance, there was no illegality, not even over-reliance upon the vendors to do official duties— but there was unchallenged secrecy.

The first vendor to sign up for testing complained about Election Technology Laboratories, says R. Doug Lewis, executive director of the Houston-based Election Center, which helps administer the program. Among the vendor's concerns was the lab's desire to examine its actual lines of computer programming code.

Administrators sided with the vendor, saying they had not intended such a deep level of examination.

"What's going on inside [the machine] is of no concern," said consultant Robert Naegle, who wrote the standards. "My major concerns were accuracy, reliability and maintainability."

"That's not rigorous testing," counters Arnold B. Urken, a co-founder of the Election Technology lab. Mischief or mistakes could go undetected.

"I'm not saying vendors are evil, but unless you test the code, you
don't know," Urken says. Cars and airplanes are regulated at that deep level, he adds. "Why should we demand anything less when we're electing the president of the United States?"


Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times
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Date: Mon, 11 Dec 2000 22:46:54 -0600
From: holptj@alltel.net
Received: from Tims ([166.102.57.61]) by mta01-srv.alltel.net
 (InterMail vM.5.01.01.01 201-252-104) with SMTP id
id <20001212044552.VLSR27064.mta01-srv.alltel.net@Tims>
for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Mon, 11 Dec 2000 22:45:52 -0600
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: support for tax increase
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.11)
Message-Id: <20001212044552.VLSR27064.mta01-srv.alltel.net@Tims>

Dear List:

I am looking for advice, references, and any other resources to guide me in developing a survey research methodology to measure (likely) voter support for a tax increase.

General responses are certainly welcome, but if you have specific examples, or even an entire instrument that you are willing to share, it will be deeply appreciated.

I leave it up to the list to decide if this topic is appropriate for general consumption, or if replies should be private.

Please respond to { HYPERLINK mailto:holptj@alltel.net }holptj@alltel.net if you so desire.

Thanks,
Tim

Timothy J. Sweet-Holp
HOLPTJ@ALLTEL.NET
TJSWEETHOLP@UALR.EDU

"Everyone is important, no one is necessary, life goes on" --- Paul Brown
A colleague who is not an AAPOR member asked me to post this (No, Jim, I don't think he is a candidate to join AAPOR ). John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician Mathematica Policy Research 600 Alexander Park
Princeton, NJ 08540
phone (609) 275-2357
fax (609) 799-0005
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

I was sent your inquiry to APPORNET about weight trimming (please feel free to post this on APPORNET). My references are as follows:


I looked at various weight trimming procedures that had been used in the past as well as some modifications of these in an empirical study for my dissertation. Some of the procedures used only the weights themselves to identify and trim extreme values and some used outcome data in the sense of reducing the estimated mean square error (the variance plus the squared bias from trimming weights). Generally, the statistician has little or no outcome data (or time) available and if data do exist, the benchmark for the evaluating the bias is itself suspect. It's a fertile area for additional research.

The dissertation (with more detailed analyses) may be still available from UNC-Chapel Hill ("Methods for Extreme Weights in Sample Surveys." The Institute of Statistics, Mimeo Series No. 1875T. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel
There is some work reported using weight shrinkage, weight smoothing, and calibration methods (see work by Ralph Folsom and Avi Singh of RTI presented at the 2000 ASA meetings, by Bruce Spencer, and by Rod Little). Some of this research is in the review article by Brick and Kalton, Handling Missing Data in Survey Research, Statistical Methods in Medicine, 1996 5: 215-238.

I hope that this helps. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Frank

Frank Potter, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Email: FPOTTER@Mathematica-MPR.COM
Tel: (609) 936-2799
FAX: (609) 799-0005
Website: http://www.Mathematica-MPR.COM

-----Original Message-----
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Weight trimming
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"

For better or worse, the dissertation is available at contentville.com.

-----Original Message-----
From: John Hall [mailto:JHall@mathematica-mpr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2000 11:14 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: Weight trimming

A colleague who is not an AAPOR member asked me to post this (No, Jim, I don't think he is a candidate to join AAPOR ). John Hall
Senior Sampling Statistician Mathematica Policy Research 600 Alexander Park
Princeton, NJ 08540
phone (609) 275-2357
fax (609) 799-0005
email jhall@mathematica-mpr.com

********************************************************************************
I was sent your inquiry to APPORNET about weight trimming (please feel free to post this on APPORNET). My references are as follows:


I looked at various weight trimming procedures that had been used in the past as well as some modifications of these in an empirical study for my dissertation. Some of the procedures used only the weights themselves to identify and trim extreme values and some used outcome data in the sense of reducing the estimated mean square error (the variance plus the squared bias from trimming weights). Generally, the statistician has little or no outcome data (or time) available and if data do exist, the benchmark for the evaluating the bias is itself suspect. It's a fertile area for additional research.

The dissertation (with more detailed analyses) may be still available from UNC-Chapel Hill ("Methods for Extreme Weights in Sample Surveys." The Institute of Statistics, Mimeo Series No. 1875T. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Biostatistics, 1990.)

There is some work reported using weight shrinkage, weight smoothing, and calibration methods (see work by Ralph Folsom and Avi Singh of RTI presented at the 2000 ASA meetings, by Bruce Spencer, and by Rod Little). Some of this research is in the review article by Brick and Kalton, Handling Missing Data in Survey Research, Statistical Methods in Medicine, 1996 5: 215-238.

I hope that this helps. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Frank

Frank Potter, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Email: FPOTTER@Mathematica-MPR.COM
Tel: (609) 936-2799
FAX: (609) 799-0005
In addition to the dissertation (just $29.95 softbound) there is another paper available on the web on this topic (at least for those of you who can read a Postscript file). "Model-Based Approaches to Trimming Survey Weights" (Elliott, M.R. and Little, R.J.A. 2000).
http://cceb.med.upenn.edu/elliott/trim/trim.htm

Plus these abstracts
"Weight trimming in a random effects model framework"
Assessment of Weighting Methodology for the National Comorbidity Survey
http://www.hcp.med.harvard.edu/ncs/PA164.html

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com
I was sent your inquiry to APPORNET about weight trimming (please feel free to post this on APPORNET). My references are as follows:

"The Effect of Weight Trimming on Nonlinear Survey Estimates."

"A Study of Procedures to Identify and Trim Extreme Sampling Weights."

"Survey of Procedures to Control Extreme Sampling Weights."

I looked at various weight trimming procedures that had been used in the past as well as some modifications of these in an empirical study for my dissertation. Some of the procedures used only the weights themselves to identify and trim extreme values and some used outcome data in the sense of reducing the estimated mean square error (the variance plus the squared bias from trimming weights). Generally, the statistician has little or no outcome data (or time) available and if data do exist, the benchmark for the evaluating the bias is itself suspect. It's a fertile area for additional research.

The dissertation (with more detailed analyses) may be still available from UNC-Chapel Hill ("Methods for Extreme Weights in Sample Surveys." The Institute of Statistics, Mimeo Series No. 1875T. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Biostatistics, 1990.)

There is some work reported using weight shrinkage, weight smoothing, and calibration methods (see work by Ralph Folsom and Avi Singh of RTI presented at the 2000 ASA meetings, by Bruce Spencer, and by Rod Little). Some of this research is in the review article by Brick and Kalton, Handling Missing Data in Survey Research, Statistical Methods in Medicine, 1996 5: 215-238.

I hope that this helps. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. Frank

Frank Potter, Ph.D.
Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Email: FPOTTER@Mathematica-MPR.COM
Lisa and Lorie --
The new label for norelserv should be: Church service attendance in days per year. Please be sure to replace the last instruction under #3. in that message regarding this variable that you should have gotten this morning (Weds).

I'm sorry about the mistake.

Sid
Dear All:

I assume the Jeanne is writing out the check already. Hope for AAPOR’s sake others took her up on her bet.

I share a brief letter from "my friend the attorney."

----- Original Message -----  
From: Craig Gurian  
To: letters@nytimes.com  
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 7:41 AM  
Subject: Equal Protection for This Case Only  

To The Editor:

The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian
December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City.

-------
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To:
<font title="craig@gurian.com" href="mailto:craig@gurian.com">Craig Gurian</font>

From:
<font title="letters@nytimes.com" href="mailto:letters@nytimes.com">letters@nytimes.com</font>

Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 7:41 AM

Subject: Equal Protection for This Case Only

To The =
The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian
December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City.

---=_NextPart_000_000A_01C064E2.C61CDA20--

It will be years before we fully appreciate the implications of the Supreme Court action in denying Florida the right to hand-count machine-failed ballots without a uniform standard for doing so.

Most obvious, no state with a variety of voting methods can ever hand-count ballots, since no single standard would apply to fundamentally different ballot formats: optical-sense sheets, stylus punched cards, butterfly ballots, etc.

For social researchers, open-ended questions are now likely inadmissible in court unless unambiguous coding standards can be demonstrated to produce 100% reliability.

Of greatest concern is a wide range of former crimes that defy uniform standards of measurement. While a 65-mile-an-hour speed
limit is probably safe, "reckless driving" is clearly out. Also at risk would be "drunk and disorderly," "assault and battery," "libel and slander," and a long list of ills demanding subjective judgement.

While it will be impossible to offer a uniform standard for "contempt of court," it is likely to be widespread.

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.

Dear AAPOR'ers:

There are no implications to follow, except putting Bush in office. As the note from my friend Gurian and the response by Sale below indicates. This has nothing to do with general standards.

Read them and weep!

Andy Beveridge

Sale's response:

As one of you so eloquently described months ago as to what this campaign was really about and now has been so aptly and quintessentially demonstrated: "It's the Supreme Court, stupid!"

Gurian's Letter

Subject: Equal Protection for This Case Only
To The Editor:

The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian
December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City.
To The Editor:

The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th).

In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian

December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City.

No question. I hope others will follow suit. There is a great deal to be done to overcome the problems that were uncovered for the public in connection with this election. 

Jeanne Anderson

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

---

Dear All:

I assume the Jeanne is writing out the check already. Hope for AAPOR's sake others took her up on her bet.

I share a brief letter from "my friend the attorney."
---

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City.
The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."
to interpret Florida law.

It is also contradictory to their own federal "equal protection" standard, by denying equal protection to Florida voters whose attempted votes could not be counted due to the obsolete punch-card voting system, which produced four to five times as many "undervotes" as the optical-scanner system.

Given that an ideal system of uniform standards could not be achieved in a recount done by December 18 (after the delay which they themselves imposed, supposedly to improve its standards), why did five conservative justices find a demonstrably incomplete machine count (of which Bush was the known winner by a few hundred votes) to be preferable? Why indeed? There was completely convincing evidence on the record that the machine count left some legal votes uncounted.

All such voters were disenfranchised.

Having worked with punch-cards machines for years (including my dissertation project on the Norwegian election of 1949 [Barton, 1998]) I know that while the counters are pretty accurate when fed cleanly punched cards, the count is no more accurate than the punching system. The BASR always used electrically powered keypunches that made clean holes - not cheapy picks trying to poke out a "chad" into a possibly stuffed or misaligned slot.

The five justices have changed America's motto from "Vox populi, vox Dei" to "Deus est machina."

The Court has also damaged itself severely in the eyes of anyone not totally partisan for Bush. Karl Llewellyn, the great professor of jurisprudence at University of Chicago, said that courts must try to follow a consistent body of precedents and statutory law, but can use ambiguities in "the law" to shape decisions that are as fair as possible without destroying legal continuity. The Florida Supreme Court tried to do this. The conservative majority of the U.S. Supreme Court manifestly did not, but used the leeways of the law to implement its ideological preference. They gave Bush the election without counting all the votes and by obstructing any process for doing so while claiming to uphold "equal protection."

And the next time I hear Bush partisans saying, "But all the votes were counted and recounted" I will throw up at the barefacedness of the lie.

Allen H. Barton
former Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516

As a survey researcher I am concerned that the U.S. Supreme Court has done irreparable harm to George Bush by giving him the Presidency without testing by adequate recount whether he was really the choice of more Florida voters than Gore. (We already know he was not the choice of more voters in the country as a whole, but that is irrelevant under the accepted electoral college system.)

The Court admitted that manual recounts are acceptable if guided by uniform standards, but refused 5-4 to allow this to be done based on their own interpretation of Florida election law. Legally this is dubious because it is the Florida Supreme Court's right to interpret Florida law.

It is also contradictory to their own federal "equal protection" standard, by denying equal protection to Florida voters whose attempted votes could not be counted due to the obsolete punch-card voting system, which produced four to five times as many "undervotes" as the optical-scanner system.

Given that an ideal system of uniform standards could not be achieved in a recount done by December 18 (after the delay which they imposed, supposedly to improve its standards), why did five conservative justices find a demonstrably incomplete machine count (of which Bush was the known winner by a few hundred votes) to be preferable? Why indeed? There was completely convincing evidence on the record that the machine count left some legal votes uncounted. All such voters were disenfranchised.

Having worked with punch-cards machines for years (including my dissertation
> project on the Norwegian election of 1949 [Barton, 1998]) I know that while
> the counters are pretty accurate when fed cleanly punched cards, the
> count is no more accurate than the punching system. The BASR always
> used electrically powered keypunches that made clean holes - not
> cheapy picks trying to poke out a "chad" into a possibly stuffed or
> misaligned slot.
> 
> The five justices have changed America's motto from "Vox populi, vox
> Dei" to
> "Deus est machina."
> 
> The Court has also damaged itself severely in the eyes of anyone not
> totally partisan for Bush. Karl Llewellyn, the great professor of
> jurisprudence at University of Chicago, said that courts must try to
> follow
> a consistent body of precedents and statutory law, but can use
> ambiguities in "the law" to shape decisions that are as fair as
> possible without destroying legal continuity. The Florida Supreme
> Court tried to do this.
> The
> conservative majority of the U.S. Supreme Court manifestly did not,
> but
> used
> the leeways of the law to implement its ideological preference. They
> gave Bush the election without counting all the votes and by
> obstructing any process for doing so while claiming to uphold "equal
> protection."
> 
> And the next time I hear Bush partisans saying, "But all the votes
> were counted and recounted" I will throw up at the barefacedness of
> the lie.
> 
> Allen H. Barton
> former Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia
> University 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516
> 
> Barton (1998) "Occupational class and vote in the 1949 Norwegian
> election."
> Scandinavian Political Studies 21(1) 71-85.

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 12:02:44 -0500
From: Eleanor Singer <esinger@isr.umich.edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Irreparable Harm
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Bravo, Allen!

-----Original Message-----
As a survey researcher I am concerned that the U.S. Supreme Court has done irreparable harm to George Bush by giving him the Presidency without testing by adequate recount whether he was really the choice of more Florida voters than Gore. (We already know he was not the choice of more voters in the country as a whole, but that is irrelevant under the accepted electoral college system.)

The Court admitted that manual recounts are acceptable if guided by uniform standards, but refused 5-4 to allow this to be done based on their own interpretation of Florida election law. Legally this is dubious because it is the Florida Supreme Court's right to interpret Florida law.

It is also contradictory to their own federal "equal protection" standard, by denying equal protection to Florida voters whose attempted votes could not be counted due to the obsolete punch-card voting system, which produced four to five times as many "undervotes" as the optical-scanner system.

Given that an ideal system of uniform standards could not be achieved in a recount done by December 18 (after the delay which they themselves imposed, supposedly to improve its standards), why did five conservative justices find a demonstrably incomplete machine count (of which Bush was the known winner by a few hundred votes) to be preferable? Why indeed? There was completely convincing evidence on the record that the machine count left some legal votes uncounted.

All such voters were disenfranchised.

Having worked with punch-cards machines for years (including my dissertation project on the Norwegian election of 1949 [Barton, 1998]) I know that while the counters are pretty accurate when fed cleanly punched cards, the count is no more accurate than the punching system. The BASR always used electrically powered keypunches that made clean holes - not cheapy picks trying to poke out a "chad" into a possibly stuffed or misaligned slot.

The five justices have changed America's motto from "Vox populi, vox Dei" to "Deus est machina."

The Court has also damaged itself severely in the eyes of anyone not totally partisan for Bush. Karl Llewellyn, the great professor of jurisprudence at University of Chicago, said that courts must try to follow a consistent body of precedents and statutory law, but can use ambiguities in "the law" to shape decisions that are as fair as possible without destroying legal continuity. The Florida Supreme Court tried to do this. The conservative majority of the U.S. Supreme Court manifestly did not, but used the leeways of the law to implement its ideological preference. They gave Bush the election without counting all the votes and by obstructing
any process for doing so while claiming to uphold "equal protection."

And the next time I hear Bush partisans saying, "But all the votes were counted and recounted" I will throw up at the barefacedness of the lie.

Allen H. Barton
former Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516
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I have no idea what anyone means by "implications to follow," except perhaps that someone needs to consult a dictionary.

On the other hand, there will certainly be lessons learned and consequences to follow.

Anyone who believes that the closeness of the election means that there will be bipartisan cooperation in Washington is likely to be in for a rude surprise.

The first lesson that the Democrats have learned is that they were right to deny Bork a seat on the Supreme Court and that their biggest mistake was not to do the same to Scalia and Thomas. That is not a mistake that will be repeated: An anonymous Democratic Senator has already told NPR's Nina Totenberg that unless Bush gets a 60+ Republican majority by 2002, he will not be allowed to nominate anyone the Democrats disapprove of to the Supreme Court, even if it means that half the seats go unfilled for the entire length of his term. The same is likely to be true in the Circuit Courts, where Republicans have been blocking Clinton appointees for years, resulting in a severe shortage of judges that is going to get much worse.

The second lesson that the Democrats have learned is that they have the muscle to get out the vote and that the big mistake they made was not realizing that this is not enough: they also have to educate their supporters and monitor the entire electoral process to make sure that their votes get counted. If they can do this effectively, they may well achieve a Democratic shift in 2002.
comparable to the Republican shift in 1994.

Third, the outgoing administration has set into motion a massive civil rights investigation that will be impossible for the Republicans to stop and that may well cause them far more trouble than Whitewater and its attendant scandals caused for Clinton. Even if the Republicans manage to prevent a count of all the ballots, or if such a count is inconclusive, the glaring disenfranchisement of minorities in such places as Duval County (Jacksonville) are going to provide fertile ground for a vocal campaign impugning Bush's legitimacy on grounds of civil rights violations. Expect to see Jeb Bush depicted wearing a white sheet and references to "Uncle" Clarence Thomas.

This issue is also going to come back to haunt the members of the Supreme Court who used the "equal protection" clause to justify their rejection of the vote count. Stating that their ruling applies only to the present circumstances is akin to Orwell's "all animals are equal, but some are more equal than others" and I expect that you are going to hear that phrase quoted ad nauseum. If the Democrats take back both the House and Senate by substantial margins in 2002, expect to see this become the basis for a movement to impeach one or more justices or to strictly limit the powers of the Supreme Court.

The biggest beneficiaries of all this may be the news media, who will cry all the way to the bank as their reputations slide deeper into the slime. AAPOR members may also be delighted to know that this will probably create an insatiable demand for polls to track Bush's ratings.

Jan Werner

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
> > Dear AAPOR'ers:
> > There are no implications to follow, except putting Bush in office.
> > As the note from my friend Gurian and the response by Sale below
> > indicates. This has nothing to do with general standards.
> > > Read them and weep!
> > > Andy Beveridge
> > > Sale's response:
> > > As one of you so eloquently described months ago as to what this
> > campaign was really about and now has been so aptly and
> > quintessentially
> > demonstrated: " It's the Supreme Court, stupid!"
> > > Gurian's Letter
> > >
Subject: Equal Protection for This Case Only

To The Editor:

The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian

December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City. From

I read the Supremes differently. By 9 to 0, they concluded that many Florida voting laws, systems and counts were defective and no candidate could be certified as the winner.

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

Dear AAPOR'ers:

There are no implications to follow, except putting Bush in office. As the note from my friend Gurian and the response by Sale below indicates. This has nothing to do with general standards.

Read them and weep!

Andy Beveridge
Sale's response:

As one of you so eloquently described months ago as to what this campaign was really about and now has been so aptly and quintessentially demonstrated: "It's the Supreme Court, stupid!"

Gurian's Letter

Subject: Equal Protection for This Case Only

To The Editor:

The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority decision reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian

December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City. From beniger@rcf.usc.edu

You Guys,

If you need any evidence (probably not) of what a precious, intangible and irreplaceable thing we Americans have lost, over the past 24 hours, you need look no further than Maureen Dowd's regular column on the Op-Ed page of this morning's New York Times. Just 48 hours ago, such a column would have been unimaginably crude, tasteless if not vulgar,
and certainly not part of what would qualify--by the famous Times masthead motto--as "news fit to print." But today, there it is, for all to see--and this on but Day #1 of After the Fall.

It's not only that the U.S. Supreme Court--not as individual members, but as an institution--has fallen from its pedestal and indeed fallen from grace. It's also that our Supreme Court has entered the cultural realm of tabloid journalism, gossip columns, political cartoons, talk shows, chat rooms, and late-night and pay-cable comedy (elbowing in among the other two branches of our federal government, long subjects of public contempt and derision in such venues as these).

You can all judge for yourselves the extent to which--and ways in which--this is good or bad. I write here only to document that something precious has now been lost--something which I do not expect to see returned in my own lifetime. That precious thing, of course, is our simplest faith that no one person might ever be above the law—not even those publicly sworn to make it or to decide it.

-- Jim
the Chevy Chase Club, my friends have been asking me why people too stupid or slack to punch a hole through a piece of paper even deserve a vote.

JUSTICE SCALIA. That's it, Sandy, baby. Suffrage, shmuffrage.

CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST. Mr. Boies, you fail to grasp the concept of equal protection for the conservative justices who want to retire. I'm 76. Sandy is 70. We started out long ago, working our hearts out for Barry Goldwater, and we're pooped. My back is killing me! But we can't leave until we install a Republican president. Al Gore would replace us with that hippy-dippy Mario Cuomo or that flower child Larry Tribe, or some minority who actually cares about the rights of the dispossessed.

JUSTICE GINSBURG. Mr. Boies -- may I call you David? -- I love you.

JUSTICE SCALIA. Ruthie, zip it. Mr. Boies, as you surely have noticed by now, I am the Big Brain here. So I will explain what should be res ipsa loquitur, not to mention a priori. We stopped the vote-counting because if we did not, Al Gore might have won. Then I would never have had a chance to be chief justice.

I have put up with so much hokum. When they upheld Roe v. Wade. When they made all-male military academies admit women. I became bitter and marginalized. Never mind Al Gore's due process. What am I due in this process?

MR. KLOCK. If I may, Justice Brandeis --

JUSTICE SCALIA. I'm Scalia, dimwit. To continue, it may look hypocritical if the court's conservatives suppress the will of the people and install a states'-rights president by federal fiat. I know I have spent my career fighting against muscular assertions of judicial power. But now I see that judicial tyranny, judiciously used, can be a good thing. I don't believe in making laws from the bench. But making presidents? That's different. Hey, who ever said the Constitution is engraved in stone, anyhow? Text is important, but so is subtext. Why should I prop up a pathetic pol who vilified Clarence and me during his campaign?

This court is riddled with conflicts of interest. Clarence's wife, Ginny, is over at the Heritage Foundation gathering conservatives' résumés for possible appointments in the new administration.
My son is a partner at Ted Olson's law firm. Another son just got hired by another law firm working for Bush. But if I had recused myself, there would have been a tie. And then those radicals on the Florida Supreme Court could have been affirmed. And President Gore might have made Ruthie the chief.

JUSTICE THOMAS (to himself). If this thing runs long, I'm going to miss "Trailer Park Nurses" and "Room Servicing" on the Spice channel.

JUSTICE STEVENS. De novo, delightful, de-lovely. Why don't we just devise a standard to count all the votes?

JUSTICE SOUTER. I know the Bushes are furious at me. That'll teach 'em to assume that a guy living like a monk in an isolated New Hampshire farmhouse is some kind of Live Free or Die nut.

JUSTICE O'CONNOR. Mr. Boies, while we are on the subject of irreparable harm, are you aware that if I side with you, it could put in jeopardy the membership of my husband, John, in the Bohemian Grove? He does so enjoy his week of stag frolicking and drag shows in the California redwoods with President Bush, Cap Weinberger, Bill Buckley, David Rockefeller and Henry Kissinger.

CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST. We're dropping in the polls on the question of our fairness, but we still need to anoint Bush president. It's best for us. We'll just have to work harder to hide the truth: that we are driven by all the same petty human emotions as everybody else in this town -- ambition, partisanship, political debts and revenge.

MR. KLOCK. How true, Chief Justice Holmes.

Copyright 2000 The New York Times Company
Yes, nationally elected officials are more partisan than most people. But, I think Democrats in Congress have been more willing to break with their Party than Republicans (they tend to enforce the line). It will be interesting to see how the Austin crowd, who "won" this election, will get along with the Capitol Hill Republicans (they kept quiet most of this time). Republicans will probably want to pass at least a few things on which they can get agreement/consensus, because elections are just around the corner... I suspect that is where they'll focus their efforts. On the other hand, a Bush win will probably help "unite" the fragmenting Democrats.

Here are a few items related to a close race in 1876 in which Rutherford B. Hayes won by 1 Electoral College vote. The compromise that put him in office was the end of Reconstruction. The end of the Civil Rights era and approaches have been underway for some time... there is clearly an ethnic/race component to this election. According to yesterday's Washington Post, Bush lost by 9 to 1 among African-Americans, "one of the worst records for a Republican presidential candidate in the history of polling." Republicans do not believe their policies are or will be harmful to people of color (and even bristle at the thought), but for some reason, many are obviously not convinced. We are a wealthy and privileged nation... but with huge social inequities. Policies that reduce inequities would seem to help with many of our social problems. But philosophically/ideologically, there is a huge split in this nation—and this election makes the dispute clear. Mark


///

On the "lighter" side, forgive me... but I heard this last night just after the Supreme Court news and couldn't help but think of Gore's looming concession...

"My Way"
Writer(s): Revaux/Francois/Anka

And now, the end is near;
And so I face the final curtain.
My friend, I'll say it clear,
I'll state my case, of which I'm certain.
I've lived a life that's full. 
I've traveled each and ev'ry highway;
But more, much more than this,
I did it my way.

Regrets, I've had a few;
But then again, too few to mention.
I did what I had to do
And saw it through without exemption.

I planned each charted course;
Each careful step along the byway,
But more, much more than this,
I did it my way.

Yes, there were times, I'm sure you knew
When I bit off more than I could chew.
But through it all, when there was doubt,
I ate it up and spit it out.
I faced it all and I stood tall;
And did it my way.

I've loved, I've laughed and cried.
I've had my fill; my share of losing.
And now, as tears subside,
I find it all so amusing.

To think I did all that;
And may I say - not in a shy way,
"No, oh no not me,
I did it my way".

For what is a man, what has he got?
If not himself, then he has naught.
To say the things he truly feels;
And not the words of one who kneels.
The record shows I took the blows -
And did it my way!

--Frank Sinatra
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As a survey researcher I am concerned that the U.S. Supreme Court has done irreparable harm to George Bush by giving him the Presidency without testing by adequate recount whether he was really the choice of more Florida voters than Gore. (We already know he was not the choice of more voters in the country as a whole, but that is irrelevant under the accepted electoral college system.)

The Court admitted that manual recounts are acceptable if guided by uniform standards, but refused 5-4 to allow this to be done based on their own interpretation of Florida election law. Legally this is dubious because it is the Florida Supreme Court's right to interpret Florida law.

It is also contradictory to their own federal "equal protection" standard, by denying equal protection to Florida voters whose attempted votes could not be counted due to the obsolete punch-card voting system, which produced four to five times as many "undervotes" as the optical-scanner system.

Given that an ideal system of uniform standards could not be achieved in a recount done by December 18 (after the delay which they themselves imposed, supposedly to improve its standards), why did five conservative justices find a demonstrably incomplete machine count (of which Bush was the known winner by a few hundred votes) to be preferable? Why indeed? There was completely convincing evidence on the record that the machine count left some legal votes uncounted. All such voters were disenfranchised.

Having worked with punch-cards machines for years (including my dissertation project on the Norwegian election of 1949 [Barton, 1998]) I know that while the counters are pretty accurate when fed cleanly punched cards, the count is no more accurate than the punching system. The BASR always used electrically powered keypunches that made clean holes - not cheapy picks trying to poke out a "chad" into a possibly stuffed or misaligned slot.

The five justices have changed America's motto from "Vox populi, vox Dei" to "Deus est machina."

The Court has also damaged itself severely in the eyes of anyone not totally partisan for Bush. Karl Llewellyn, the great professor of jurisprudence at University of Chicago, said that courts must try to follow a consistent body of precedents and statutory law, but can use ambiguities in "the law" to shape decisions that are as fair as possible without destroying legal continuity. The Florida Supreme Court tried to do this. The conservative majority of the U.S. Supreme Court manifestly did not, but used the leeways.
of the law to implement its ideological preference. They gave Bush the election without counting all the votes and by obstructing any process for doing so while claiming to uphold "equal protection."

And the next time I hear Bush partisans saying, "But all the votes were counted and recounted" I will throw up at the barefacedness of the lie.

Allen H. Barton
former Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516


It's nice to know that we are academics first and citizens second.

It's not the Republicans' fault that a faulty ballot design was used (and has been used for many years). It's not Republicans' fault that people were confused by the ballot and voted twice. (I'm still not sure how we can gauge intent of another person when we weren't in the booth with them).

It's not Bush's fault that we have a conservative tilt to the court. And, it's not Bush's fault that a worn-out Jesse Jackson wasn't able to inflame the country enough to overturn the election for Al Gore.

While political gamesmanship will most certainly continue at an increased pace in the next term, an outgoing Administration should not have as its legacy (and we all know Clinton is worried about his legacy) a civil rights battle that they will not take part in. One should not start a war they cannot finish in the name of party loyalty.

If Bush does indeed become President, perhaps he (or even Clinton now?) can create a commission, with Al Gore or some other prominent Democrats as a part of it, to come up with recommendations for more uniform election standards and guidelines and recommendations for eliminating punch ballots. I think this would be a much more beneficial thing to do than to send the "disenfranchised" out into the streets.
And as for comments about the U.S. Supreme Court playing politics, it was the FL Supreme Court which initiated the delays. Recall that four of the 7 FL justices have made significant monetary contributions to Gore's campaign. Let's face it, when the FL Chief Justice dissent there obviously is something fishy going on in FL.

This whole disaster will be debated for years to come, but we should all begin to think about this as Americans, not Crusaders. No one is totally happy with this election, but our system has survived and though imperfect, has rendered a decision. If you want to change the system, that's fine, but let's not assassinate the actors involved since there are as many bad apples on the liberal side as there are on the conservative side.

If Bush and the Republicans can't unite the country or accomplish things, then they will deserve to lose the next election. What comments like the last few make me wonder is, how many of you will be willing to give Bush credit if he can unite the country and the Congress can accomplish things...and the fact that I need to ask that of such a distinguished group is disappointing.

-- Jim
good strategy. I feel as if we have been taken advantage of, mentally raped, and then violated with words that don't begin to explain any of this to me.

I feel as if we are robbed in a lot of ways. The media thinks we are stupid so they try to tell us how we feel, what we saw, and in spite of all the mistakes they made with polling and information gathering they are still using the information gathering in the same way. This is not good.

If there is still one small victory in this, it is that all the people in the US have no clear idea of what really happened and justice, as we call it in the hood, though I am not of a ghetto mentality, just us, the kind we usually get is being applied to all. You get to get the same raw deal that we usually get, chess board mentality on the solving of problems. That is smoking pot is a youthful indiscretion when a person of means does it, but when a poor person does it, it is a jailable offense with legs.

You expect from the white robes, injustice.

You expect at least some kind of consensus, and leadership that works for us that is not divisive from the Supreme Court.

My protests will not be covered over, my feelings about this will not be wrapped in sugary spin doctoring. I resent this process like I did separate but equal. Neither Al Gore, or the new president will restore my trust in this system. It is broken.

******
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Right on! The first rational comment that has been made on AAPORnet among all the partisan campaigning and whining.

Harry O'Neill
I've enjoyed watching the process with, as far as I was concerned, an unbiased viewpoint for many weeks. The public, according to the polls that many of us have conducted (not I, having moved into government work), has been equally interested but not concerned about the country falling apart. It's been fun to watch. Last Friday, the FL Supreme Court came up with the first common sense solution -- if the machine rejects the card, check the card to see if the intent of the voter can be determined. There was a cry for a standard, but like pornography, it's hard to describe but we know it when we see it. If the recounters were conservative in their determination so be it.

Then on Saturday, I didn't pay attention. I got busy with family, the holidays, and never turned on the news. On Sunday morning when I saw the headlines I discovered that I was a partisan and much to my horror so was the Supreme Court. Up until that ruling, I felt that everybody (with the exception of Harris) had acted fairly, justly and within their rights and responsibilities -- the lawyers on both sides were exceptional I thought.

So while I think most of us in AAPOR try to be nonpartisan, which is especially important when we conduct media polls, we do have partisan opinions. The Supreme Court, which we all believe should be above politics, has shown its partisanship. Forgive us when we show ours.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: Bill Thompson [SMTP:bthompson@directionsrsch.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 1:19 PM
> To: jwerner@jwdp.com
> Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Implications to follow
> >
> >
> > It's nice to know that we are academics first and citizens second.
> >
> > It's not the Republicans' fault that a faulty ballot design was used
> > (and has been used for may years). It's not Republicans' fault that
> > people were confused
> > by the ballot and voted twice. (I'm still not sure how we can gauge
> > intent of
> > another person when we weren't in the booth with them).
> >
> > It's not Bush's fault that we have a conservative tilt to the court.
> > And, its not Bush's fault that a worn-out Jesse Jackson wasn't able to
inflame the country enough to overturn the election for Al Gore.

While political gamesmanship will most certainly continue at an increased pace in the next term, an outgoing Administration should not have as its legacy (and we all know Clinton is worried about his legacy) a civil rights battle that they will not take part in. One should not start a war they cannot finish in the name of party loyalty.

If Bush does indeed become President, perhaps he (or even Clinton now?) can create a commission, with Al Gore or some other prominent Democrats as a part of it, to come up with recommendations for more uniform election standards and guidelines and recommendations for eliminating punch ballots. I think this would be a much more beneficial thing to do than to send the "disenfranchised" out into the streets.

And as for comments about the U.S. Supreme Court playing politics, it was the FL Supreme Court which initiated the delays. Recall that four of the 7 FL justices have made significant monetary contributions to Gore's campaign. Let's face it, when the FL Chief Justice dissents there obviously is something fishy going on in FL.

This whole disaster will be debated for years to come, but we should all begin to think about this as Americans, not Crusaders. No one is totally happy with this election, but our system has survived and though imperfect, has rendered a decision. If you want to change the system, that's fine, but let's not assassinate the actors involved since there are as many bad apples on the liberal side as there are on the conservative side.

If Bush and the Republicans can't unite the country or accomplish things, then they will deserve to lose the next election. What comments like the last few make me wonder is, how many of you will be willing to give Bush credit if he can unite the country and the Congress can accomplish things...and the fact that I need to ask that of such a distinguished group is disappointing.
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Bob: Florida election law says that attempted votes are to be considered votes if the intent of the voter is clearly discernable from the ballot.
The U.S. Supreme Court just complained about the lack of a uniform standard for ascertaining this on a manual recount. Allen Barton

Would you have found acceptable a FL Supreme Court mandated standard based on the instructions to voters punch out the hole and leave no hanging chad? (I have no idea what the specific instructions were to the voters in FL, but that is the sense of the instructions we have in Missouri?) If dimples and hanging chad are eliminated from consideration, how reliable are the machine counts compared to hand counts?
To be picky about language, the question is not which candidate was the "choice" of the most voters. The question is which candidate received the most properly cast votes. Attempted votes, by definition, are not votes.
Of course this doesn't address the butterfly ballot confusion, the military postmark standards, and the absentee ballot issue, By the way, I am certain you will need a barf bag in the next couple of weeks.
Since a ballot is fundamentally a questionnaire, and since the processing of ballots overlaps with survey technology, it would seem to me that the members of this list ought to be central to any major overhaul of our national voting procedures.

How can we ensure that? Should AAPOR be pro-active?

Earl

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie  
Tel: 714-997-6565  
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A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.

It may not be Bush the son's fault that there is a conservative tilt to the court, but it is certainly his father's fault, and he heartily endorsed it, stating that Scalia and Thomas were his "ideals" of a Supreme Court justice.

Note that those were also the two justices that had the most to gain from a Bush victory, and that Thomas's glaring conflict of interest (his wife's current duties for the Bush transition effort at the Heritage Foundation) would have disqualified any honest judge, quite aside from
political considerations.

I will certainly agree that it was not the Republican's fault that a faulty ballot design was used in Palm Beach County, but it just as certainly was the Jeb Bush administration's fault that minority areas had disproportionately inadequate voting equipment, that minority voters were falsely purged from the rolls on the grounds that they "might be felons" as determined by a consulting firm with close ties to the national Republican organization, and that minority precincts were not given the means to verify voters names when they did not appear on the voter lists provided by the Florida Secretary of State, Mr. Bush's campaign chairman.

As Kevin Philips pointed out this morning, you have to be incredibly cynical or ignorant to claim that Bush's margin of victory in Jacksonville makes any logical sense except through the massive disenfranchisement of minority voters.

Herb London, a professor at NYU and former Conservative Party candidate for Governor of New York, commented today that Bush's tainted victory may very well mean that he could be the last Republican President in our lifetimes, as "minorities" become the majority of the U.S. population and will always remember the Republicans as the party that tried to disenfranchise them, both at the polls and through the Census.

The fact remains that Bush's victory may be legal but will never be accepted as legitimate by any except his most partisan supporters.

I am not an academic, but as Tom Paine stated a couple of centuries ago, the first duty of a citizen is to fight injustice. So count me a citizen first.

Jan Werner

Bill Thompson wrote:
> It's nice to know that we are academics first and citizens second.
> It's not the Republicans' fault that a faulty ballot design was used
> (and has been used for may years). It's not Republicans' fault that
> people were confused by the ballot and voted twice. (I'm still not
> sure how we can gauge intent of another person when we weren't in the
> booth with them).
> It's not Bush's fault that we have a conservative tilt to the court.
> And, its not Bush's fault that a worn-out Jesse Jackson wasn't able to
> inflame the country enough to overturn the election for Al Gore.
> While political gamesmanship will most certainly continue at an
> increased pace in the next term, an outgoing Administration should not
> have as its legacy (and we all know Clinton is worried about his
> legacy) a civil rights battle that they will not take part in. One
> should not start a war they cannot finish in the name of party
> loyalty.
If Bush does indeed become President, perhaps he (or even Clinton now?) can create a commission, with Al Gore or some other prominent Democrat as a part of it, to come up with recommendations for more uniform election standards and guidelines and recommendations for eliminating punch ballots. I think this would be a much more beneficial thing to do than to send the "disenfranchised" out into the streets.

And as for comments about the U.S. Supreme Court playing politics, it was the FL Supreme Court which initiated the delays. Recall that four of the 7 FL justices have made significant monetary contributions to Gore's campaign. Let's face it, when the FL Chief Justice dissents there obviously is something fishy going on in FL.

This whole disaster will be debated for years to come, but we should all begin to think about this as Americans, not Crusaders. No one is totally happy with this election, but our system has survived and though imperfect, has rendered a decision. If you want to change the system, that's fine, but let's not assassinate the actors involved since there are as many bad apples on the liberal side as there are on the conservative side.

If Bush and the Republicans can't unite the country or accomplish things, then they will deserve to lose the next election. What comments like the last few make me wonder is, how many of you will be willing to give Bush credit if he can unite the country and the Congress can accomplish things...and the fact that I need to ask that of such a distinguished group is disappointing. From jwerner@jwdp.com
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Glad to know that you agree with me on a political issue, possibly for the first time ever.

Jan Werner

HOOneill536@aol.com wrote:
>
Right on! The first rational comment that has been made on AAPORnet among all the partisan campaigning and whining.

Harry O'Neill

Last week a friend in history suggested our motto is now

"Vox populi ex machinae optimae solum constituo est,"

The voice of the people is found in only the best machines.

As a survey researcher I am concerned that the U.S. Supreme Court has done irreparable harm to George Bush by giving him the Presidency without testing by adequate recount whether he was really the choice of more Florida voters than Gore. (We already know he was not the choice of more voters in the country as a whole, but that is irrelevant under the accepted electoral college system.)

The Court admitted that manual recounts are acceptable if guided by uniform standards, but refused 5-4 to allow this to be done based on their own interpretation of Florida election law. Legally this is dubious because it is the Florida Supreme Court's right to interpret Florida law.

It is also contradictory to their own federal "equal protection" standard, by denying equal protection to Florida voters whose attempted votes could not be counted due to the obsolete punch-card voting system, which produced four to five times as many "undervotes" as the optical-scanner system.

Given that an ideal system of uniform standards could not be achieved in a recount done by December 18 (after the delay which they themselves imposed, supposedly to improve its standards), why did five conservative justices find a demonstrably incomplete machine count (of which Bush was the known winner by a few hundred votes) to be preferable? Why indeed? There was completely convincing evidence on the record that the machine count left some legal votes uncounted. All such voters were disenfranchised.

Having worked with punch-cards machines for years (including my
> dissertation project on the Norwegian election of 1949 [Barton, 1998])
> I know that while
> the counters are pretty accurate when fed cleanly punched cards, the count
> is no more accurate than the punching system. The BASR always used
> electrically powered keypunches that made clean holes - not cheapy picks
> trying to poke out a "chad" into a possibly stuffed or misaligned slot.
> The five justices have changed America's motto from "Vox populi, vox
> Dei" to "Deus est machina."
>
> The Court has also damaged itself severely in the eyes of anyone not
> totally partisan for Bush. Karl Llewellyn, the great professor of
> jurisprudence at University of Chicago, said that courts must try to
> follow a consistent body of precedents and statutory law, but can use
> ambiguities in "the law" to shape decisions that are as fair as
> possible without destroying legal continuity. The Florida Supreme
> Court tried to do this. The
> conservative majority of the U.S. Supreme Court manifestly did not, but
> used
> the leeways of the law to implement its ideological preference. They gave
> Bush the election without counting all the votes and by obstructing any
> process for doing so while claiming to uphold "equal protection."
>
> And the next time I hear Bush partisans saying, "But all the votes
> were counted and recounted" I will throw up at the barefacedness of
> the lie.
>
> Allen H. Barton
> former Director, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia
> University 118 Wolf's Trail, Chapel Hill, NC 27516
>
> Barton (1998) "Occupational class and vote in the 1949 Norwegian
> election." Scandinavian Political Studies 21(1) 71-85.
>
> It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about
> "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either
> on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus
> overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow
> technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on
instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been decided in favor of Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to say about this.

One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a thought . . .

Ray Funkhouser

*****************************************************************************

* **

ELECTION 2000, Day 36

Appeals court upholds military ballots
Federal panel says 2,400 absentee votes must be counted

By Jon E. Dougherty
© 2000 WorldNetDaily.com

A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400 absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day. A three-judge panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the workings of the state's absentee laws. The case was brought initially as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes for George W. Bush from being tallied. "While Florida law seems to favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders -- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote. The court rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters who argued that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S. Constitution -- require that votes be received by the close of polling stations on Election Day. "The decision seems inconsistent with the enacted laws of Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based lawyer for the plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely. On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey Collier ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections.
officials.
In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been thrown out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a date or a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by registered voters.
According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled that federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no formal request for a write-in ballot.
"It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United States is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of the several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It is even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed forces serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."
Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had been discarded:
· Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the elections supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.
· Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarded any federal write-in ballots.
· Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, 14 of which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a spokeswoman for the county elections board.
Officials in Miami-Dade County did not return calls. Seminole County officials said elections personnel were in meetings throughout the day but would return calls; they failed to do so.
The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal write-in ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush because military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidates. However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic lawyer Mark Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject military ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could receive by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.

Related stories:
Military missing absentee ballots
Military anguishes over missing ballots
Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell busting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.
Hey, check you history. Contrary to what many think, Nixon did. Also, the courts will hold those votes be counted just as they did in Seminole and Martin counties. The issue in Duvall County, and I was there in the last 2 weeks, is blatant racism. I don't care if it was for Gore, Bush or Nader. One final thought. Why were Baker, Cheney, GHWBush as involved in Iran-Contra? Is that why GWB needs then to tell him what to do? Why did Thomas not recuse himself if his wife was being paid by the transition team?

Apparently, many do not realize (read your Max Weber) in the public's eyes this is becoming a question of legitimacy. Earlier this year the National Center for State Courts released data showing a majority of Americans neither trust the lower courts -- they believe money talks -- and were unsure about the Judiciary.

Injustice is evil and it grows like a cancer. I heard Limbaugh encourage the Republicans to avoid paying any attention to the divisive Democrats and pass their package because the people voted for it. Gramsci wrote at length about hegemony and the R's are trying to control the labels and the discourse. The issue, for all citizens, is to make the system work. It did with Nixon. Deep inside me I believe it will with the Bush family -- Iran-Contra, Savings and Loan, Florida(?). Follow the money.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been decided in favor of Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to say about this.

One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a thought . . .

Ray Funkhouser

ELECTION 2000, Day 36
Appeals court upholds military ballots
Federal panel says 2,400 absentee votes must be counted

By Jon E. Dougherty
© 2000 WorldNetDaily.com

A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400 absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day. A three-judge panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the workings of the state's absentee laws. The case was brought initially as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes for George W. Bush from being tallied. "While Florida law seems to favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders -- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote. The court rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters
who argued that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S.
Constitution -- require that votes be received by the close of polling
stations on Election Day. "The decision seems inconsistent with the
enacted laws of Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based
lawyer for the plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely.
On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey
ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some
absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections
officials.
In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee
ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been
thrown out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a date
or a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by registered
voters.
According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been
discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled that
federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no formal
request for a write-in ballot.
"It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United
States is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of the
several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It is
even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed forces
serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."
Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to
determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had been
discarded:
· Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the elections
supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.
· Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarded any
federal write-in ballots.
· Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, 14 of
which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a
spokeswoman for the county elections board.
Officials in Miami-Dade County did not return calls. Seminole County
officials said elections personnel were in meetings throughout the day but
would return calls; they failed to do so.
The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal write-in
ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush
because military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidates.
However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic lawyer
Mark Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject military
ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could receive
by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.
Related stories:
Military missing absentee ballots
Military anguishes over missing ballots
Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell busting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.

---

No doubt if the shoe were on the other foot, that is if the US Supremes had upheld the FL Supremes, there would be loud chest beating about how the election had been stolen by those criminals in the Whitehouse and how an acute injustice had been done. The right wing talk radio shows would be calling for revolution. It would be a pathetic and frightening display.

The time for arguing about this result is over. For better or worse George Bush is the next president of the United States. It's time to calm down now and start thinking about what comes next.

It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been decided in favor of Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these votes
would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to say about this.

One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a thought . . .

Ray Funkhouser
***************************************************************************
*
**
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Appeals court upholds military ballots
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A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400 absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day.

A three-judge panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the workings of the state's absentee laws.

The case was brought initially as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes for George W. Bush from being tallied.

"While Florida law seems to favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders -- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote.

The court rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters who argued that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S. Constitution -- require that votes be received by the close of polling stations on Election Day.

"The decision seems inconsistent with the enacted laws of Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based lawyer for the plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely.

On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey Collier ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections officials.

In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been thrown out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a date or a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by registered voters.

According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been
discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled that federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no formal request for a write-in ballot.

"It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United States is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of the several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It is even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed forces serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."

Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had been discarded:

- Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the elections supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.
- Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarded any federal write-in ballots.
- Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, 14 of which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a spokeswoman for the county elections board.

Officials in Miami-Dade County did not return calls. Seminole County officials said elections personnel were in meetings throughout the day but would return calls; they failed to do so.

The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal write-in ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush because military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidates. However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic lawyer Mark Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject military ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could receive by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.

Related stories:
Military missing absentee ballots
Military anguishes over missing ballots
Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell bursting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.
Also, I'm fairly sure that Republicans are secretly supporting the Grinch this Christmas, that judges wear absolutely nothing under those robes, and the Democrats planned all this as part of some esoteric conspiracy to force us to have head implants so they can really evaluate voter intent.

Hopefully this list will move on to less partisan matters and more on the influence this debacle will have on public opinion and confidence in government institutions. I'll be interested to see how evaluations of the U.S. Supreme Court fare in the long run compared to other government institutions such as the branches, the military, and the like.

____________________________

Barry Hollander
Associate Professor
College of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
Yes, and the system sure worked for the Clintons...Whitewater...TravelGate...Monica. Do I hear the song "I'm Still Standin'" in the background?

If the system is that unfair, well, at least the other side won one for a change.

Brian Vargus <igem100@iupui.edu> on 12/13/2000 04:14:06 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters

Hey, check you history. Contrary to what many think, Nixon did. Also, the courts will hold those votes be counted just as they did in Seminole and Martin counties. The issue in Duvall County, and I was there in the last 2 weeks, is blatant racism. I don't care if it was for Gore, Bush or Nader. One final thought. Why were Baker, Cheney, GHWBush as involved in Iran-Contra? Is that why GWB needs then to tell him what to do? Why did Thomas not recuse himself if his wife was being paid by the transition team? Apparently, many do not realize (read your Max Weber) in the public's eyes this is becoming a question of legitimacy. Earlier this
year the National Center for State Courts released data showing a majority of Americans neither trust the lower courts -- they believe money talks -- and were unsure about the Judiciary.

Injustice is evil and it grows like a cancer. I heard Limbaugh encourage the Republicans to avoid paying any attention to the divisive Democrats and pass their package because the people voted for it. Gramsci wrote at length about hegemony and the R's are trying to control the labels and the discourse. The issue, for all citizens, is to make the system work. It did with Nixon. Deep inside me I believe it will with the Bush family -- Iran-Contra, Savings and Loan, Florida(?). Follow the money.

Brian Vargus

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

> It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been decided in favor of Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to say about this.

> One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a thought . . .

> Ray Funkhouser

> ******************************************

> *****

> **

> ELECTION 2000, Day 36

> Appeals court upholds military ballots

> Federal panel says 2,400 absentee votes must be counted

> By Jon E. Dougherty
A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400 absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day.

A three-judge panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the workings of the state's absentee laws.

The case was brought initially as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes for George W. Bush from being tallied. "While Florida law seems to favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders -- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote. The court rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters who argued that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S. Constitution -- require that votes be received by the close of polling stations on Election Day.

"The decision seems inconsistent with the enacted laws of Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based lawyer for the plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely.

On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey Collier ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections officials.

In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been thrown out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a =
date or
> a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by register=
ed
> voters.
> According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been=

> discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled =
that
> federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no forma=
1
> request for a write-in ballot.
> "It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United=States
> is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of t=he
> several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It= is
> even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed force=
s
> serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."
> Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to
> determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had = been
> discarded:
> =B7 Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the electi= ons
> supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.=

> =B7 Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarde=d any
> federal write-in ballots.
> =B7 Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, = 14 of
> which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a
> spokeswoman for the county elections board. Officials in Miami-Dade
> County did not return calls. Seminole County officials said elections
> personnel were in meetings throughout the da=y but
> would return calls; they failed to do so.
> The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal writ= e-in
> ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush = because
> military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidate=
s.
> However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic law= yer Mark
> Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject mi= litary
> ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could= receive
> by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.
>
> Related stories:
> Military missing absentee ballots
> Military anguishes over missing ballots
> Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell busting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.
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Folks, I realized after receiving a direct reply from Jan that I had sent this
e-mail directly to him. To be honest I was intending
to submit it to the group. I thank Jan for his comments to me and open this up
for your consideration (and argument). Give me a few seconds to duck!

---------------------- Forwarded by Bill Thompson/DRI on 12/13/2000 04:45 PM
----------------------

(Embedded Bill Thompson
image moved 12/13/2000 03:23 PM
to file: (Embedded image moved to file: pic04320.pcx) pic22634.pcx)
To: jwerner@jwp.com
cc:

Subject: Re: Implications to follow  (Document link: Bill Thompson)

Jan,

To the victor goes the spoils. When a Republican is president they get to appoint who they want. When a Democrat is president, they get to appoint who they want. Sorry if it was Gore's bad luck to run for President when there was a conservative tilt to the Court. That still doesn't prove it was a purely partisan decision. Were any of us there in the back rooms during their discussions and voting? Would a Republican have won in the Court in the not too distant past when it was more liberal?

Let's remember, Gore ran for president once before, and didn't win then either. (By the way, for a sitting Vice-President to do so poorly in an election bid is not the fault of conservatives, it speaks to a flaw in the candidate. Gore should have kicked Bush's tail, but he couldn't, hell he couldn't even win his own state!)

As for the Court members having "something to gain"...c'mon, they're set for life. To think they would mess with the constitution for their own gain is silly. That's a politician's job.

And now comes the point where I take my politically incorrect stab at the "disenfranchised minorities" in our country. To blame Jeb Bush for disenfranchising blacks is to ignore the fact that blacks have been disenfranchised for YEARS by both Democrats and Republicans. The election methods, punch cards and rules were not created by Jeb Bush. Most of this has been in place for years, and remember, Jeb Bush's predecessor was a Democrat. Did Chiles do anything to make the system more fair for blacks? Four years ago there were a nearly equal number of votes that were disqualified for double punches or no punches. Where was the outcry then?? Because we had a clear winner and recounts weren't needed doesn't mean blacks were any less disenfranchised, but no one (certainly not the re-elected Democrat Bill "I feel your pain" Clinton) paid any attention then to "their people". But let a Republican win and suddenly we're all wearing white hoods and we should turn over the government to the disenfranchised.

I think if ANYONE was disenfranchised it is a shame, however, lessons learned cannot always be used to turn back the clock. We should use our lessons to change things for the future. (Such was the attempt with Affirmative Action) I look forward to hearing Al Gore mark his place in history tonight as someone who lost the battle but won a war for increased justice in our voting system. (Any takers?? I bet not!)
To your comment about the professor from the Conservative Party in NY...oh wait, what party? How many votes did they get? (OK, I apologize, that was low). On a more serious note...to think that this spells the end for the Republicans in the long term is wishful thinking. This event will energize people for sure, but I feel both sides will benefit. Let's recall for the most part, the public felt more negative toward Gore's handling of this than Bush. Certainly, this could be damaging to the GOP in the short term, I agree. George Bush will have to overcome many obstacles, not the least of which will be an unfavorable press, and he'll have to carry the Republicans in Congress with him (since they can't seem to do it for themselves) which will be a daunting task even for a talented politician. He may well be a one term president, but public opinion is a valuable weapon as Bill Clinton has proven. If Bush prove himself to be genuine in his claims to want to work with both sides, then perhaps he and the party will survive the short term. Let's not call the game before it has been played.

You say that the election of Bush will only be legitimate to the most partisan supporters. Well, wouldn't we be able to say the same if Gore won? We could, but since a Democrat would be in the White House, that would make it OK, I guess. The ends justify the means.

What AAPOR should focus on is not the ballot methods or formats (I disagree that there is a correlation between survey research and ballots, they have completely different purposes and histories). What we as an organization MUST focus on is getting the media to stop calling elections early. The media looks really bad after this one and maybe now is the time for a full blown PR campaign to pressure the media to change their reporting methods. Maybe they'll be more receptive since they have egg on their face.

Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com> on 12/13/2000 02:50:27 PM

Please respond to jwerner@jwdp.com

To: Bill Thompson/DRI@DRI, AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc:

Subject: Re: Implications to follow

It may not be Bush the son's fault that there is a conservative tilt to the court, but it is certainly his father's fault, and he heartily endorsed it, stating that Scalia and Thomas were his "ideals" of a Supreme Court justice.
Note that those were also the two justices that had the most to gain from a Bush victory, and that Thomas's glaring conflict of interest (his wife's current duties for the Bush transition effort at the Heritage Foundation) would have disqualified any honest judge, quite aside from political considerations.

I will certainly agree that it was not the Republican's fault that a faulty ballot design was used in Palm Beach County, but it just as certainly was the Jeb Bush administration's fault that minority areas had disproportionately inadequate voting equipment, that minority voters were falsely purged from the rolls on the grounds that they "might be felons" as determined by a consulting firm with close ties to the national Republican organization, and that minority precincts were not given the means to verify voters names when they did not appear on the voter lists provided by the Florida Secretary of State, Mr. Bush's campaign chairman.

As Kevin Philips pointed out this morning, you have to be incredibly cynical or ignorant to claim that Bush's margin of victory in Jacksonville makes any logical sense except through the massive disenfranchisement of minority voters.

Herb London, a professor at NYU and former Conservative Party candidate for Governor of New York, commented today that Bush's tainted victory may very well mean that he could be the last Republican President in our lifetimes, as "minorities" become the majority of the U.S. population and will always remember the Republicans as the party that tried to disenfranchise them, both at the polls and through the Census.

The fact remains that Bush's victory may be legal but will never be accepted as legitimate by any except his most partisan supporters.

I am not an academic, but as Tom Paine stated a couple of centuries ago, the first duty of a citizen is to fight injustice. So count me a citizen first.

Jan Werner

Bill Thompson wrote:
> It's nice to know that we are academics first and citizens second.
> It's not the Republicans' fault that a faulty ballot design was used (and has been used for many years). It's not Republicans' fault that people were confused by the ballot and voted twice. (I'm still not sure how we can gauge intent of another person when we weren't in the booth with them).
> It's not Bush's fault that we have a conservative tilt to the court.
> And, it's not Bush's fault that a worn-out Jesse Jackson wasn't able to inflame the country enough to overturn the election for Al Gore.
While political gamesmanship will most certainly continue at an increased pace in the next term, an outgoing Administration should not have as its legacy (and we all know Clinton is worried about his legacy) a civil rights battle that they will not take part in. One should not start a war they cannot finish in the name of party loyalty.

If Bush does indeed become President, perhaps he (or even Clinton now?) can create a commission, with Al Gore or some other prominent Democrats as a part of it, to come up with recommendations for more uniform election standards and guidelines and recommendations for eliminating punch ballots. I think this would be a much more beneficial thing to do than to send the "disenfranchised" out into the streets.

And as for comments about the U.S. Supreme Court playing politics, it was the FL Supreme Court which initiated the delays. Recall that four of the 7 FL justices have made significant monetary contributions to Gore's campaign. Let's face it, when the FL Chief Justice dissents there obviously is something fishy going on in FL.

This whole disaster will be debated for years to come, but we should all begin to think about this as Americans, not Crusaders. No one is totally happy with this election, but our system has survived and though imperfect, has rendered a decision. If you want to change the system, that's fine, but let's not assassinate the actors involved since there are as many bad apples on the liberal side as there are on the conservative side.

If Bush and the Republicans can't unite the country or accomplish things, then they will deserve to lose the next election. What comments like the last few make me wonder is, how many of you will be willing to give Bush credit if he can unite the country and the Congress can accomplish things...and the fact that I need to ask that of such a distinguished group is disappointing.

Bill Thompson
Senior Account Manager
If what Al says is true then a) why certify Bush and b) why stop with Florida's election. Others would be in doubt, as well. 

Hats off to Jan Werner and Alan Barton for cogent analyses.

At 12:09 PM 12/13/00 -0500, you wrote:
>I read the Supremes differently. By 9 to 0, they concluded that many
>Florida voting laws, systems and counts were defective and no candidate
>could be certified as the winner.
>">"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:
>">
> "Dear AAPOR'ers:
> ">
> "There are no implications to follow, except putting Bush in office.
> "As the note from my friend Gurian and the response by Sale below
> "indicates. This has nothing to do with general standards.
> ">
> "Read them and weep!
> ">
> "Andy Beveridge
> ">
> "Sale's response:
> ">
> "As one of you so eloquently described months ago as to what this
> "campaign was really about and now has been so aptly and
> "quintessentially
> "demonstrated: " It's the Supreme Court, stupid!"
> ">
> "Gurian's Letter
> ">
> "Subject: Equal Protection for This Case Only
> ">
> "To The Editor:
> ">
> "The most extraordinary sentence in an extraordinary bare-majority
> decision

---0__=ivLamt693ze8xKvnP9jPpFiWtNKJ4haiCn6jrrr1yrpIi3ldxIU3Kpwk--
reads, "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities" (Text of Decision, December 13th). In other words, the majority recognizes that an even-handed application of its purported concern about equal protection would invalidate a wide range of election procedures throughout the country. Hence, the majority is obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only."

Craig Gurian
December 13, 2000

Note: I am a civil rights lawyer practicing in New York City.

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

-----------------------------
Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 17:30:55 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBEIEECOA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
   charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <3A377C91.6384.517A672@localhost>

I'm sure most people, except maybe the most partisan Democrats, would want the military ballots to be counted if the intent of the voter could be determined--and they were counted. I have the impression that most people are just glad the election is over and can't stand the fighting, even if they're not sure if it was fair or not (what does that say?). Only half of the country even bothered to vote. And many people before the election--especially younger ones--were of the opinion that regardless of who won, the outcome would be the same. Partisans "know" that is not true, but many people seem to have a hard time telling the difference between Democrat and Republican leaders once they're in power. Had Gore won,
I'm afraid we would probably have seen some violence by the far right (not mainstream Republicans) that is bunkeried down with their Constitutionally protected firearms, waiting for the showdown with the forces of "the one world government." And the word "theft" would have been thrown around a lot by some Congressional leaders—they may have needed to put barricades between the White House and the Congress. The left will be out to protest over the next few months, as an article in today's Wash. Times describes (D.C. police prepare for protests at inauguration, http://www.washtimes.com/metro/default-2000121322282.htm). Republicans would have done the same had Gore won. But I don't expect to see violence—frustration and anger, yes. In any case, U.S. security/secret police have been monitoring the situation for some time (for better or worse). It really is time for the elders and wise women to emerge, whomever they are. Mark

---

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 14:30:47 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Richard Rands <rrands@cfmc.com>
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
In-Reply-To: <3A377C91.6384.517A672@localhost>
References: <a7.9f6a512.27693b5a@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

> The time for arguing about this result is over. For better or worse
> George Bush is the next president of the United States. It's time
> to calm down now and start thinking about what comes next.

After reading the message from Jim's friend, and then reading this comment that essentially says to these people, shut up and accept the injustices yet again, it seems to me that we have learned absolutely nothing in the last 40 years of the civil rights movement. It is sort of like telling voters the equivalent of never mind that three little girls were murdered in the Birmingham Church bombing, just drop it and get on with your life!

Personally I will never again be able to volunteer for a get-out-the-vote campaign because I couldn't look someone in the eye and say their vote makes a difference.

Richard Rands

---

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 17:35:16 -0500 (EST)
From: Andrew Beveridge <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Implications to follow
In-Reply-To: <3A37AD61.3080AF05@american.edu>
> I read the Supremes differently. By 9 to 0, they concluded that many
> Florida voting laws, systems and counts were defective and no
> candidate could be certified as the winner.
>
> But they did not withdraw certification and throw the election out. They let
the defective result stand.

Bush Won:  5 to 4.

========================================================================
Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 17:32:49 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
In-Reply-To: <a7.9f6a512.27693b5a@aol.com>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit
X-MIME-Autoconverted: from quoted-printable to 8bit by usc.edu id OAA11883

Ray,
Is this "just a thought" or another partisan gibe pretending to be just a
thought? Just thought I'd ask. My feeling is that the whole process is
argued by partisans. Who is representing the public in all the proceedings?
warren

At 03:51 PM 12/13/00 -0500, you wrote:

>It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing
>about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO
>ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING
>about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and
>rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members
(acting on
>instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These
>ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably
>yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for
>Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the
>progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been
decided in favor of
>Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the
>Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these
>votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of
>minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to
>say about this.
>
>One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one
little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was
Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to
scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a
thought . . . .

Ray Funkhouser

ELECTION 2000, Day 36
Appeals court upholds military ballots
Federal panel says 2,400 absentee votes must be counted

By Jon E. Dougherty
© 2000 WorldNetDaily.com

A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400
absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown
out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day. A three-judge
panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with
U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last
week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be
consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the
workings of the state's absentee laws. The case was brought initially
as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes
for George W. Bush from being tallied. "While Florida law seems to
favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of
thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed
forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders
-- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by
Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote. The court
rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters who argued
that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S. Constitution --
require that votes be received by the close of polling stations on
Election Day. "The decision seems inconsistent with the enacted laws of
Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based lawyer for the
plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely.

On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey
ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some
absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections
officials.

In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee
ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been thrown
out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a date or
a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by registered
voters.

According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been
discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled that
federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no formal
request for a write-in ballot.

"It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United States
is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of the
several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It is
even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed forces
serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."

Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to
determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had been
discharged:
· Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the elections
supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.
· Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarded any
federal write-in ballots.
· Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, 14 of
which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a
spokeswoman for the county elections board.
· Officials in Miami-Dade County did not return calls. Seminole County
officials said elections personnel were in meetings throughout the day but
would return calls; they failed to do so.

The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal write-in
ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush because
military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidates.
However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic lawyer
Mark Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject military
ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could receive
by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.

Related stories:
Military missing absentee ballots
Military anguishes over missing ballots
Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell busting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.
What comes next is dissent - loud, clear and prolonged, until all the perpetrators of this sham are out of office. The time for dissent has just begun.

At 01:41 PM 12/13/00 -0800, you wrote:
>No doubt if the shoe were on the other foot, that is if the US Supremes
>had upheld the FL Supremes, there would be loud chest beating about how
>the election had been stolen by those criminals in the Whitehouse and
>how an acute injustice had been done. The right wing talk radio shows
>would be calling for revolution. It would be a pathetic and
>frightening display.
>
The time for arguing about this result is over. For better or worse
>George Bush is the next president of the United States. It's time to
>calm down now and start thinking about what comes next.
>
>It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing
>about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO
>ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING
>about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and
>rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members
>(acting on
>instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer).
>These
>ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably
>yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for
>Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the
>progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been
decided in favor of
>Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the
>Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these
>votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of
>minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to
>say about this.
One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a thought . . .

Ray Funkhouser

=================================================================================================

******

ELECTION 2000, Day 36

Appeals court upholds military ballots

Federal panel says 2,400 absentee votes must be counted

By Jon E. Dougherty

© 2000 WorldNetDaily.com

A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400 absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day. A three-judge panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the workings of the state's absentee laws. The case was brought initially as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes for George W. Bush from being tallied. "While Florida law seems to favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders -- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote. The court rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters who argued that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S. Constitution -- require that votes be received by the close of polling stations on Election Day. "The decision seems inconsistent with the enacted laws of Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based lawyer for the plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely.

On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey Collier ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections officials. In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been thrown out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a date or a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by registered voters. According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled that federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no formal
request for a write-in ballot.

"It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United States is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of the several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It is even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed forces serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."

Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had been discarded:

· Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the elections supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.

· Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarded any federal write-in ballots.

· Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, 14 of which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a spokeswoman for the county elections board.

Officials in Miami-Dade County did not return calls. Seminole County officials said elections personnel were in meetings throughout the day but would return calls; they failed to do so.

The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal write-in ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush because military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidates.

However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic lawyer Mark Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject military ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could receive by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.

Related stories:

Military missing absentee ballots
Military anguish over missing ballots
Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell busting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.
It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been decided in favor of Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the
Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to say about this.

A recent analysis was that of the rejected overseas ballots, the number one reason for rejection was that the presumptive voter did not register to vote, and for number two that had not applied for a ballot.

Another thing you should know that in Florida people who register a car or virtually anything can be a Fla resident without having a domicile. So why they should get better treatment than others is beyond me.

I think that lawful ballots absentee or not should be counted. Until the Supreme Court acted, the uncounted ballots were legal!

Andy Beveridge

As a former 60s radical, I'll bet what comes next is Christmas.

Date sent: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 17:45:03 -0500
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters

What comes next is dissent - loud, clear and prolonged, until all the perpetrators of this sham are out of office. The time for dissent has just begun.

At 01:41 PM 12/13/00 -0800, you wrote:
>No doubt if the shoe were on the other foot, that is if the US Supremes had upheld the FL Supremes, there would be loud chest beating about how the election had been stolen by those criminals in the Whitehouse and how an acute injustice had been done. The right wing talk radio shows would be calling for revolution. It would be a pathetic and frightening display.
>
The time for arguing about this result is over. For better or worse, George Bush is the next president of the United States. It's time to calm down now and start thinking about what comes next.

Date sent: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 15:51:38 EST
Send reply to: aaapornet@usc.edu
From: RFunk787@aol.com
To: aaapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters

It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore. FYI, below is an item from WorldNetDaily (12/12/00) on the progress of Federal suits regarding these ballots, which so far have been decided in favor of Bush. I must say, for an outfit that wants "every vote counted", the Democrats have devoted remarkable energy in trying to ensure that these votes would not be. As many armed forces personnel are members of minority groups, one might think Jesse Jackson would have something to say about this.

One must wonder -- how would this discussion on AAPORNET be going, if one little thing were different. Suppose, rather than Al Gore, Jr (Dem), it was Richard M Nixon (Rep) that was using every legalistic dodge available to scrounge votes with the aim of overturning a certified election? Just a thought . . .

Ray Funkhouser

ELECTION 2000, Day 36
Appeals court upholds military ballots
Federal panel says 2,400 absentee votes must be counted

By Jon E. Dougherty
© 2000 WorldNetDaily.com

A federal appeals court has upheld a lower court ruling that said 2,400 absentee ballots -- most from military personnel -- could not be thrown out in Florida because they arrived after Election Day. A three-judge
A panel of the 11th U.S. District Court of Appeals in Atlanta agreed with U.S. District Judge Maurice Paul in Gainesville, Fla., who ruled last week that the ballots must be counted because to do so would be consistent with the Florida Supreme Court's earlier comments about the workings of the state's absentee laws. The case was brought initially as a lawsuit by Democratic voters as a way to prevent additional votes for George W. Bush from being tallied. "While Florida law seems to favor counting ballots, this change would take away the votes of thousands of Florida citizens -- including members of America's armed forces on duty outside of the country pursuant to the nation's orders -- who, to cast their ballots, just did what they were told by Florida's election officials," the appeals court wrote. The court rejected claims made by lawyers for the Democratic voters who argued that federal and state law -- as well as the U.S. Constitution -- require that votes be received by the close of polling stations on Election Day. "The decision seems inconsistent with the enacted laws of Florida," said Roger Bernstein, a New York-based lawyer for the plaintiffs, who said a further appeal was likely.

On Friday, in a separate military-ballot case, U.S. District Judge Lacey Collier ordered the canvassing boards in Florida counties to accept some absentee ballots that had been rejected previously by local elections officials.

In that case, also brought by Democratic voters, 1,547 overseas absentee ballots -- about 40 percent of the total Florida received -- had been thrown out by county elections workers, mostly because they lacked either a date or a signature, or in some cases because they were not filed by registered voters.

According to the order, Collier said the ballots should not have been discarded simply because they had no postmark. Furthermore, he ruled that federal write-in ballots must be accepted, even if there was no formal request for a write-in ballot.

"It is truly an unfortunate circumstance when a citizen of the United States is denied the fundamental right to vote, whether residing in one of the several states or residing overseas," Collier wrote in his ruling. "It is even more unfortunate when a vote cast by a member of the armed forces serving abroad is rejected for no legitimate or compelling reason."

Yesterday, WorldNetDaily contacted a sampling of Florida counties to determine how many absentee ballots and federal write-in ballots had been discarded:

- Palm Beach County -- A canvassing board spokesman said the elections supervisor was out until next week and could not provide any figures.
- Broward County -- Canvassing officials said they had not discarded any federal write-in ballots.
- Leon County -- Officials discarded 51 military absentee ballots, 14 of which were federal write-in ballots, according to Lynn Priestly, a spokeswoman for the county elections board.

Officials in Miami-Dade County did not return calls. Seminole County officials said elections personnel were in meetings throughout the day but would return calls; they failed to do so.

The pair of federal court rulings regarding military and federal write-in ballots, analysts say, are a boost to the campaign of George W. Bush because military personnel traditionally tend to support Republican candidates.

However, beginning with a five-page memo circulated by Democratic lawyer Mark Herron in November advising county canvassing boards how to reject military ballots, Democrats have sought to blunt the potential gain Bush could receive
by challenging the validity of the ballots in the courts.

Related stories:
Military missing absentee ballots
Military anguishes over missing ballots
Mystery, intrigue surround military ballots
Lawsuit over missing military absentee ballots
Democrats now support counting military votes
Bacon denies WND military-ballot report
Will Congress probe military-ballot snafu?
Defense reviews military ballots
'Hell busting loose' over ballot denial
Lawmaker: Navy ballots 'likely' arrived too late
Judge to hear military-ballot case today
Tarawa sailor disputes Navy ballot count
Pentagon training de-emphasizes postmarks

Jon E. Dougherty is a staff reporter for WorldNetDaily.
When everything hit the fan the Wednesday after the election, my Theories of Social Psychology class was all for "let's move on and get the country going."

My response was remembering that I felt the same way after Gerald Ford pardoned Richard Nixon in 1974 when I was [comparatively] young and carefree. (And, yes, there are members of this list who knew me with another name and another life back in those days.)

But that was before I compiled General Social Survey data on "the crisis of confidence" from 1972 to 1998.

Go to:

http://syp5105-01.su00.fsu.edu/Ethster1.htm#TrendsGeneralMalaise

and scroll down "about one page" to Table C, "Percent of Americans stating that they have "a great deal of confidence" in the following institutions:"

Now I know that one always has to be careful about interpreting time series and a lot happened between 1972 and 1975 (including the oil embargo and the beginning of "stagflation").

Nevertheless there is a drop in confidence for many institutions during the mid-1970s that never recovers (except for the "FSU Football game AND WE WON" euphoria of the Persian Gulf in 1991). One of the few institutions to hold steady over this time period is the U.S. Supreme Court. I suspect it will no longer be immune to this malaise.
Too bad the year 2000 GSS has already been put to bed and the next one isn't until 2002.

Tom, under the circumstances, can't you speed up the process?!

Susan
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm
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===============================================================
Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 16:52:04 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
In-Reply-To: <3A37A46C.3265.5B35E69@localhost>
References: <5.0.2.1.2.20001213174252.02d211d0@pop.mindspring.com>
            <3A377C91.6384.517A672@localhost>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

>As a former 60s radical, I'll bet what comes next is Christmas.

Actually, what comes next is the Winter Solstice. Then the first night of Channukah. THEN Christmas. And then, before we know it, it will be time for the 2002 congressional elections. (Bring 'em on!)

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford University
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 16:58:36 -0800
From: "MJS" <sullivan@fsc-research.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
Message-ID: <3A37AABC.18510.5CC0847@localhost>
In-reply-to: <4.2.0.58.20001213164911.0095bde0@jpearson.pobox.stanford.edu>
References: <3A37A46C.3265.5B35E69@localhost>
X-mailer: Pegasus Mail for Win32 (v3.12c)
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7BIT

Sorry for the insensitive characterization of the season. It's all the same long party from my point of view; and yes!!! bring on the 2002 congressional elections.

Date sent: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 16:52:04 -0800
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters

>As a former 60s radical, I'll bet what comes next is Christmas.

Actually, what comes next is the Winter Solstice. Then the first night of Channukah. THEN Christmas. And then, before we know it, it will be time for the 2002 congressional elections. (Bring 'em on!)

Jerold Pearson, ’75
Director of Market Research
Stanford University
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 20:08:10 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Win98; U)  
X-Accept-Language: en  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters  
References: <a7.9f6a512.27693b5a@aol.com>  
<4.1.20001213141119.00a25400@pop cfmc.com>  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  

Richard Rands wrote:  
> Personally I will never again be able to volunteer for a  
> get-out-the-vote campaign because I couldn't look someone in the eye  
> and say their vote makes a difference.  

That is absolutely the wrong reaction. What this shows is that their vote CAN  
make a difference, and that the way to make sure of  
that is to be better prepared next time so that their votes can't be stolen  
again.  

Jan Werner  

=========================================================================  
Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 20:17:27 -0500  
From: Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>  
Subject: Earl's comment on ballots  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Message-id: <3A381FA7.8D7523D9@rider.edu>  
MIME-version: 1.0  
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.51 [en] C-CCK-MCD {RIDER} (Win98; U)  
Content-type: MULTIPART/ALTERNATIVE;  
BOUNDARY="Boundary_(ID_qzL2VzWIqV805utQDxxAw)"  
X-Accept-Language: en  
References: <a7.9f6a512.27693b5a@aol.com> <3A37E69E.7A57FA57@iupui.edu>  

--Boundary_(ID_qzL2VzWIqV805utQDxxAw)  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  

Earl's logic (below) is impeccable, but don't bet on it happening. After  
all, a census is fundamentally within the realm of  
sampling, but AAPOR's pleas for supplementary sampling to help enumerate  
undercounted groups was largely ignored. No, I fear  
politics, and not expertise or logic, will carry the day here.  

Frank Rusciano  

>  
> Earl Babbie wrote:  
>  
> > Since a ballot is fundamentally a questionnaire, and since the  
> > processing of ballots overlaps with survey technology, it would seem  
> > to me that the members of this list ought to be central to any major
> > overhaul of our national voting procedures.
> >
> > How can we ensure that? Should AAPOR be pro-active?
> >
> > Earl
> >
> --Boundary_(ID_qzL2VzW1qV805utQQDxXAw)
> Content-type: text/html; charset=us-ascii
> Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
> <html>
> <br>Earl's logic (below) is impeccable, but don't bet on it happening. After all, a census is fundamentally within the realm of sampling, but AAPOR's pleas for supplementary sampling to help enumerate undercounted groups was largely ignored. No, I fear politics, and not expertise or logic, will carry the day here. &nbsp;Frank Rusciano &nbsp;Earl Babbie wrote:&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&n
counting the ballots on Governor Bush's legitimacy once in the Oval Office
(never mind legitimizing democracy by counting votes
cast, but uncounted).

I am angry! But, why do I feel so lonely?

Happy Holidays (some irony here),

Sid

=========================================================================

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 21:25:05 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPCFJBPEOMCHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <5.0.2.1.2.20001213173028.02d1acb0@pop.mindspring.com>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf
> Of Warren Mitofsky
> Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 5:33 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters
>
> Ray,
> Is this "just a thought" or another partisan gibe pretending to be
> just a thought? Just thought I'd ask. My feeling is that the whole
> process is argued by partisans. Who is representing the public in all
> the proceedings? warren
>
>From my perspective, the whole point of this exercise was to shut out a
large number of the public, especially those from large, urban, non-white,
non-GOP areas. What happened in Jacksonville harkened back to a different era.

Andy

> 

=========================================================================

Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 21:08:30 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
What I find interesting, is in all the reportage on absentee ballots that were corrected by Republican operatives in two counties (and eventually recognized as legitimate votes by the court), I've never heard how many Democratic votes were possibly discarded because their own party were not given the same access to the ballots to add voter registration numbers etc.

Robert Godfrey

At 3:51 PM -0500 12/13/00, RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
> It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore.

If this was the real Al Gore -- whom we saw tonight with his concession speech -- then I think the Democrats have one more frustration, of gigantic proportions, with this campaign.

If Gore had handled himself this well (I think it was a fantastic speech, and I voted for Bush) during the nationally televised debates, he would have won by a landslide. The differences in affect, demeanor, content -- you name it -- were staggering. He just came across great, in my opinion. But why did we have that overdirected, unbelievably wound, tell-me-how-to-act, How'd I do? person in the three nationally televised debates? Those TV audiences contained exactly the people he needed to win over, and could have, but didn't.

Which one is the real Al Gore?
Are you sure about the chronology? I want a recount! Wait, let's change the calendar they've been using for 2000 years!!!

Happy Holidays everyone!

Jerold Pearson <jpearson@stanford.edu> on 12/13/2000 07:52:04 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Re: Uncounted ballots and disenfranchised voters

>As a former 60s radical, I'll bet what comes next is Christmas.

Actually, what comes next is the Winter Solstice. Then the first night of Channukah. THEN Christmas. And then, before we know it, it will be time for the 2002 congressional elections. (Bring 'em on!)

 Jerold Pearson, '75
 Director of Market Research
 Stanford University
 650-723-9186
 jpearson@stanford.edu
 http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/
An excellent point which goes with the point I made in an earlier e-mail. Gore should have won this election hands down, but couldn't. Sorry, you can blame the Courts all you want, but it is the candidate who is to blame if his message doesn't convince people. I also think Gore gave an excellent speech considering how wooden he usually appears (and I too voted Bush). I think what you saw in the debates, though was the politician, not the person. The guy who does what he thinks he has to do to win, who relies on polls more than people, on talking heads more than his own gut instincts. If Gore the person had been campaigning, this might not have been a close election?

"James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com> on 12/13/2000 11:21:42 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: The Real Al Gore?

If this was the real Al Gore -- whom we saw tonight with his concession speech -- then I think the Democrats have one more frustration, of gigantic proportions, with this campaign.

If Gore had handled himself this well (I think it was a fantastic speech, and I voted for Bush) during the nationally televised debates, he would have won by a landslide. The differences in affect, demeanor, content -- you name it -- were staggering. He just came across great, in my opinion. But why did we have that overdirected, unbelievably wound, tell-me-how-to-act, How'd I do? person in the three nationally televised debates? Those TV audiences contained exactly the people he needed to win over, and could have,
but didn't.

Which one is the real Al Gore?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

---

Robert - The Republican's problems with the absentee ballots began when the vendor they used to print and mail the ballots screwed up and didn't get all the info onto the ballots. Anybody who has ever done a mail survey with a custom printed cover letter knows well the potential for this type of error. The democrats in these counties (1) didn't have the same vendor problems and (2) had voters return their signed ballots to party headquarters. The ballots were then brought by party workers to the county clerks' offices. It's possible that this latter move may be just as illegal as what the republicans did by going to the county offices to fill in the information that was left out of their preprinted ballots.

Robert Godfrey wrote:

> What I find interesting, is in all the reportage on absentee ballots that were corrected by Republican operatives in two counties (and eventually recognized as legitimate votes by the court), I've never heard how many Democratic votes were possibly discarded because their own party were not given the same access to the ballots to add voter registration numbers etc.
>
> Robert Godfrey
At 3:51 PM -0500 12/13/00, RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
> It is interesting to me how, amidst all the lamenting and handwringing about "uncounted ballots" and "disenfranchised voters" in Florida, NO ONE either on AAPORNET or in the mainstream press is saying ANYTHING about the 1000-plus overseas absentee ballots that were contested and rejected on narrow technical grounds, by Democrat election board members (acting on instructions in a five-page memo distributed by a Democratic lawyer). These ballots, mostly from military personnel, if counted would probably yield more votes for Bush than the hand-counting would have yielded for Gore.

--------------FB24F13440FD63A558617084
Content-Type: text/x-vcard; charset=us-ascii; name="efreelan.vcf"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Description: Card for Edward Freeland
Content-Disposition: attachment;
   filename="efreelan.vcf"

begin:vcard
n:Freeland;Edward
tel;fax:609 258-0549
tel;work:609 258-1854
x-mozilla-html:FALSE/org:Princeton University;Survey Research Center
version:2.1
e-mail;internet:efreelan@princeton.edu
title:Associate Director
adr;quoted-printable:;;169 Nassau Street=0D=0A;Princeton;NJ;08542-7007;
x-mozilla-cpt:;-21120
fn:Edward Freeland
end:vcard

--------------FB24F13440FD63A558617084--

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 06:02:21 -0800
From: Earl Babbie <babbie@chapman.edu>
Reply-To: babbie@chapman.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73C-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; U; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Implications to follow
References: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGPFPJBOEOAACHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
<5.0.2.1.2.20001213171849.00a40020@pop.mindspring.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Just out of idle curiosity, how many states that went for Bush have Democratic-controlled state legislatures?

Earl
Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> If what Al says is true then a) why certify Bush and b) why stop with
> Florida's election. Others would be in doubt, as well.
> 
> Hats off to Jan Werner and Alan Barton for cogent analyses. warren
> 
> --
>
> kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie

Earl Babbie                                          Tel: 714-997-6565
babbie@chapman.edu                                   Fax: 714-281-6213
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.

========================================================================= 
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 09:35:40 -0500  
From: "Kay, Ward (NIAAA)" <wkay@mail.nih.gov> 
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Subject: RE: The Real Al Gore?  
MIME-Version: 1.0 
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19) 
Content-Type: text/plain 

The feeling in Washington was that it was a great speech -- but did he have to
preempt The West Wing?

> -----Original Message-----
> From: James P. Murphy [SMTP:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]  
> Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 11:22 PM 
> To: AAPORNET 
> Subject: The Real Al Gore? 
> 
> If this was the real Al Gore -- whom we saw tonight with his
> concession speech -- then I think the Democrats have one more
> frustration, of gigantic proportions, with this campaign.
> 
> If Gore had handled himself this well (I think it was a fantastic
> speech, and I voted for Bush) during the nationally televised debates,
> he would have won by a landslide. The differences in affect,
> demeanor, content -- you name it -- were staggering. He just came
> across great, in my opinion. But
> 
> why did we have that overdirected, unbelievably wound, tell-me-how-to-act,
> How'd I do? person in the three nationally televised debates? Those TV
> audiences contained exactly the people he needed to win over, and could
> have, but didn't.
> 
> Which one is the real Al Gore?
> 
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800 
> Fax (610) 408-8802 


Time was available.

The only significance of the Dec 12 date was that states which filed their slate of electors by that date could not have their slate challenged by Congress. Otherwise, states have until Dec 18 to file their slates.

How important was the Dec 12 date? Apparently not that important because 20 OTHER STATES had not filed their slates as of the evening of Dec 12.

s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu wrote:

> I am still dazed by what the United States Supreme Court did to democracy. In just two days it issued a convoluted (try to follow the logic), ungramatical (e.g., "None are...") hypocritical (which court now makes new law?), stopped the counting of ballots (insisted it could go on if time were available, which isn't and couldn't give the court's stay in the first place), worried about a violation of the U. Constitution (but settled the dispute based on State law), and generally worried about the effect of counting the ballots on Governor Bush's legitimacy once in the Oval Office (never mind legitimizing democracy by counting votes cast, but uncounted).
> I am angry! But, why do I feel so lonely?
> Happy Holidays (some irony here),
> Sid

---

> I am still dazed by what the United States Supreme Court did to democracy. In just two days it issued a convoluted (try to follow the logic), ungramatical (e.g., "None are...") hypocritical (which court now makes new law?), stopped the counting of ballots (insisted it could go on if time were available, which isn't and couldn't give the court's stay in the first place), worried about a violation of the U. Constitution (but settled the dispute based on State law), and generally worried about the effect of counting the ballots on Governor Bush's legitimacy once in the Oval Office (never mind legitimizing democracy by counting votes cast, but uncounted).
> I am angry! But, why do I feel so lonely?
> Happy Holidays (some irony here),
> Sid
Revenge of the Democratic governors?

If the Florida Legislature picks its electors, others states could follow suit -- and give the election to Al Gore.

---

By Dan Conley (salon.com)

Dec. 8, 2000 | In the ever-expanding civics lesson we call the 2000 recount, the Republican-controlled Florida Legislature convenes in special session Friday to begin the process of choosing the state's electors and, Democrats fear, awarding them to Texas Gov. George W. Bush.

State legislatures do have a constitutional right to choose the men and women who cast the actual votes for president. Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution provides for states appointing electors in the manner of their choosing. Prior to 1824, many state legislatures chose presidential electors. But Bush backers pushing for a legislative solution ought to consider carefully before letting this constitutional genie out of the bottle.

The first problem is legal: The same law Bush lawyers cite when claiming the Florida Supreme Court cannot change election laws after the fact and extend the deadline for a manual recount (the "Safe Harbor Law") could also invalidate legislative action if the Legislature chooses electors directly. A number of election-law scholars, such as University of Chicago law professor Elizabeth Garrett, believe the Legislature would be violating federal election law by giving the right of elector selection to the Legislature and not the voters, after the fact.

But even if such action proved legal, it would be unwise politically.

Should the Florida Legislature ignore the ongoing legal challenges and preemptively select Florida's 25 electors, it would remove the only obstacle -- tradition -- that prevents Democrats from taking similar action. If Vice President Al Gore chose to do so, he could play tit-for-tat in five states.

Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Missouri and North Carolina were carried by George W. Bush but have Democratic governors and Democrat-controlled legislatures. Should Bush choose to take the 25 Florida electoral votes through a legislative vote, Democrats in those states would face no legal or political impediment to appointing Gore electors.

Of course, it would be political suicide, both for the vice president and many Democrats, for the Gore campaign to ask those states to overturn the will of the people and award all of their electoral votes to the losing side. But there is a less onerous option: State
> legislatures could decide to award electoral votes on a proportional basis, as is done in Maine and Nebraska.
>
> If these five states awarded an elector for each congressional district carried by Gore, the vice president would pick up an additional 17 electoral votes: five in Georgia; four each in Missouri and North Carolina; and two in Alabama and Mississippi. Combined with his recently certified wins in Oregon and New Mexico, that would give Gore 284 electoral votes, enough to win the election even without Florida.
>
> Republicans would have fewer options to retaliate, since only two states whose electors are pledged to Gore-- Michigan and New Jersey -- are firmly under Republican control. Even if Gov. Bush's team could persuade those two states to award electoral votes proportionally, Bush would gain only 13 additional electors, not enough to deny Gore the presidency.
>
> The Gore team could argue that a proportional allotment of electors in those five states is an appropriate step, given the vice president's victory in the national popular vote and the disputed outcome in Florida. Missouri Democrats, who have already accepted the idea of keeping the polls open in St. Louis and electing a deceased U.S. senator, might be most easily persuaded to breathe new life into the Gore campaign.
>
> Furthermore, the Bush campaign would be on shaky legal ground in challenging the action in those five states while defending what happened in the Florida Legislature. Congressional options also shouldn't give Republicans solace. While it is true that Congress determines which electoral slate to accept in case of a dispute, a tie in the new Senate, with its 50-50 makeup, would be broken by the sitting vice president, Al Gore. With the House voting Republican and accepting the Bush slates, the governor of the state with the disputed electoral slate is charged with determining which is valid.
>
> The current thinking is that Florida Gov. Jeb Bush could eventually decide who becomes our next president. But if Democrats choose to retaliate in the legislatures, similar choices may be up to Democratic governors Bob Holden (Missouri), Don Siegelman (Alabama), Roy Barnes (Georgia), Ronnie Musgrove (Mississippi) and Mike Easley (North Carolina).
>
> A preemptive vote in the Florida Legislature to award 25 electoral votes to George W. Bush before all legal challenges are resolved could make every future presidential election outcome with a margin of less than 1 percent fair game for legislative meddling and partisan state-by-state retaliation.

Earl Babbie wrote:

> Just out of idle curiosity, how many states that went for Bush have Democratic-controlled state legislatures?
>
> Earl
Warren Mitofsky wrote:

If what Al says is true then a) why certify Bush and b) why stop with Florida's election. Others would be in doubt, as well.

Hats off to Jan Werner and Alan Barton for cogent analyses. warren

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/

A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.

--

Monica Wolford mwolford@hers.com
Program on International Policy Attitudes www.pipa.org
A joint program of Center on Policy Attitudes www.policyattitudes.org and the Center for Int'l & Security Studies at U Maryland
1779 Massachusetts Ave NW #510 Washington, DC 20036

See William Glaberson's story in today's NY Times (p. A17) on how David Boies on Nov 20 accepted the Dec 12 "deadline" - apparently to hurry things on with still three weeks to deadline - and got trapped by the Bushies delaying tactics.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Nick Panagakis" <mkshares@mcs.net> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Subject: Re: A lonely feeling

See William Glaberson's story in today's NY Times (p. A17) on how David Boies on Nov 20 accepted the Dec 12 "deadline" - apparently to hurry things on with still three weeks to deadline - and got trapped by the Bushies delaying tactics.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Nick Panagakis" <mkshares@mcs.net> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 3:38 AM 
Subject: Re: A lonely feeling
> Time was available.
> The only significance of the Dec 12 date was that states which filed
> their slate
> of electors by that date could not have their slate challenged by Congress.
> Otherwise, states have until Dec 18 to file their slates.
> How important was the Dec 12 date? Apparently not that important
> because 20 OTHER
> STATES had not filed their slates as of the evening of Dec 12.
> s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu wrote:
> > I am still dazed by what the United States Supreme Court did to democracy. In
> > just two days it issued a convoluted (try to follow the logic), ungramatical
> > (e.g., "None are..."), hypocritical (which court now makes new
> > law?), stopped
> > the counting of ballots (insisted it could go on if time were
> > available, which
> > isn't and couldn't give the court's stay in the first place),
> > worried about a
> > violation of the U. S. Constitution (but settled the dispute based
> > on State
> > law), and generally worried about the effect of counting the
> > ballots on Governor Bush's legitimacy once in the Oval Office (never
> > mind legitimizing
> > democracy by counting votes cast, but uncounted).
> > I am angry! But, why do I feel so lonely?
> > Happy Holidays (some irony here),
> > Sid
>
> It didn't preempt West Wing, not where I live anyway. West Wing was on 1 hour
earlier and Law and Order was preempted. I had to wonder about the choice of which particular West Wing rerun to show. In the
final scene, the whole cast sat on the steps drinking beer and saying "God Bless America". Was this a plug by NBC for us all to get over this election mess and put the country first?

>>> Kay, Ward (NIAAA) <wkay@mail.nih.gov> 12/14/00 08:35am

>>> The feeling in Washington was that it was a great speech -- but did he have to preempt The West Wing?

> -----Original Message-----
> From: James P. Murphy [SMTP:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 11:22 PM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: The Real Al Gore?
> > If this was the real Al Gore -- whom we saw tonight with his concession speech -- then I think the Democrats have one more frustration, of gigantic proportions, with this campaign.
> > If Gore had handled himself this well (I think it was a fantastic speech, and I voted for Bush) during the nationally televised debates, he would have won by a landslide. The differences in affect, demeanor, content -- you name it -- were staggering. He just came across great, in my opinion.
> But why did we have that overdirected, unbelievably wound, tell-me-how-to-act, How'd I do? person in the three nationally televised debates? Those TV audiences contained exactly the people he needed to win over, and could have, but didn't.
> > Which one is the real Al Gore?
> > James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> > Voice (610) 408-8800
> > Fax (610) 408-8802
> > jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

========================================================================
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 10:54:14 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.001213100050.9401-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
I have two contributions -- I hope they will help your friend.

One: If a research assistant were to say when we discovered that a poorly-designed self-administered instrument had produced systematic unreadable replies, "that was 'respondent error,'" I would fire the research assistant. Whether he/she wore a white robe, a black robe or any other sort of uniform.

Second: I do not understand why there has been no comment on the fact that Justice Scalia's son is a law partner of the Mr. Olsen (Olsten?) who pleaded Bush's case before the Supreme Court.

James Beniger wrote:

> The message below comes to me from a distant friend, an American Black woman of modest prominence (which is why I choose not to disclose her name here, even though I have just written to encourage her to share her thoughts and feelings with as many others as she can). I post this here only for what it might contribute to our collective understanding of public opinion, and also because it made me cry.
>
> I guess I am still hurting. Not a sore loser. But the people in white robes used to be the people we feared in the communities of color. Also, the idea of getting people to vote, and to then have the votes not validated, to have the process stopped and then time used as a reason to not do it does not circulate in my thinking as a good strategy. I feel as if we have been taken advantage of, mentally raped, and then violated with words that don't begin to explain any of this to me.
>
> I feel as if we are robbed in a lot of ways. The media thinks we are stupid so they try to tell us how we feel, what we saw, and in spite of all the mistakes they made with polling and information gathering they are still using the information gathering in the same way. This is not good.
>
> If there is still one small victory in this, it is that all the people in the US have no clear idea of what really happened and justice, as we call it in the hood, though I am not of a ghetto mentality, just us, the kind we usually get is being applied to all. You get to get the same raw deal that we usually get, chess board mentality on the solving of problems. That is smoling pot is a youthful indiscretion when a person of means does it, but when a poor person does it, it is a jailable offense with legs.
>
> You expect from the white robes, injustice.
You expect at least some kind of consensus, and leadership that works for us that is not divisive from the Supreme Court.

My protests will not be covered over, my feelings about this will not be wrapped in sugary spin doctoring. I resent this process like I did separate but equal. Neither Al Gore, or the new president will restore my trust in this system. It is broken.

******

Apparantly several justices have a relative working at law firms who are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There is some sort of process (I'm not sure what you call it or how it works) where these relations are officially noted and "cleared" if you will. I don't know if these relatives are banned from actually arguing before the Supreme Court or not, but they are not prohibited from working at these firms, so this really is a non-issue. It may not look nice, but its legal.

Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net> on 12/14/2000 01:54:14 PM

Please respond to ande271@attglobal.net

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

I have two contributions -- I hope they will help your friend.

One: If a research assistant were to say when we discovered that a poorly-designed self-administered instrument had produced systematic unreadable replies, "that was 'respondent error,'" I would fire the research assistant. Whether he/she wore a white robe, a black robe or any other sort of uniform.
Second: I do not understand why there has been no comment on the fact that Justice Scalia's son is a law partner of the Mr. Olsen (Olsten?) who pleaded Bush's case before the Supreme Court.

James Beniger wrote:

> The message below comes to me from a distant friend, an American Black woman of modest prominence (which is why I choose not to disclose her name here, even though I have just written to encourage her to share her thoughts and feelings with as many others as she can). I post this here only for what it might contribute to our collective understanding of public opinion, and also because it made me cry.
>
> --
>
> Jim
>
> ---------- Forwarded message ----------
> Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 11:20:48 EST
>
> I guess I am still hurting. Not a sore loser. But the people in white robes used to be the people we feared in the communities of color. Also, the idea of getting people to vote, and to then have the votes not validated, to have the process stopped and then time used as a reason to not do it does not circulate in my thinking as a good strategy. I feel as if we have been taken advantage of, mentally raped, and then violated with words that don't begin to explain any of this to me.
>
> I feel as if we are robbed in a lot of ways. The media thinks we are stupid so they try to tell us how we feel, what we saw, and in spite of all the mistakes they made with polling and information gathering they are still using the information gathering in the same way. This is not good.
>
> If there is still one small victory in this, it is that all the people in the US have no clear idea of what really happened and justice, as we call it in the hood, though I am not of a ghetto mentality, just us, the kind we usually get is being applied to all. You get to get the same raw deal that we usually get, chess board mentality on the solving of problems. That is smoling pot is a youthful indiscretion when a person of means does it, but when a poor person does it, it is a jailable offense with legs.
>
> You expect from the white robes, injustice.
>
> You expect at least some kind of consensus, and leadership that works for us that is not divisive from the Supreme Court.
>
> My protests will not be covered over, my feelings about this will not be wrapped in sugary spin doctoring. I resent this process like I did separate but equal. Neither Al Gore, or the new president will restore my trust in this system. It is broken.
>
> **

******
Harvard School of Public Health
Department of Health Policy and Management

Assistant or Associate Professor in health policy survey research

The Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health, is seeking to recruit an assistant or associate professor specializing in the conduct of survey research on health policy issues. Candidates should possess a broad knowledge of the use of survey methodologies. Ideally the candidate would be equipped to develop indicators that could assess patients' experience with the health care system including outcomes, satisfaction and indicators of quality, public and health professional policy preferences and perceptions, and experience related to current and emerging health policy issues. Relevant research includes the review, design, conduct, and quantitative analysis of surveys and polls on access to health, studies of the impact of health services innovations in organization and/or finance, and views of major health policy debates. Candidates should have demonstrated experience and skills to play a central role in the research and teaching program in the Department.

Candidates should hold a doctoral degree in health policy, sociology, social psychology, political science, survey research, or other closely related social science discipline. Other qualifications include the demonstrated capacity to manage national and international survey projects, to collaborate with professionals in other disciplines, and to teach health policy survey methods at the graduate level.

Please send a letter of application and the names of three references to:
Harvard School of Public Health
Department of Health Policy and Management
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115

Harvard University is committed to increasing representation of women and minority members among its faculty and particularly encourages applications from such candidates. EOE --

Assistant or Associate Professor in health policy survey research

The Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health, is seeking to recruit an assistant or associate professor specializing in the conduct of survey research on health policy issues. Candidates should possess a broad knowledge of the use of survey methodologies. Ideally the candidate would be equipped to develop indicators that could assess patients’ experience with the health care system including outcomes, satisfaction and indicators of quality, public and health professional policy preferences and perceptions, and experience related to current and emerging health policy issues. Relevant research includes the review, design, conduct, and quantitative analysis of surveys and polls on access to health, studies of the impact of health services innovations in organization and/or finance, and views of major health policy debates. Candidates should have demonstrated experience and skills to play a central role in the research and teaching program in the Department. Candidates should hold a doctoral degree in health policy, sociology, social psychology, political science, survey research, or other closely related social science discipline. Other qualifications include the demonstrated capacity to manage national and international survey projects, to collaborate with professionals in other disciplines, and to teach health policy survey methods at the graduate level. Please send a letter of application and the names of three references to:

Chair, Search Committee/Health Policy Survey Research
Department of Health Policy and Management
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
of Health Policy and Management<br>Harvard School of Public Health<br>677 Huntington Avenue<br>Boston, MA 02115<br><br>Harvard University is committed to increasing representation of women and minority members among its faculty and particularly encourages applications from such candidates. EOE</b></html>-----Original Message-----
From: Bill Thompson [SMTP:bthompson@directionsrsch.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 10:55 AM
To: ande271@attglobal.net
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

Apparantly several justices have a relative working at law firms who are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There is some sort of process (I'm
I have two contributions -- I hope they will help your friend.

One: If a research assistant were to say when we discovered that a poorly-designed self-administered instrument had produced systematic unreadable replies, "that was 'respondent error,'" I would fire the research assistant. Whether he/she wore a white robe, a black robe or any other sort of uniform.

Second: I do not understand why there has been no comment on the fact that Justice Scalia's son is a law partner of the Mr. Olsen (Olsten?) who pleaded Bush's case before the Supreme Court.

James Beniger wrote:

-- The message below comes to me from a distant friend, an American Black woman of modest prominence (which is why I choose not to disclose her name here, even though I have just written to encourage her to share her thoughts and feelings with as many others as she can). I post this here only for what it might contribute to our collective understanding of public opinion, and also because it made me cry.

Jim

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Wed, 13 Dec 2000 11:20:48 EST

I guess I am still hurting. Not a sore loser. But the people in white robes used to be the people we feared in the communities of
color.
Also,
the idea of getting people to vote, and to then have the votes not validated, to have the process stopped and then time used as a reason to not do it does not circulate in my thinking as a good strategy. I feel as if we have been taken advantage of, mentally raped, and then violated with words that don't begin to explain any of this to me.
I feel as if we are robbed in a lot of ways. The media thinks we are stupid so they try to tell us how we feel, what we saw, and in spite of all the mistakes they made with polling and information gathering they are still using the information gathering in the same way. This is not good.
If there is still one small victory in this, it is that all the people in the US have no clear idea of what really happened and justice, as we call it in the hood, though I am not of a ghetto mentality, just us, the kind we usually get is being applied to all. You get to get the same raw deal that we usually get, chess board mentality on the solving of problems. That is smoling pot is a youthful indiscretion when a person of means does it, but when a poor person does it, it is a jailable offense with legs.
You expect from the white robes, injustice.
You expect at least some kind of consensus, and leadership that works for us that is not divisive from the Supreme Court.
My protests will not be covered over, my feelings about this will not be wrapped in sugary spin doctoring. I resent this process like I did separate but equal. Neither Al Gore, or the new president will restore my trust in this system. It is broken.

*******
Apparently several justices have a relative working at law firms who are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There is some sort of process (I'm not sure what you call it or how it works) where these relations are officially noted and "cleared" if you will. I don't know if these relatives are banned from actually arguing before the Supreme Court or not, but they are not prohibited from working at these firms, so this really is a non-issue. It may not look nice, but it's legal.

The fact the Justice Scalia's son is a partner with Ted Olson (the chief Bush lawyer) is actually an inherent conflict, since Scalia's sons livelihood could be affected by Olson's performance. That the other son was hired (an associate by Barry Richard, the Bush Fla lawyer) is somewhat less troubling, since he does not have the same relationship to Richard (he is an employee) as does the other son to Olson.

The fact that Clarence Thomas's wife is actually being paid by and through the Heritage Foundation to sift through potential appointees to the new Bush administration is also a conflict.

In the past, Justices would issue statements about why such conflicts were not relevant (Rehnquist did this regarding his son, who was working for Microsoft's lawyer), but apparently Scalia and Thomas don't think such statements are needed.

Andy Beveridge
According to my quick count,

Alabama
Arkansas
Georgia
Louisiana
Mississippi
North Carolina
New Mexico
Oklahoma
Tennessee or
West Virginia

could have done for Gore what Florida did for Bush.
(Bush won the popular vote; Democrats control
the state legislatures.)

Just another indicator of how tenuous our electoral system really is--unlike
what I was led to believe in 8th grade.

Earl

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie                            Tel: 714-997-6565
babbie@chapman.edu                     Fax: 714-281-6213
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
  A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.
the first quarter had a much more dramatic effect on
the score and the eventual outcome.

Not to minimize the tally hassle in Tallahassee, but what was it about this
contest that made it so tight? What were the turning
points in public opinion earlier in the game that could have made one
candidate or the other gain a greater advantage?

James suggests the debates. What else?

-----Original Message-----
From: James P. Murphy [mailto:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 10:22 PM
To: AAPORNET
Subject: The Real Al Gore?

If this was the real Al Gore -- whom we saw tonight with his concession
speech
-- then I think the Democrats have one more
frustration, of gigantic proportions, with this campaign.

If Gore had handled himself this well (I think it was a fantastic speech, and
I voted for Bush) during the nationally televised
debates, he would have won by a landslide. The differences in affect,
demeanor, content -- you name it -- were staggering. He just
came across great, in my opinion. But why did we have that overdirected,
unbelievably wound, tell-me-how-to-act, How'd I do? person
in the three nationally televised debates? Those TV audiences contained
exactly the people he needed to win over, and could have,
but didn't.

Which one is the real Al Gore?

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

===============================

Perhaps I misunderstand you, but are you saying that if Bush (Olsen) lost,
Scalia's son would be out of a job because his boss would
not get any more work? That is unlikely to happen. If anything, Olsen gets a
name recognition boost and gets more work because of
the exposure. One does not necessarily have to win to gain popularity. You
just have to put up the "good fight".
OJ Simpson's prosecutors are doing better now than they were as prosecutors even though they lost what was supposed to be an open and shut case.

"Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> on 12/14/2000 11:09:17 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu> (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)
Subject: RE: A Message from a Friend

> > >
> >
> > Apparently several justices have a relative working at law firms who are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There is some sort of process (I'm not sure what you call it or how it works) where these relations are officially noted and "cleared" if you will. I don't know if these relatives are banned from actually arguing before the Supreme Court or not, but they are not prohibited from working at these firms, so this really is a non-issue. It may not look nice, but it's legal.

The fact the Justice Scalia's son is a partner with Ted Olson (the chief Bush lawyer) is actually an inherent conflict, since Scalia's son's livelihood could be affected by Olson's performance. That the other son was hired (an associate by Barry Richard, the Bush Fla lawyer) is somewhat less troubling, since he does not have the same relationship to Richard (he is an employee) as does the other son to Olson.

The fact that Clarence Thomas's wife is actually being paid by and through the Heritage Foundation to sift through potential appointees to the new Bush administration is also a conflict.

In the past, Justices would issue statements about why such conflicts were not relevant (Rehnquist did this regarding his son, who was working for Microsoft's lawyer), but apparently Scalia and Thomas don't think such statements are needed.

Andy Beveridge
Al Gore gave the keynote speech at the 1996 American Association for the Advancement of Science meetings. Now, no surprise that this was a natural constituency for him, but I thought he was terrific. He was poised, articulate, and a visionary.

I voted for Al Gore this time around, and I think it was apparent last night who has acted the most presidential the past month.


Susan
Susan Carol Losh, PhD.
slosh@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

visit the site at:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~slosh/Index.htm

The Department of Educational Research
307L Stone Building
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4453

850-644-8778 (Voice Mail available)
Educational Research Office 850-644-4592
FAX 850-644-8776
But winning the popular vote wasn't the issue. Irregularities were the issue. The Democratic controlled legislatures would have been hard pressed to explain their actions if there were no claims of large scale irregularities. In other words, you can't (shouldn't) just vote to change the results out of thin air.

In FL, The Republicans would have had at least the potential of political cover by saying there were irregularities made evident and even more irregularities in the proposed remedies, and they acted for the "good of the state" so its electors would be counted. Now getting people to buy that is another story...

Earl Babbie <babbie@chapman.edu> on 12/14/2000 11:22:42 AM

Please respond to babbie@chapman.edu

To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Civics the Hard Way

According to my quick count,

    Alabama
    Arkansas
    Georgia
    Louisiana
    Mississippi
    North Carolina
    New Mexico
    Oklahoma
    Tennessee or
    West Virginia

could have done for Gore what Florida did for Bush.
(Bush won the popular vote; Democrats control the state legislatures.)

Just another indicator of how tenuous our electoral system really is--unlike what I was led to believe in 8th grade.

Earl

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
A day without cancer is like. . .a day without cancer.

========================================================================
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 12:39:59 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: A lonely feeling
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIBMEEOCOAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
In-Reply-To: <006501c065e2$f6bd76c0$05a0f7a5@default>

That lonely feeling. Come to the District of Columbia... many here also have that lonely... powerless... feeling. D.C. is a community with a lot of social liberals and majority African-American, and 80% voted for Gore-boy, are they in trouble now! D.C. has no safeguards to protect itself against Congress (they can yell and whine I guess), and has relied heavily on the President to back Congress off (veto threat) from passing pet projects (vouchers, death penalty, killing local gun control laws, spending money on the marina, whatever) or from overriding local decisions and budgetary priorities. Even with Clinton at the helm, D.C.'s domestic partnership laws and many others were "traded" and overridden in deals between the two branches. President-elect Bush will become D.C.'s de facto "Governor"-he will appoint D.C.'s court judges and sign off on D.C.'s local budget after Congress changes it around (80% is from local taxpayers). Unlike Robert Dole, Howard Baker, and
Richard Nixon, George W. has made it clear he opposes D.C. voting rights in Congress, even if residents pay full federal taxes, too.

D.C. is trying to get back the mostly symbolic vote the delegate had for a couple years in the 1990s in the Committee of the Whole of the House (http://www.giveitback.org). Good luck.

So, that's D.C.'s sob story. Elected officials come and go, and D.C. deals with it-sometimes by fighting or giving in to reckless abandon (everyone remembers Marion Barry—he started out a fighter and eventually gave in to abandon), and sometimes by trying to prove they're worthy of equal rights and even republican forms of self-government (as current Mayor Williams is trying to show).

But whatever the case, D.C. residents know who has the power—and it is not their elected officials who must grovel before 8 Congressional committees and the President. Whine, whine. Democracy hasn't existed in D.C. since 1801 when Congress assumed control, so many here sympathize with those who feel disenfranchised and nobody cares. (And, I know: some D.C. residents don't care and like it this way, and the others can sell their homes and move.) On the bright side, I'm sure Bush will do some good things for the country, some friends will probably get interesting jobs in his Admin, his wife will make a cute first lady, the stock market may improve, and just maybe he'll even be restrained in his actions toward D.C. We'll see. On with the holidays! mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Allen Barton
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 10:32 AM
To: mkshares@mcs.net; aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A lonely feeling

See William Glaberson's story in today's NY Times (p. A17) on how David Boies on Nov 20 accepted the Dec 12 "deadline"—apparently to hurry things on with still three weeks to deadline—and got trapped by the Bushies delaying tactics.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Nick Panagakis" <mkshares@mcs.net>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 3:38 AM
Subject: Re: A lonely feeling

> Time was available.
> The only significance of the Dec 12 date was that states which filed their slate of electors by that date could not have their slate challenged by Congress.
> Otherwise, states have until Dec 18 to file their slates.
>
How important was the Dec 12 date? Apparently not that important because 20 OTHER STATES had not filed their slates as of the evening of Dec 12.

s.kraus@NotesMail1.csuohio.edu wrote:

> I am still dazed by what the United States Supreme Court did to democracy. In just two days it issued a convoluted (try to follow the logic), ungramatical (e.g., "None are..."), hypocritical (which court now makes new law?), stopped the counting of ballots (insisted it could go on if time were available, which isn't and couldn't give the court's stay in the first place), worried about a violation of the U. S. Constitution (but settled the dispute based on State law), and generally worried about the effect of counting the ballots on Governor Bush's legitimacy once in the Oval Office (never mind legitimizing democracy by counting votes cast, but uncounted).

> I am angry! But, why do I feel so lonely?

> Happy Holidays (some irony here),

> Sid

====================================================================
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 12:49:06 -0500 (EST)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: preempting West Wing
In-Reply-To: <sa38951d.037@SRL.UIC.EDU>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0012141247390.25016-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Actually West Wing was preempted. They were scheduled to show an original episode but opted for a rerun an hour earlier instead. The new show will be broadcast next week Bruce Altschuler SUNY Oswego

On Thu, 14 Dec 2000, Linda Owens wrote:

> It didn't preempt West Wing, not where I live anyway. West Wing was on 1 hour earlier and Law and Order was preempted. I had to wonder about the choice of which particular West Wing rerun to show. In the final scene, the whole cast sat on the steps drinking beer and saying
"God Bless America". Was this a plug by NBC for us all to get over this election mess and put the country first?

>>> Kay, Ward (NIAAA) <wkay@mail.nih.gov> 12/14/00 08:35am

The feeling in Washington was that it was a great speech -- but did he have to preempt The West Wing?

> -----Original Message-----
> From: James P. Murphy [SMTP:jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com]
> Sent: Wednesday, December 13, 2000 11:22 PM
> To: AAPORNET
> Subject: The Real Al Gore?
> If this was the real Al Gore -- whom we saw tonight with his concession speech -- then I think the Democrats have one more frustration, of gigantic proportions, with this campaign.
> If Gore had handled himself this well (I think it was a fantastic speech, and I voted for Bush) during the nationally televised debates, he would have won by a landslide. The differences in affect, demeanor, content -- you name it -- were staggering. He just came across great, in my opinion.
> But why did we have that overdirected, unbelievably wound, tell-me-how-to-act, How'd I do? person in the three nationally televised debates? Those TV audiences contained exactly the people he needed to win over, and could have, but didn't.
> Which one is the real Al Gore?
> James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
> Voice (610) 408-8800
> Fax (610) 408-8802
> jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
> 

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 09:49:30 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012140845350.21857-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
I intend no criticism whatsoever of Bill Thompson, whose message here I find both usefully informative and well reflective of our own culture in the broadest sense. I do myself cherish those very same values.

That said, I cannot pass by Bill's message without alerting all those who might teach courses in political theory or related subjects that there's likely a good lecture or several good seminar discussions in just Bill's eight closing words:

    It may not look nice, but it's legal.

One theoretical concept that these words might inform, for example, is sometimes translated from the German as "false consciousness."

In any case, to break the ice for classroom considerations of the much larger topic, teachers might wish to begin with structural grammatical assaults on its logic, as in:

    It may not look legal, but it's nice.

This takes us directly back to the origin of our species, wouldn't we be forced to agree? And, in keeping with the spirit of the holidays, it in turn might become:

    It may not be legal, but it's nice.

This, however, forces us to confront the darker side of much the same point:

    It may not be nice, but it's legal.

By this point, certainly, we confront questions of the relationships among a culture's values, ethics and morality, on the one hand, and its laws and legal system on the other. Certainly I hope that many would hold that these two conceptual systems ought to be related to one another—if not also to hold that legal systems exist only and entirely to serve the culture's values, in the most general and universal sense.

This would pretty much at least neutralize—if not defeat—Bill's original eight-word expression, or so at least it now seems to me. I of course welcome your comments, whether constructive or, as it were, deconstructive.

-- Jim

******

-------- Forwarded message --------
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 10:55:12 -0500
From: Bill Thompson <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: ane271@attglobal.net
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

Apparantly several justices have a relative working at law firms who are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There
is some sort of process (I'm not sure what you call it or how it works) where
these relations are officially noted and "cleared" if
you will. I don't know if these relatives are banned from actually arguing
before the Supreme Court or not, but they are not
prohibited from working at these firms, so this really is a non-issue. It may
not look nice, but it's legal.

******

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 13:09:40 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Y1967-L@Aya. Yale. Edu" <y1967-l@aya.yale.edu>,
"Aapornet@UsI. Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: A History of Trying to Frustrate Voters
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIQIKDMKGCPFJBPAEPKCHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

Read the Article Below if you want to find out if Rehnquist has tried to
stifle votes in other elections to protect conservative
causes.

Andy Beveridge

HEADLINE: REHNQUIST IN ARIZONA: A MILITANT CONSERVATIVE IN 60'S POLITICS

BYLINE: By ROBERT LINDSEY, Special to the New York Times

DATELINE: PHOENIX, Aug. 2

BODY:
In the city where William H. Rehnquist began the legal career that took him
to
the United States Supreme Court, there is little
dispute that he played a major role in resisting Democratic efforts to
attract
black and Hispanic voters to the polls in the early
1960's.

At the time, it is said, he was one of many Republican conservatives who
battled with Democrats for control of a state that had many
of the racial traditions of the Deep South.

In Washington Friday, four witnesses told the Senate Judiciary Committee,
which is considering President Reagan's nomination of
Associate Justice Rehnquist to Chief Justice of the United States, that they
had seen him personally challenge minority-group voters
at polling places in Phoenix in 1962 and 1964. These accounts were denied by
Justice Rehnquist and other witnesses.

Veracity Is Questioned

The nature of the Rehnquist role in Arizona politics in the early 1960's has
become a major issue in the nomination hearings.
Although he is widely expected to be confirmed as Chief Justice, some Senate
Democrats say the conflicting reports raise questions
about his veracity and possible prejudice regarding black and Hispanic
Americans.

Contemporaries of William Rehnquist from both parties here agree that he
worked militantly on behalf of the conservative wing of the
state Republican Party in the early 1960's in an unusually bitter struggle
with Democrats for police dominance in Arizona.

Republicans say that in the 1960, 1962 and 1964 campaigns, he helped plan and
direct a poll-watching program that was intended to
block what Republicans called illegal attempts by Democrats to win elections
by bringing large numbers of unqualified black and
Hispanic residents to the polls shortly before they closed.

Although the practice of turning away illiterate voters was later barred by
the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it was then legal in
Arizona. Democrats assert that the Republican poll-watchers intimidated
minority voters and restricted voting booths to discourage
black and Hispanic residents.

A Phoenix lawyer and longtime Democratic activist, who said he did not want
to
be identified because he expected Justice Rehnquist
to be confirmed as Chief Justice, said that at the 1962 election he was
photographed by William Rehnquist as he and another Democrat
approached a voting precinct in a minority community.

Photographing Voters

"We asked him what he was doing, or perhaps he just told us, 'I'm taking
pictures of everybody,' " the lawyer recalled. "We asked
if that wasn't harassment. He just laughed and said, 'There's no film in the
camera.' "

Justice Rehnquist told the Senate committee he had never ''harassed and
intimidated'' or personally challenged voters. Supporters of
Mr. Rehnquist suggest that the witnesses Friday may have confused him with
another Republican poll-watcher involved in an
altercation near a polling place in 1962.

Although the Justice's critics argue that the number of witnesses who say
they
saw him at the polls is so large that a mistake is
not likely, some concede that because of the conflicting stories the dispute
will probably never be resolved.

A Committed Conservative
And while some Democrats, including many prominent blacks, contend that William Rehnquist behavior was racially motivated, others say they believe his actions may not have been those of a bigot but of a party activist committed to conservative principles.

Herbert Ely, a former state Democratic chairman, suggested that William Rehnquist had opposed a 1964 ordinance that outlawed racial segregation of theaters, restaurants and other public places for philosophical reasons. "He just believed property rights shouldn't be compromised for any reason," Mr. Ely said.

After it was disclosed during the Senate hearings on Justice Rehnquist this week that he had owned a home here from 1961 to 1969 that barred the sale or ownership of the property to "any person not of the white or Caucasian race," lawyers pointed out that such covenants probably applied to hundreds of other homes here, including many owned by Democratic leaders.

Arizona's Metamorphosis

When Mr. Rehnquist entered law practice here in 1953, Arizona was a largely rural state that had not begun the metamorphosis that in time that would draw so many people to Phoenix that it now has one of the nation's worst air pollution problems.

Arizona was dominated for generations by a few ranching, mining and mercantile families, some of whom, it has been reported, exploited Hispanic immigrants and blacks from the South.

Its political heritage was frontier-style rugged individualism and distrust of a distant Federal Government, and it often elected conservative Democrats to office, such as the late Senator Carl Hayden.

After World War II, the state, helped by increased availability of air-conditioners that made its summers more tolerable, began attracting more and more immigrants, especially from the South and the Middle West.

Insulated From Changes

But, encouraged by Eugene C. Pulliam, a conservative, now dead, who was the publisher of The Arizona Republic, the state remained insulated from changes occurring in Northern states, and its Democratic Party remained as conservative as any in the South, according to researchers.

"It was just like the South," Dr. Morrison F. Warren, professor of emeritus of education at Arizona State University, recalled. Dr. Warren, a black man, moved to Phoenix with his family in the 1920's, while an infant. "Schools, the theaters, restaurants, housing; everything was segregated," he said.
It remained that way, he said, until the early 1960's, when Arizona began to feel the impact of the national civil rights movement. But, said Dr. Warren, who in 1966 was the first black elected to the City Council, change did not come easy. "For a long time, we were a very segregated city."

The following was from a Washington Post Op-Ed piece published

Not so Rehnquist. His failures to deal with the odious covenants are not isolated episodes, but part of a pattern. For instance, he helped challenge the voting qualifications of Arizona blacks and Hispanics. He was entitled to do so. But even if he did not personally harass potential voters, as witnesses allege, he clearly was a brass-knuckle partisan, someone who would deny the ballot to fellow citizens for trivial political reasons -- and who made his selection on the basis of race or ethnicity.

---

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 10:28:08 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Midday Market Report (Thursday, 14 Dec 2000) (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012141005260.21857-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=X-UNKNOWN
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8BIT

For the record, here are the initial market responses to our acquisition last night--at long last--of a President-Elect. Does this have much to do with the end of Election 2000, or not, do you think? Did the initial response already play out yesterday? How are you all betting on markets over the next days and weeks?

-- Jim

WARNING: Only widely erroneous predictions will be remembered by anyone, but of course.

*****

--------- Forwarded message ---------

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 09:45:00 -0700
From: Wired News Finance <wiredmail-info@lists.wired.com>
**Subject: Midday Market Report (Thursday, 14 Dec 2000)**

```
Market Snapshot as of 12/14/2000 11:30:02 EST

Dow Jones Industrial Average (sm)    10660.58  -133.86
NASDAQ Composite Index               2783.36   -39.41
S&P 500 Index (CBOE)                 1346.58   -13.41
S&P 100 Index (CBOE)                 714.14    -6.45
13-week Treasury Bill Index          58.90     +4.60
5-year Treasury Note Index           51.59     -0.80
30-year Treasury Bond Index          54.13     -0.65
AMEX Composite                       876.55    -3.41
Computer Technology Index (AMEX)     1062.54   +6.46
NASDAQ Chicago Regional Index       701.21    -1.39
Dow Jones Transportation Average    2764.30   -83.11
Dow Jones Utilities Average         387.12    -2.69
Handy Harmon Palladium Index        781.00     0.00
Handy Harmon Platinum Index         593.00     0.00
Major Market Index (AMEX)           1047.48   -9.70
Mexico Index (The) (AMEX)            95.72     -1.05
NYSE Financial Index                608.30   -14.49
NYSE Issues up - issues down         450.00   -473
NYSE Short Term Trading Index (Arms Index) 1.12   -0.03
Russell 2000 Index (CBOE)           463.77    -6.14

Market data for delayed quotes and charts is provided by Quote.com, Inc.
NYSE and AMEX quotes are delayed by at least 20 minutes.
All other quotes are delayed by at least 15 minutes.
```

```bash
To think that I (a politically incorrect, white, male, Catholic Republican no
less) might have an impact on the discourse of political theory in the
country
is gratifying! ;-)```
I intend no criticism whatsoever of Bill Thompson, whose message here I find both usefully informative and well reflective of our own culture in the broadest sense. I do myself cherish those very same values.

That said, I cannot pass by Bill's message without alerting all those who might teach courses in political theory or related subjects that there's likely a good lecture or several good seminar discussions in just Bill's eight closing words:

It may not look nice, but it's legal.

One theoretical concept that these words might inform, for example, is sometimes translated from the German as "false consciousness."

In any case, to break the ice for classroom considerations of the much larger topic, teachers might wish to begin with structural grammatical assaults on its logic, as in:

It may not look legal, but it's nice.

This takes us directly back to the origin of our species, wouldn't we be forced to agree? And, in keeping with the spirit of the holidays, it in turn might become:

It may not be legal, but it's nice.

This, however, forces us to confront the darker side of much the same point:

It may not be nice, but it's legal.

By this point, certainly, we confront questions of the relationships among a culture's values, ethics and morality, on the one hand, and its laws and legal system on the other. Certainly I hope that many would hold that these two conceptual systems ought to be related to one another--if not also to hold that legal systems exist only and entirely
to serve the culture's values, in the most general and universal sense.

This would pretty much at least neutralize—if not defeat—Bill's original eight-word expression, or so at least it now seems to me. I of course welcome your comments, whether constructive or, as it were, deconstructive.

-- Jim

*******

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 10:55:12 -0500
From: Bill Thompson <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: ande271@attglobal.net
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

Apparently several justices have a relative working at law firms who are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There is some sort of process (I'm not sure what you call it or how it works) where these relations are officially noted and "cleared" if you will. I don't know if these relatives are banned from actually arguing before the Supreme Court or not, but they are not prohibited from working at these firms, so this really is a non-issue. It may not look nice, but it's legal.

*******

===============================================================
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 13:40:15 -0500
From: "Ratledge, Edward" <ratledge@UDel.Edu>
To: "aapornet@usc.edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

The primary reasons for current condition are probably the current string of poor earnings reports coupled with the lack of inflation in this morning's economic report and a drop in the number of unemployment claims. The latter indicators suggest that Greenspan may not be in a hurry to reduce interest rates. The end of the election was probably factored into the market a week or so ago.
Scalia's son and Olson's fate are interlinked. So it is an inherent conflict, and should at least be acknowledged.

The Thomas conflict with his wife is probably irresolvable.

This is based upon the normal application of conflict of interest doctrine.

Andrew A. Beveridge

I guess I'm from the school that thinks that we never get to see the "real" candidates; rather, since political communication tends to structure reality, we see whatever construction results from that process. That having been said, though, I would agree that there was a change in Gore's demeanor from the campaign (and especially the debates) to last night. While I thought Gore won the debates (except for the second, which was a draw), I was amazed to hear others say they thought Bush did better, or more surprisingly, they thought Gore did better but they preferred Bush. I'm sure we will expend many pages discussing the differences between "winning" a debate and attracting voters over the next few years.
To return to Gore's demeanor, though, I think that his image changed because the agenda changed. For most of the campaign, people felt this was a "Seinfeld election"-- i.e. an election about nothing. Under those circumstances, there are no broad themes, there are no principles expounded, and silliness can reign as the misspoken word or misplaced sigh sways voters. In the post-election period, however, this election came to be about something-- the right of all voters to have their voices heard versus the need for closure. Critical issues of disenfranchisement and rights were raised. In that context, it is not surprising that a candidate might gain gravitas when addressing these issues, even in defeat.

As Eliot said, "Thoughts of a dry brain in a dry season..."

Frank Rusciano

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 15:03:06 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012140845350.21857-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I'm sorry, but I take strong exception to this and even more so to the idea expressed by Bill Thompson in the first place.

How about the Nuremberg Laws of 1935? They may not have been nice, but they were legal in Germany and they led to the murder of 6 million Jews.

Closer to home, how about the "Jim Crow" laws passed in the 1870's in this country? In 1896, the Supreme Court affirmed their legality in Plessy vs. Ferguson, and they stood as the law of the land until the Brown vs. Board of Education ruling in 1954. They were not nice, but legal.

Note that Brown vs. Board provided the impetus for the conservative crusade against "liberal activist judges" that eventually brought us Rehnquist, Scalia and Thomas. Now these worthies have given us another "not nice, but legal" ruling that will surely rate with Plessy and Dred Scott in years to come.

Jan Werner

___________________

James Beniger wrote:
>

I intend no criticism whatsoever of Bill Thompson, whose message here I find both usefully informative and well reflective of our own culture in the broadest sense. I do myself cherish those very same values.

That said, I cannot pass by Bill's message without alerting all those who might teach courses in political theory or related subjects that there's likely a good lecture or several good seminar discussions in just Bill's eight closing words:

> It may not look nice, but it's legal.

One theoretical concept that these words might inform, for example, is sometimes translated from the German as "false consciousness."

In any case, to break the ice for classroom considerations of the much larger topic, teachers might wish to begin with structural grammatical assaults on its logic, as in:

> It may not look legal, but it's nice.

This takes us directly back to the origin of our species, wouldn't we be forced to agree? And, in keeping with the spirit of the holidays, it in turn might become:

> It may not be legal, but it's nice.

This, however, forces us to confront the darker side of much the same point:

> It may not be nice, but it's legal.

By this point, certainly, we confront questions of the relationships among a culture's values, ethics and morality, on the one hand, and its laws and legal system on the other. Certainly I hope that many would hold that these two conceptual systems ought to be related to one another—if not also to hold that legal systems exist only and entirely to serve the culture's values, in the most general and universal sense.

This would pretty much at least neutralize—if not defeat—Bill's original eight-word expression, or so at least it now seems to me. I of course welcome your comments, whether constructive or, as it were, deconstructive.

--

Jim

********

-------- Forwarded message --------
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 10:55:12 -0500
From: Bill Thompson <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
Reply-To: aapornet@usc.edu
To: ande271@attglobal.net
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

Apparently several justices have a relative working at law firms who
> are members of the Supreme Court bar, not just Scalia. There is some
> sort of process (I'm not sure what you call it or how it works) where
> these relations are officially noted and "cleared" if you will. I
> don't know if these relatives are banned from actually arguing before
> the Supreme Court or not, but they are not prohibited from working at
> these firms, so this really is a non-issue. It may not look nice, but
> its legal.
> *

> *******

=========================================================================  
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 14:48:45 -0500  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: There will be Implications to follow  
In-Reply-To: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPFJBPOEOACHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>  
References: <3A378398.646504EE@chapman.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

Unless I misunderstood Andy Beveridge, I think he misses Earl Babbie's
point about implications to follow. Whenever a major institution,
particularly one involved with legal niceties such as the Supreme Court,
issues pronouncements about things like 'lack of standards', there will
always be implications in all sorts of other unexpected areas which have
nothing to do with the original legal issues. People will quote the
authority of the Supreme Court to support their arguments with respect to a
host of other issues that have nothing to do with the particulars that the
Court addressed on that particular occasion. That the Court felt obliged to
declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case
only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and quickly
forgotten. This is the world we live in.

Dick Halpern

=========================================================================  
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 15:03:04 -0500  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>  
Subject: RE: Irreparable Harm  
In-Reply-To: <5D28BEE5CAE8D1119F5700AOC9B4268E05219403@isr.umich.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

I echo Eleanor Singer's comment below. Barton's comment about irreparable
harm is perhaps one of the clearest, most concise commentaries I've read to
date. It's going to take the Supreme Court a long time to recover from
their decision, which coupled with the inappropriate commentary of Justice
Scalia, has severely tainted their image as fair and non-partisan.

Dick Halpern

At 12:02 PM 12/13/00, you wrote:  
>Bravo, Allen!
To compare the Scalia conflict of interest to the Holocaust is quite a leap and in my personal opinion insults the memory of those killed.

I didn't say nothing should be done about these conflicts in the future, only that, (much as the argument used in court re: the election), these are the rules in place at the time. We are a society run by rules and they must be adhered to whether we like them or not. We have a process by which rules can be changed, and if they are changed for the better, I welcome that.

Raising questions about the rules after the fact can certainly bring about positive change, but it doesn't mean you can turn back the clock.

---

That the Court felt
> obliged to
> declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case
> only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and quickly
> forgotten. This is the world we live in.

In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at "legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to
be any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,

Linda Greenhouse's article in today's NYT picks up the same point. What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential candidate might lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be clothed in something.

Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from the "legal" nature of the decision.

Andy Beveridge

=========================================================================
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 12:52:57 -0800
From: Earl Babbie <babbie@chapman.edu>
Reply-To: babbie@chapman.edu
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73-CCK-MCD {C-UDP; EBM-APPLE} (Macintosh; U; PPC)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: AAPORNET <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Bumper Sticker Suggestions
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii; x-mac-type="54455854"; x-mac-creator="4D4F5353"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The following have been suggested as new bumper stickers:

"Don't worry about the Court" --Ralph Nader

Three strikes and you're President

My parents retired to Florida and all I got was this lousy President

Campaign spending: $184,000,000. Having your little brother rig the election for you: Priceless.

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
Tel: 714-976-6565
Fax: 714-281-6213
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.

=========================================================================
Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 16:17:02 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow
In-Reply-To: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCFFJBPEMPNCHAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>

==
There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did. warren mitofsky

At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
> . That the Court felt
> > obliged to
> > declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this
> > case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and
> > quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
> >
> >In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was
> >equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the
> >implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at
> >"legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any
> >until there is serious change of personnel on the court,
> >
> >Linda Greenhouse's article in todays NYT picks up the same point. What
> >we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential
> >candidate might lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is
> >clothed in the verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought.
> >It had to be clothed in something.
> >
> >Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott
> >decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage
> >such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from
> >the "legal" nature of the decision.
> >
> >Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky
*************************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the mythos that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)." mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.
The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did. warren mitofsky

At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
>. That the Court felt
> > obliged to
> > declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this
> > case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and
> > quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
> >
> >In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was
> >equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the
> >implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at
> >"legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any
> >until there is serious change of personnel on the court,
> >
> >Linda Greenhouse's article in todays NYT picks up the same point. What
> >we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential
> >candidate
> >might
> >lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the
> >verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be
> >clothed in something.
> >
> >Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott
decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage
> >such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from
> >the "legal" nature of the decision.
> >
> >Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky
***************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX
But is that the court's fault, or is it really not that there's a court that will hear a case, but that there's always a lawyer who will chase the ambulance and take it to court. I blame the lawyers as much as the courts in this debacle. One wonders how much they all made in this, win or lose?

"Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com> on 12/14/2000 04:42:36 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the mythos that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)."

mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few
other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did. warren mitofsky

At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
>. That the Court felt
>>> obliged to
>>> declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
>
>In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at "legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,
>
>Linda Greenhouse's article in todays NYT picks up the same point. What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential candidate might lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be clothed in something.
>
>Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from the "legal" nature of the decision.
>
>Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky
***********************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX
The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection.

Hear hear. Very nicely stated. (Hey, maybe the next few years will be on the lively side!)

It will be interesting to measure and track feelings (of outrage, of acquiescence, of whatever) over the next two and four years -- especially among those who now feel they were disenfranchised. How long will they retain their anger, how intense will it be, and will they REMEMBER come 2002 and 2004? Also, of course, there's the question of whether or not it will galvanize any non-voters to actually vote next time.

As public opinion researchers, we should have some fascinating stuff to get our teeth into. I almost wish I were still doing political polling.

Jerold Pearson, '75
Director of Market Research
Stanford University
650-723-9186
jpearson@stanford.edu
http://www.stanford.edu/~jpearson/
Hey!!!!! It's Ralph Nader and his victims that created this situation!!!! No need for a recount, courts, lawyers, legislatures or anything else if you don't have a virtual tie. Once you do have such a situation all the rest is quite inevitable.

The notion that the lawyers or the judges caused any of this is just naive; and frankly, the notion that any of us are more qualified than any one of the members of the Supreme Court to rule on this case is just ludicrous.

I don't much like the way this turned out, but it is hard to quarrel with the equal protection argument. I mean, turn it around. Suppose Al Gore was ahead by 100 votes and the Bush campaign was trying to hand count the ballots in all those little Florida counties. How many of us would be demanding the recount proceed?

But is that the court's fault, or is it really not that there's a court that will hear a case, but that there's always a lawyer who will chase the ambulance and take it to court. I blame the lawyers as much as the courts in this debacle. One wonders how much they all made in this, win or lose?

I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the mythos that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to
fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)."

mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did. warren mitofsky

At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
> That the Court felt
> obliged to
> declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
> In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at "legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,
> Linda Greenhouse's article in todays NYT picks up the same point. What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential candidate might
>lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the
>verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be
>clothed in something.
>
>Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott
decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage
>such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from
>the "legal" nature of the decision.
>
Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky
***************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

The information contained in this communication is
confidential and is intended only for the use of the
addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co.
If you have received this communication in error,
please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by
e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this
communication and all copies thereof, including
attachments.

We might feel better about all this if we looked at it from a game theory
perspective.

The election was a tie. As people experienced in measurement, we know
that.
So the problem is nothing more than finding the best
tie-breaker. Let me suggest just three that could have been used.
1. Flip a coin. It has the virtue of fairness and low cost, but the winner might feel guilty and the loser might be resentful at the simplicity of the device.

2. Agree on a set of ballot counting rules such that the outcome would not be known in advance, e.g. hanging chads, but not dimpled chads; swinging chads, but not pregnant chads. Delegate the counting to a disinterested United Nations committee. Agree in advance not to argue about its count (since it will most likely still be a statistical tie.)

3. Give the election to whichever party or ideology controls the Supreme Court. Over time, this is about a 50-50 proposition like flipping a coin. Yes, I know we get bad law this way, but, hey, all we're really doing is breaking a tie. And the case law will be nothing but a historical curiosity like Dred Scott.

My point is that procedures 2 and 3 are really not much different from flipping a coin. Therefore, neither side should be proud nor resentful.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall  Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina  Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365  http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

Phil's versions strike me as an ever wimpy liberal's idea of how ties should be broken. The tie breakers he is referring to here relate to indivisible outcomes. Twenty-five Electoral College votes are divisible. As I said in an earlier message, since no winner of the Florida vote could be determined, they should have been divided, with perhaps a coin-flip or spittin' contest to decide who gets the odd one.

Al Biderman
abider@american.edu
Philip Meyer wrote:

> We might feel better about all this if we looked at it from a game theory perspective.

> The election was a tie. As people experienced in measurement, we know that. So the problem is nothing more than finding the best tie-breaker. Let me suggest just three that could have been used.

> 1. Flip a coin. It has the virtue of fairness and low cost, but the winner might feel guilty and the loser might be resentful at the simplicity of the device.

> 2. Agree on a set of ballot counting rules such that the outcome would not be known in advance, e.g. hanging chads, but not dimpled chads; swinging chads, but not pregnant chads. Delegate the counting to a disinterested United Nations committee. Agree in advance not to argue about its count (since it will most likely still be a statistical tie.)

> 3. Give the election to whichever party or ideology controls the Supreme Court. Over time, this is about a 50-50 proposition like flipping a coin. Yes, I know we get bad law this way, but, hey, all we're really doing is breaking a tie. And the case law will be nothing but a historical curiosity like Dred Scott.

> My point is that procedures 2 and 3 are really not much different from flipping a coin. Therefore, neither side should be proud nor resentful.

I stand at the barricade with Warren!

Happy Holidays
Philip Meyer wrote:

> 3. Give the election to whichever party or ideology controls the Supreme Court. Over time, this is about a 50-50 proposition like flipping a coin. Yes, I know we get bad law this way, but, hey, all we're really doing is breaking a tie. And the case law will be nothing but a historical curiosity like Dred Scott.

Historical curiosity?

The Dred Scott decision destroyed the credibility of the Supreme Court for more than a generation and became a major catalyst in the hardening of anti-slavery feeling in the North, resulting in the Civil War four years later.

Are you being sarcastic here?

Jan Werner

I haven't read everything in this thread, but it appears that the "poorly-designed ballot" is either OK, or it is the Republicans' fault that it is poorly designed. My criticism was of a Supreme Court justice (or two or more) who could not acknowledge that the election system was faulty and then try to find a remedy, of some sort.
Well, I mean in a hundred years it'll be a historical curiosity. You've got
to take the long view, Jan.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism  Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall                      Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina              Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365                 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

On Thu, 14 Dec 2000, Jan Werner wrote:

> Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 21:28:58 -0500
> From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: A Bush-Gore game
> 
> Philip Meyer wrote:
> >
> > 3. Give the election to whichever party or ideology controls
> > the Supreme Court. Over time, this is about a 50-50 proposition like
> > flipping a coin. Yes, I know we get bad law this way, but, hey, all
> > we're really doing is breaking a tie. And the case law will be
> > nothing but a historical curiosity like Dred Scott.
> >
> > Historical curiosity?
> >
> The Dred Scott decision destroyed the credibility of the Supreme Court
> for more than a generation and became a major catalyst in the
> hardening of anti-slavery feeling in the North, resulting in the Civil
> War four years later.
>
> Are you being sarcastic here?
>
> Jan Werner
>

Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 23:03:55 -0800
From: Jeanne Anderson Research <ande271@attglobal.net>
Reply-To: ande271@attglobal.net
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.5 [en]C-CCK-MCD {TLC;RETAIL} (Win95; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
I guess I need to know why Olsen was chosen to plead before the Supreme Court. Tribe was chosen for the first appeal because he is an expert in constitutional law. Boies was chosen for the second because of his intimate familiarity with the case in FL.

Is Olsen particularly well-known as a) a constitutional law expert or b) familiar with election law generally, or c) something else?

What bothers me is that he was appointed by Bush Jr. while Scalia was appointed by Bush Sr. It sounds like Old Boy politics all over again.

It is difficult to think this election through when of course one can be "partisan" (that is, in favor of one candidate or another). Of course one thinks that the Republicans are not even trying to be non-partisan. But it does seem to me that Bill Thompson is replying to attempts to be objective with partisan comments.

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> Scalia's son and Olson's fate are interlinked. So it is an inherent conflict, and should at least be acknowledged.
> The Thomas conflict with his wife is probably irresolvable.
> This is based upon the normal application of conflict of interest doctrine.
> Andrew A. Beveridge

The "rule in place" was put there by the FL legislature: the "intent of the voter." What Supreme Court Justice has the authority to say that you CANNOT decipher that intent? It is the LAW in FL that you must.
Bill Thompson wrote:

> To compare the Scalia conflict of interest to the Holocaust is quite a
> leap and in my personal opinion insults the memory of those killed.
> 
> I didn't say nothing should be done about these conflicts in the
> future, only that, (much as the argument used in court re: the
> election), these are the rules in place at the time. We are a society
> run by rules and they must be adhered to whether we like them or not.
> We have a process by which rules can be changed, and if they are
> changed for the better, I welcome that.
> 
> Raising questions about the rules after the fact can certainly bring
> about positive change, but it doesn't mean you can turn back the
> clock.

=====================================================================
Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 08:42:06 -0500 (EST)
From: Philip Meyer <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
X-Sender: pmeyer@login6.isis.unc.edu
To: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
cc: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: A Bush-Gore game
In-Reply-To: <3A3A1570.399344BB@jwdp.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0012150836400.85936-100000@login6.isis.unc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Actually, I used both documents in my American government textbook years
ago. My point about Dred Scott is that it was an
evolutionary dead end in case law. While it nullified the Missouri
Compromise,
it set no lasting precedent and its reasoning is an
object of ridicule today. So will go Bush v. Gore. It's not the end of the
world! It really isn't.

=====================================================================

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer

=====================================================================

Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 09:11:05 -0500 (EST)
From: Bruce Altschuler <altschul@Oswego.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: BMW
In-Reply-To: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIIBCEFDC0AA.mark@bisconti.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0012150904370.29771-100000@rocky.oswego.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII
Mark David Richards memory of the case of a BMW owner getting the Supreme Court to hear his suit against BMW for its touchup painting of a supposedly new car is faulty. The car owner, whose name interestingly enough was Gore, had been awarded $4000 in compensatory damages but also $4 million in punitive damages ($4000 for each of the 1000 other cars in the US that had been similarly repainted) by an Alabama jury. It was BMW which appealed in what to most people would seem an important case to determine whether punitive damage awards could be limited. The case was BMW of North America v. Ira Gore Jr. but I don't have the cite handy.

Bruce Altschuler SUNY Oswego

On Thu, 14 Dec 2000, Mark David Richards wrote:

> I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the mythos that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)."

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
> Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow
>
> There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.
>
> The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a wit about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.
>
> I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did.
> warren mitofsky

>
At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
> > > That the Court felt
> > > obliged to
> > > declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this
> > > case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and
> > > quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
> > >
> > >In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was
> > >equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the
> > >implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at
> > >"legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be
> > >any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,
> > >
> > >Linda Greenhouse's article in todays NYT picks up the same point.
> > >What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential
> > >candidate
> > >might
> > >lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the
> > >verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be
> > >clothed in something.
> > >
> > >Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott
> > >decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from
> > >outrage such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not
> > >flow from the "legal" nature of the decision.
> > >
> > >Andy Beveridge
> > >
> > >Warren Mitofsky
> > >**************************
> > >Mitofsky International
> > >1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> > >New York, NY 10022
> > >
> > >212 980-3031
> > >212 980-3107 FAX
> >
>
>========================================================================
>Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 09:07:08 -0500
>From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
>To: ande271@attglobal.net
>cc: aapornet@usc.edu
>Message-ID: <852569B6.004D8F2A.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
>Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend
>Mime-Version: 1.0
>Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
>Content-Disposition: inline

The bottom line is, we don't really know the truth, and each of us is applying
a partisan filter to our opinions.
We don't know why people voted the way they did. We don't know whether or not those who had no vote for President intended to leave it blank or simply mispunched. We don't know why the judges ruled as they did and we don't know whether Bush Jr. picked Olson because he felt he had an "in" with Scalia's son being on the team. Why don't we know the truth? Because we weren't there. All of this, then, is an academic exercise and an opportunity for some of us to vent our frustrations with the outcome of the election, by speculating that the other guys cheated. I guarantee you Bush supporters would have been screaming the same injustices if Gore won.

Whether we like it or not, we have a decision and a president-elect. More importantly, our system has survived a major crisis bruised but not broken. Even Gore had the decency to say a week or so ago that Bush would be "his president" if he won. If people want to go to the barricades they have that right and, frankly, that obligation, but they shouldn't expect their opposition to sit quietly against their tirades. Not everyone shares their views and they should be willing to take what they dish out.

AAPOR as an organization should dedicate itself to working toward ballot reform and to continuing to educate the media and the public about these important issues. From this point forward we should all focus our energies (and frustrations) on fixing problems, not pointing fingers. I will do my part by trying to respond on this issue in private from now on so that bandwith is reserved for more meaningful discussion of the broader issues of reform and education. Anyone want to get on the wagon?

If you think the Dred Scott decision is a historical curiosity nearly a century and a half afterward, you must not have a lot of friends in the African American community. I suggest you read Chief Justice Taney's opinion in that case, which contains the
following language explaining why the Constitution forbids the emancipation of slaves:

They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit.

Indeed, when we look to the condition of this race in the several States at the time, it is impossible to believe that these rights and privileges were intended to be extended to them.

I guess you could consider it progress that no politician today would dare to use this kind of language in public, but we are presented almost daily with proof that these beliefs remain deeply ingrained and all too easy to appeal to.

George W. Bush may parade Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice as proof that he embraces the aspirations of minorities, but we should never forget that he owes his election primarily to a systematic effort led by his brother Jeb to keep minority votes from being cast or counted in Florida.

I would also suggest that you read one of the great documents of our time, Martin Luther King's "Letter from Birmingham City Jail," in which he writes, with startling relevance to the events of the last six weeks:

It is the strangely irrational notion that there is something in the very flow of time that will cure all ills. Actually time is neutral. It can be used either destructively or constructively. I am coming to feel that the people of ill will have used time much more effectively than the people of good will. We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the vitriolic words and actions of the bad people, but for the appalling silence of the good people. We must come to see that human progress never rolls on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and persistent work of men willing to be co-workers with God, and without this hard work, time itself becomes an ally of the forces of social stagnation.

Jan Werner

Philip Meyer wrote:

> Well, I mean in a hundred years it'll be a historical curiosity.
> You've got to take the long view, Jan.

Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
On Thu, 14 Dec 2000, Jan Werner wrote:

> Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 21:28:58 -0500
> From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: Re: A Bush-Gore game

> Philip Meyer wrote:
> >
> > 3. Give the election to whichever party or ideology controls the Supreme Court. Over time, this is about a 50-50 proposition like flipping a coin. Yes, I know we get bad law this way, but, hey, all we're really doing is breaking a tie. And the case law will be nothing but a historical curiosity like Dred Scott.

> Historical curiosity?

> The Dred Scott decision destroyed the credibility of the Supreme Court for more than a generation and became a major catalyst in the hardening of anti-slavery feeling in the North, resulting in the Civil War four years later.

> Are you being sarcastic here?

> Jan Werner

The private-"er" you are the better. POWER TO THE PEOPLE!

Bill Thompson wrote:

> The bottom line is, we don't really know the truth, and each of us is applying a partisan filter to our opinions.

> We don't know why people voted the way they did. We don't know whether or not those who had no vote for President intended to leave it blank or simply mispunched. We don't know why the judges ruled as they did and we don't know whether Bush Jr. picked Olson because he felt he had an "in" with Scalia's son being on the team. Why don't we know the truth? Because we weren't there. All of this, then, is an academic exercise and an opportunity for some of us to vent our
> frustrations with the outcome of the election, by speculating that the
> other guys cheated. I guarantee you Bush supporters would have been
> screaming the same injustices if Gore won.
> 
> Whether we like it or not, we have a decision and a president-elect.
> More importantly, our system has survived a major crisis bruised but
> not broken. Even Gore had the decency to say a week or so ago that
> Bush would be "his president" if he won. If people want to go to the
> barricades they have that right and, frankly, that obligation, but
> they shouldn't expect their opposition to sit quietly against their
> tirades. Not everyone shares their views and they should be willing
> to take what they dish out.
> 
> AAPOR as an organization should dedicate itself to working toward
> ballot reform and to continuing to educate the media and the public
> about these important issues. From this point forward we should all
> focus our energies (and
> frustrations) on fixing problems, not pointing fingers. I will do my part
> by
> trying to respond on this issue in private from now on so that bandwith is
> reserved for more meaningful discussion of the broader issues of reform and
> education. Anyone want to get on the wagon?

========================================================================= 
Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 10:20:04 -0500  
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: RE: BMW  
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLLCIIIIBIEFJCOAA.mark@bisconti.com>  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="us-ascii"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit  
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)  
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.4.21.0012150904370.29771-100000@rocky.oswego.edu> 
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400  

Thanks for the clarification Bruce, that comment was an off-the-cuff
reference
from a lawyer friend who is a bit depressed by some
members of the SC. (I have no memory at all of the BMW case.) I would still
be interested in seeing an opinion study of lawyers
(might be a tough crowd to interview!). Cheers, mark

-----Original Message-----  
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
Bruce
Altschuler  
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 9:11 AM  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
Subject: RE: BMW  

Mark David Richards memory of the case of a BMW owner getting the
Supreme Court to hear his suit against BMW for its touchup
painting of a supposedly new car is faulty. The car owner, whose name interestingly enough was Gore, had been awarded $4000 in compensatory damages but also $4 million in punitive damages ($4000 for each of the 1000 other cars in the US that had been similarly repainted) by an Alabama jury. It was BMW which appealed in what to most people would seem an important case to determine whether punitive damage awards could be limited. The case was BMW of North America v. Ira Gore Jr. but I don't have the cite handy.

Bruce Altschuler SUNY Oswego

On Thu, 14 Dec 2000, Mark David Richards wrote:

> I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the mythos that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)."

mark

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
> Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow
>
> There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

> The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a wit about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

> I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at
the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did. warren
mitofsky

At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
>. That the Court felt
>. > obliged to
>. > declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this
>. > case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and
>. > quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
>. >
>. > In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was
>. > equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the
>. > implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at
>. > "legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be
>. > any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,
>. >
>. > Linda Greenhouse's article in todays NYT picks up the same point.
>. > What we
>. > now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential
>. > candidate
>. > might
>. > lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the
>. > verbiage
>. > of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be clothed
>. > in something.
>. >
>. > Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott
>. > decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from
>. > outrage
>. > such
>. > as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from the
>. > "legal"
>. > nature of the decision.
>. >
>. > Andy Beveridge
>
Warren Mitofsky
>*******************************
>Mitofsky International
>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
>New York, NY 10022
>
>212 980-3031
>212 980-3107 FAX
>

========================================================================
Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 10:19:24 -0500
From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.A41.4.21L1.0012142249450.74970-100000@login1.isis.unc.edu>
Subject: Re: A Bush-Gore game
MIME-Version: 1.0
Dear Phil -- We won't be here in a hundred years. Now we have to live through the next four years. I would like to believe that George Junior is as under-rated as Harry Truman, but look at the difference in their lives before coming President. (And I voted for Norman Thomas in 1948 because I didn't like Truman's Supreme Court appointments! Well we all make mistakes.)

Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Philip Meyer" <pmeyer@email.unc.edu>
To: "Jan Werner" <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 10:50 PM
Subject: Re: A Bush-Gore game

> Well, I mean in a hundred years it'll be a historical curiosity. You've got to take the long view, Jan.
> 
> ________________________________
> Philip Meyer, Knight Chair in Journalism Voice: 919 962-4085
> CB 3365 Carroll Hall Fax: 919 962-1549
> University of North Carolina Cell: 919 906-3425
> Chapel Hill NC 27599-3365 http://www.unc.edu/~pmeyer
> ________________________________
> 
> On Thu, 14 Dec 2000, Jan Werner wrote:
> 
> > Date: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 21:28:58 -0500
> > From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: Re: A Bush-Gore game
> >
> > Philip Meyer wrote:
> >
> > 3. Give the election to whichever party or ideology controls the Supreme Court. Over time, this is about a 50-50 proposition like flipping a coin. Yes, I know we get bad law this way, but, hey, all we're really doing is breaking a tie. And the case law will be nothing but a historical curiosity like Dred Scott.
The Dred Scott decision destroyed the credibility of the Supreme Court for more than a generation and became a major catalyst in the hardening of anti-slavery feeling in the North, resulting in the Civil War four years later.

Are you being sarcastic here?

Jan Werner

Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 10:31:18 -0500
From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <852569B6.004D8F2A.00@drione.directionsrsch.com>
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Bill - What we do know is that the percentage of "undervotes" was five times as high in punch-card counties as in optical reader counties. That rules out voluntary refraining from voting as an explanation of the great mass of "undervotes." But your recommendation of what we should do is very reasonable. Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Bill Thompson" <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
To: <ande271@attglobal.net>
Cc: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 9:07 AM
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

The bottom line is, we don't really know the truth, and each of us is applying a partisan filter to our opinions.

We don't know why people voted the way they did. We don't know whether or not those who had no vote for President intended to leave it blank or simply mispunched. We don't know why the judges ruled as they did and we don't know whether Bush Jr. picked Olson because he felt he had an "in" with Scalia's
son
> being on the team. Why don't we know the truth? Because we weren't
> there. All
> of this, then, is an academic exercise and an opportunity for some of
> us
to
> vent our frustrations with the outcome of the election, by speculating
> that the
> other guys cheated. I guarantee you Bush supporters would have been
> screaming
> the same injustices if Gore won.
> >
> Whether we like it or not, we have a decision and a president-elect.
> More importantly, our system has survived a major crisis bruised but
> not
> broken.
> Even Gore had the decency to say a week or so ago that Bush would be
> "his president" if he won. If people want to go to the barricades
> they have
> that
> right and, frankly, that obligation, but they shouldn't expect their
> opposition
> to sit quietly against their tirades. Not everyone shares their views
> and
> they
> should be willing to take what they dish out.
> >
> AAPOR as an organization should dedicate itself to working toward
> > ballot
> reform
> > and to continuing to educate the media and the public about these
> important
> > issues. From this point forward we should all focus our energies (and
> > frustrations) on fixing problems, not pointing fingers. I will do my
> > part
> by
> > trying to respond on this issue in private from now on so that
> > bandwith is reserved for more meaningful discussion of the broader
> > issues of reform
> and
> > education. Anyone want to get on the wagon?
> >
> >
> =============================================================================
> Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 10:50:00 -0500
> From: "Richard M. Perloff" <r.perloff@csuohio.edu>
> Subject: 3rd per/supremes
> X-Sender: r.perloff@popmail.csuohio.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Message-id: <3.0.3.32.20001215105000.006859d8@popmail.csuohio.edu>
> MIME-version: 1.0
> X-Mailer: QUALCOMM Windows Eudora Light Version 3.0.3 (32)
> Content-type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
> Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Seems like we have a provocative example of the well-known third-person effect in reactions to the Supreme Court decision. Confirming research that shows people assume bias when they are ego-involved in an issue, liberals assume that: (1) the 5-4 decision was unquestionably biased and prejudiced; (2) it reflected hostile, partisan intent (e.g., by Republican justices); and (3) it will have a strong impact (suggestions that it will erode confidence in the court for generations to come.)

Had the 5-4 decision gone the other way, conservative AAPORNETERS -- a null set? -- would have perceived that the decision was biased against their side, reflected liberal jurors' long-standing judicial activist prejudices, and would erode confidence in the courts.

All of which is not to compliment the complex, reasoned, but arguably flawed majority position. It is to say that some views may be more steeped in ego-involved emotion than one would like to admit -- understandable and inevitable in such cases.

-- Rick Perloff

I don't think any of us have said it any better. Thank you, Rick!

"Richard M. Perloff" <r.perloff@csuohio.edu> on 12/15/2000 10:50:00 AM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: 3rd per/supremes
Seems like we have a provocative example of the well-known third-person effect in reactions to the Supreme Court decision. Confirming research that shows people assume bias when they are ego-involved in an issue, liberals assume that: (1) the 5-4 decision was unquestionably biased and prejudiced; (2) it reflected hostile, partisan intent (e.g., by Republican justices); and (3) it will have a strong impact (suggestions that it will erode confidence in the court for generations to come.)

Had the 5-4 decision gone the other way, conservative AAPORNETers -- a null set? -- would have perceived that the decision was biased against their side, reflected liberal jurors' long-standing judicial activist prejudices, and would erode confidence in the courts.

All of which is not to compliment the complex, reasoned, but arguably flawed majority position. It is to say that some views may be more steeped in ego-involved emotion than one would like to admit -- understandable and inevitable in such cases.

-- Rick Perloff

I, for one, would demand the recount continue, even if Gore had been ahead, because what I believe to this day is when the contest is in doubt you count ALL THE VOTES. The Florida Supreme Court ordered a recount of ALL undervotes STATEWIDE so there would BE equal
protection. All press accounts suggest that the recount (the one stayed by the federal Supreme Court) had begun smoothly and few undervote ballots were so ambiguous that they needed to be set aside for judicial review. The most hotly contested ballots, the ones from Miami-Dade, were being counted in Tallahassee, NOT Miami-Dade. Count the votes, the winner is the winner, what could be fairer.

Every statistical analysis of any repute indicated that a count of the undervotes gave Gore a better than even chance of winning the election. Just running the ballots though the machines a second time (for the Florida constitutionally required recount) shrank the distance between Bush and Gore by two-thirds. The co-designer of the punch card ballot system, a witness for Bush-Cheney no less, explicitly states under oath that said machines have high error rates that only increase with age and usage, AND that when an election is close a visual examination of apparent non-votes is a necessity. Yet, without ever looking at a single disputed ballot, the circuit court ruled there was no evidence the election result would be affected by a recount.

The Supreme Court majority's guiding principles in state cases has been that state supreme courts should be the ultimate arbiters of their states' laws. Yet they reject their own principle in this case to offer "equal protection" to people who legally cast votes and were counted, but apparently no protection to people who legally cast votes but were not counted. NO, instead they endorse the argument of Bush-Cheney lawyers that handcounts and determinations of intent are inherently unfair even though this argument is diametrically opposite of a bill Bush himself signed into law in Texas.

The lesson learned? Rights don't mean jack, the laws don't mean jack, and principles don't mean jack. It's only the results that count. Our esteemed president-elect has already stated that the legislative branch makes laws and the executive branch interprets them. Apparently, in his constitution, the judicial branch is there only to make sure no one messes with the executive branch's determination of the way things should be. Why should I have confidence in the future when the coming administration is rife with hypocrisy and whose guiding principle seems to be "get the result I want, everything else be damned."

To the barricades indeed, although they will probably be illegal in a couple of years.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu <mailto:lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu>

-----Original Message-----
From: MJS [SMTP:sullivan@fsc-research.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 2:34 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow
Hey!!!!! It's Ralph Nader and his victims that created this situation!!!! No need for a recount, courts, lawyers, legislatures or anything else if you don't have a virtual tie. Once you do have such a situation all the rest is quite inevitable.

The notion that the lawyers or the judges caused any of this is just naive; and frankly, the notion that any of us are more qualified than any one of the members of the Supreme Court to rule on this case is just ludicrous.

I don't much like the way this turned out, but it is hard to quarrel with the equal protection argument. I mean, turn it around. Suppose Al Gore was ahead by 100 votes and the Bush campaign was trying to hand count the ballots in all those little Florida counties. How many of us would be demanding the recount proceed?

Date sent: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 16:43:16 -0500
Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Bill Thompson"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

But is that the court's fault, or is it really not that there's a court that will hear a case, but that there's always a lawyer who will chase the ambulance and take it to court. I blame the lawyers as much as the courts in this debacle. One wonders how much they all made in this, win or lose?

"Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com> on 12/14/2000 04:42:36 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the
That the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)." mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did.

warren mitofsky
declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.

In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at "legal implications."

Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,

Linda Greenhouse's article in today's NYT picks up the same point. What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential candidate might lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be clothed in something.

Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from the "legal nature of the decision."

Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky
**********************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX
Perhaps I am cynical but I saw the suit to throw out the absentee ballots (in the two counties where Republicans had been allowed to add information after the votes were received) and the suit to stop the recount as two sides of the same coin. It appeared to me that both sides (or at least some members of both sides) would do whatever it took to get their guy elected. And the LA Times story about the national voting problems only served to confirm this belief.

I hope that all this will lead to an examination of how we vote, how we count votes and what I found (personally) most disturbing the reports of racial vote blocking in Florida.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu [SMTP:LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu]
> Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 10:55 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow
> > I, for one, would demand the recount continue, even if Gore had been ahead, because what I believe to this day is when the contest is in doubt you count ALL THE VOTES. The Florida Supreme Court ordered a recount of ALL undervotes STATEWIDE so there would BE equal protection. All press accounts suggest that the recount (the one stayed by the federal Supreme Court) had begun smoothly and few undervote ballots were so ambiguous that they needed to be set aside for judicial review. The most hotly contested ballots, the ones from Miami-Dade, were being counted in Tallahassee, NOT Miami-Dade. Count the votes, the winner is the winner, what could be fairer.
> > Every statistical analysis of any repute indicated that a count of the undervotes gave Gore a better than even chance of winning the election. Just running the ballots though the machines a second time (for the Florida constitutionally required recount) shrunk the distance between Bush and Gore by two-thirds. The co-designer of the punch card ballot system, a witness for Bush-Cheney no less, explicitly states under oath that said machines
have high error rates that only increase with age and usage, AND that when
an election is close a visual examination of apparent non-votes is a
necessity. Yet, without ever looking at a single disputed ballot, the
circuit court ruled there was no evidence the election result would be
affected by a recount.

The Supreme Court majority's guiding principles in state cases has
been that state supreme courts should be the ultimate arbiters of
their states' laws.
Yet they reject their own principle in this case to offer "equal
protection" to people who legally cast votes and were counted, but apparently no
protection to people who legally cast votes but were not counted. NO,
instead they endorse the argument of Bush-Cheney lawyers that handcounts
and
determinations of intent are inherently unfair even though this argument
is
diametrically opposite of a bill Bush himself signed into law in Texas.

The lesson learned? Rights don't mean jack, the laws don't mean jack,
and principles don't mean jack. It's only the results that count. Our
esteemed president-elect has already stated that the legislative
branch makes laws and the executive branch interprets them.
Apparently, in his constitution, the judicial branch is there only to
make sure no one messes with the executive branch's determination of
the way things should be. Why should I have confidence in the future
when the coming administration is rife with hypocrisy and whose
guiding principle seems to be "get the result I want, everything else
be damned."

To the barricades indeed, although they will probably be illegal in a
couple of years.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

-----Original Message-----
From: MJS [SMTP:sullivan@fsc-research.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 2:34 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

Hey!!!!! It's Ralph Nader and his victims that created this
situation!!!! No need for a recount, courts, lawyers, legislatures
or
anything else if you don't have a virtual tie. Once you do have such
a situation all the rest is quite inevitable.

The notion that the lawyers or the judges caused any of this is just
naive; and frankly, the notion that any of us are more qualified than
any one of the members of the Supreme Court to rule on this case
is just ludicrous.

To the barricades indeed, although they will probably be illegal in a
couple of years.
I don't much like the way this turned out, but it is hard to quarrel with the equal protection argument. I mean, turn it around. Suppose Al Gore was ahead by 100 votes and the Bush campaign was trying to hand count the ballots in all those little Florida counties. How many of us would be demanding the recount proceed?

But is that the court's fault, or is it really not that there's a court that will hear a case, but that there's always a lawyer who will chase the ambulance and take it to court. I blame the lawyers as much as the courts in this debacle. One wonders how much they all made in this, win or lose?

I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with public opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was thinking about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained of the mythos that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly legal questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're a rich medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand new Beemer which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during transport to the point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding;
There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted. I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did.

Warren Mitofsky
protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at "legal implications." Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any until there is serious change of personnel on the court, Linda Greenhouse's article in today's NYT picks up the same point. What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential candidate might lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be clothed in something. Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from the "legal" nature of the decision.

Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including attachments.
Allen Barton wrote:

> Bill - What we do know is that the percentage of "undervotes" was five
times as high in punch-card counties as in optical reader counties.
> That rules out voluntary refraining from voting as an explanation of
> the great mass of "undervotes." But your recommendation of what we should
do is very
> reasonable. Allen Barton

There are a number of counter-explanations, I'm sure. Here are a couple. We'll undoubtedly hear more.

1. "How come we got stuck with these crummy machines? I could call the
   registrar of voters to complain; I could write a letter to the editor.
   No, I know what I'll do. I won't vote for anyone at the top of the
   ballot. That'll send a message."

2. People who care most about voting move to areas with op-sense
   ballots. "3 BR, 2 bath, half acre, good schools, op-sense balloting."

3. Outdated voting technology caused people to recall the past,
   romanticizing about better times and better candidates. This
   made them depressed about the Gore-Bush choice, so they
   couldn't bring themselves to vote for either.

Earl

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie Tel: 714-997-6565
babbie@chapman.edu Fax: 714-281-6213
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
   A day without cancer is like... a day without cancer.
Leo Simonetta wrote:

> Perhaps I am cynical but I saw the suit to throw out the absentee ballots (in the two counties where Republicans had been allowed to add information after the votes were received) and the suit to stop the recount as two sides of the same coin.

Is there a definitive source of what really happened here?

It was first presented as though the registrar's machine had made a mistake on absentee ballot applications and only the Republicans were allowed to make the necessary changes. I felt the Republican ballots should be thrown out, since it sounded as Democratic ballots were tossed because they weren't corrected.

Then it sounded as though the only mistake was made by the Republican party in preparing applications, and they were allowed to correct the error--but it was not an issue for Democratic applications. While technically improper, I felt the ballots from the corrected applications should be counted.

Now, Leo suggests the changes were made once ballots were received. It gets harder and harder to put a sense of fair play ahead of partisanship.

Earl

--

kth Law of CyberSpace: We are all, as individuals, in over our heads.

Earl Babbie
babbie@chapman.edu
http://www.chapman.edu/wilkinson/socsci/sociology/Faculty/Babbie/
A day without cancer is like...a day without cancer.
The ballots will be counted, I expect, one way or the other. But focusing efforts where they can have an impact—fixing the electoral system, getting involved in the political process, helping someone run or running for office, pushing for campaign finance reform, etc. is extremely important now (as always). At least half of the country probably think the SC made a good decision—but many of the same people will support electoral and campaign finance reform, etc. And the other half who are riled will probably be willing to take some actions if it is clear that it could make some difference.

I suspect trust in the Supreme Court will still remain higher than many federal institutions (the buck has to stop somewhere-where?). Americans are pragmatic and tend to listen to everyone, wondering about the motives and interests of the various groups. Part of the issue is about abstractions... many say they don't trust Congress as a whole, but they trust their own Congresswoman. Maybe we shouldn't trust institutions. Why should we? It is not our institutions that have fought for our values most—it is our people who called upon the conscience of the people running our institutions, through protest, activism, developing political leaders starting with the school board, and yes, voting. As a result, many of our institutions listen now more than ever (I think). Maybe now opinions about the Supremes will be more accurate...? People may think they did what had to be done under the circumstances. The military, I think, has high trust ratings. Maybe the relative secrecy of organizations plays a role in the mystery, and thus trust. In any case, you won't seem many people clamoring for a new Constitution. We're too fearful that something else could be even worse. I bet most people still think we can make this damn representative democracy experiment work for more people—the struggle continues, and we can never sit back and think we won't lose small gains. As long as we care, and think we can make improvements, we can. Once people begin to think it is all a lie (A-LIE-NATION), empires crumble. I'm glad statistical sampling exists to explore individual opinions and try to listen to people, maybe even find areas of consensus and solutions. Elected leaders become partisan rapidly, but most people are more pragmatic (the radical center I think the Clinton people use to call it). Whether those who hold decision-making authority listen is their decision. mark

Here is an article from December 3. I agree with this author.

The Myth of Democracy, www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A16709-
Perhaps I am cynical but I saw the suit to throw out the absentee ballots (in the two counties where Republicans had been allowed to add information after the votes were received) and the suit to stop the recount as two sides of the same coin. It appeared to me that both sides (or at least some members of both sides) would do whatever it took to get their guy elected. And the LA Times story about the national voting problems only served to confirm this belief.

I hope that all this will lead to an examination of how we vote, how we count votes and what I found (personally) most disturbing the reports of racial vote blocking in Florida.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

> -----Original Message-----
> From: LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu [SMTP:LPollack@psg.ucsf.edu]
> Sent: Friday, December 15, 2000 10:55 AM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow
>
> I, for one, would demand the recount continue, even if Gore had been ahead, because what I believe to this day is when the contest is in doubt you count ALL THE VOTES. The Florida Supreme Court ordered a recount of ALL undervotes STATEWIDE so there would BE equal protection. All press accounts suggest that the recount (the one stayed by the federal Supreme Court) had begun smoothly and few undervote ballots were so ambiguous that they needed to be set aside for judicial review. The most hotly contested ballots, the ones from Miami-Dade, were being counted in Tallahassee, NOT Miami-Dade. Count the votes, the winner is the winner, what could be fairer.
>
> Every statistical analysis of any repute indicated that a count of the undervotes gave Gore a better than even chance of winning the election. Just running the ballots though the machines a second time (for the Florida constitutionally required recount) shrunk the distance between Bush and Gore by two-thirds. The co-designer of the punch card ballot system, a witness for Bush-Cheney no less, explicitly states under oath that said machines have high error rates that only increase with age and usage, AND that when an election is close a visual examination of apparent non-votes is a necessity. Yet, without ever looking at a single disputed ballot, the circuit court ruled there was no evidence the election result would be
affected by a recount.

The Supreme Court majority's guiding principles in state cases has been that state supreme courts should be the ultimate arbiters of their states' laws. Yet they reject their own principle in this case to offer "equal protection" to people who legally cast votes and were counted, but apparently no protection to people who legally cast votes but were not counted. NO, instead they endorse the argument of Bush-Cheney lawyers that handcounts and determinations of intent are inherently unfair even though this argument is diametrically opposite of a bill Bush himself signed into law in Texas.

The lesson learned? Rights don't mean jack, the laws don't mean jack, and principles don't mean jack. It's only the results that count. Our esteemed president-elect has already stated that the legislative branch makes laws and the executive branch interprets them. Apparently, in his constitution, the judicial branch is there only to make sure no one messes with the executive branch's determination of the way things should be. Why should I have confidence in the future when the coming administration is rife with hypocrisy and whose guiding principle seems to be "get the result I want, everything else be damned."

To the barricades indeed, although they will probably be illegal in a couple of years.

Lance M. Pollack, Ph.D.
Center for AIDS Prevention Studies (CAPS)
University of California, San Francisco
lpollack@psg.ucsf.edu

--------Original Message--------
From: MJS [SMTP:sullivan@fsc-research.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 2:34 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

Hey!!!!! It's Ralph Nader and his victims that created this situation!!!! No need for a recount, courts, lawyers, legislatures or anything else if you don't have a virtual tie. Once you do have such a situation all the rest is quite inevitable.

The notion that the lawyers or the judges caused any of this is just naive; and frankly, the notion that any of us are more qualified than any one of the members of the Supreme Court to rule on this case is just ludicrous.

I don't much like the way this turned out, but it is hard to
> quarrel

> with the equal protection argument. I mean, turn it around.
> Suppose Al Gore was ahead by 100 votes and the Bush campaign
> was trying to hand count the ballots in all those little Florida
> counties. How many of us would be demanding the recount
> proceed?

> Date sent: Thu, 14 Dec 2000 16:43:16 -0500
> Send reply to: aapornet@usc.edu
> From: "Bill Thompson"
> <bthompson@directionsrsch.com>
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

> But is that the court's fault, or is it really not that there's
> a court that
> will hear a case, but that there's always a lawyer who will
> chase the ambulance
> and take it to court. I blame the lawyers as much as the courts
> in this
> debacle. One wonders how much they all made in this, win or
> lose?

> "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com> on 12/14/2000 04:42:36
> PM
> Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)
> Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

> I'd like to see a survey of lawyers on the SC ruling, along with
> public
> opinion as Susan suggested. I asked a lawyer friend what he was
> thinking
> about it... he said: "I'm with Stevens. What little remained
> of the mythos
> that the Court is an impartial and apolitical forum for strictly
> legal
> questions died Saturday and was buried yesterday. But if you're
> a rich
> medical doctor and want to sue BMW because they sold you a brand
> new Beemer
> which had touchup paint to fix tiny nicks suffered during
> transport to the
point of sale, you got a court which will hear your case (I'm not kidding; this was a real case)." mark

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Warren Mitofsky
Sent: Thursday, December 14, 2000 4:17 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: RE: There will be Implications to follow

There is no legal decision. The majority on the court invalidated its own treatment of state courts and their interpretation of state law. Face it, it was a political opinion clothed in legal buzz words that were totally inconsistent with the prior opinions of the majority that rendered it. If they believed in equal protection they would have challenged the vote in New Mexico and a few other states, where their so-called principle would have had an effect on the election outcome. If they cared about equal protection they would have ordered a statewide recount in Florida and an extension of the December 12th deadline. By their actions the Supremes cared about none of this. Their only objective was to elect George W. Bush.

The only response to a blatant political opinion under the guise of lawfulness is not acquiescence, but sustained objection. This is a call to the barricades much the same as it was in the '60s and '70s over civil rights and Vietnam. And I don't care a with about Al Gore. I care about protecting the right to vote and having that vote counted.

I have not objected to anything this much for years, and I'm mad as hell at the court and all those who want to whitewash what they did.

warren mitofsky

At 03:38 PM 12/14/00 -0500, you wrote:
>. That the Court felt obliged to declare in effect that there should be "equal protection for this case only" is nice but this proviso will be conveniently and quickly forgotten. This is the world we live in.
In fact Dick, that the court felt it important to say that this was equal protection only for this case is an attempt to limit the implications at least in the court system. But Earl was looking at "legal implications."

Given this statement, there is unlikely to be any until there is serious change of personnel on the court,

Linda Greenhouse's article in today's NYT picks up the same point. What we now have is a special law for cases where a GOP presidential candidate might lose if the votes are counted. The fact that it is clothed in the verbiage of equal protection is almost an afterthought. It had to be clothed in something.

Make no mistake about this decision is on the order of the Dred Scott decision. There will be implications, but they will flow from outrage such as that expressed in Barton's message. They will not flow from the "legal" nature of the decision.

Andy Beveridge

Warren Mitofsky

Mitofsky International

1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022

212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of Freeman, Sullivan & Co. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to postmaster@fsc-research.com, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including
Someone kindly pointed out an error in my previous post. (Hard to believe isn't it?)

I was wrong about absentee votes being corrected, rather forms requesting absentee ballots were corrected.


"Democrats charged in each case that Bush was the beneficiary of favored treatment by Republican election supervisors. Before the election, the Florida GOP sent pre-printed cards to registered Republicans, allowing them to request an absentee ballot. Some of the cards contained a misprint that omitted the required voter identification number. In Seminole County, testimony showed that Republican Party staff member Michael A. Leach was permitted to use Goard's offices for about 15 days to correct the application forms. In Martin County, GOP workers were permitted to retrieve incorrect forms, fix them and return them to the election offices. The Democrats charged that Florida law requires certain details to be supplied on the forms. They said the law considers invalid any forms that do not contain the proper information. They contended that the Republican elections officials gave an unfair advantage to their own party by bending or breaking the rules. Lawyers for Bush and the two counties countered that the changes were a mere scrivener's task that did nothing to threaten the integrity of the ballots delivered as a result. They pointed out that the Democrats did not need help because the application forms dispatched by the Democrats did not contain errors."

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com
Bill -I'm on the wagon with you. I'd like to see my AAPOR e-mail reduced to something useful.

Dear Richard:

I really think that this issue really is related to the question of taking the case in the first place or not. In other words, they took the first case, and the second case when the recount had started. In both instances they examined the issues surrounding the recount. In the first case they remanded it back. In the second case they stopped the recount and kept in stopped. In the first case, by the time they had heard it Bush was still ahead. When they took it, there was a danger that Gore would go ahead. Since Bush was still ahead they had nothing to reverse. In the second case, if they hadn't stopped the recount Gore might have gone ahead. So they kept it stopped.

I have several lawyer friends who predicted the outcome long before it happened. The interesting question about the decision was not what they did. The interesting question was how they did it.

They applied "equal protection for this case only" to protect the votes of Bush's supporters. Since it is "this case only" they will probably spurn any extension of these principles other elections with other aggrieved groups. Though obviously there will be 4 votes to do so.

It is this rather transparent approach along with an even more radical view from Thomas, Scalia and Rehnquist that sets everyone's teeth on edge.
News Analysis: Another Kind Of Bitter Split When Jurisprudence Is Pulled Into Politics By LINDA GREENHOUSE WASHINGTON, Dec. 13 - The Supreme Court justices who drove off into the night on Tuesday left behind more than a split decision that ended a disputed presidential election.

They also left behind an institution that many students of the court said appeared diminished, if not actually tarnished, by its extraordinary foray into presidential politics.

They point to the contradiction between the majority's action in this case and those justices' usual insistence on deference to the states.

The members of the majority appeared at pains to refute any suggestion that the court had intervened unduly by stopping the Florida recount on Saturday or by ruling Tuesday that it could not resume. It was "our unsought responsibility to resolve the federal and constitutional issues" in the case, the majority said in its unsigned opinion.

And Justice Clarence Thomas, a member of the 5-to-4 majority, told a group of high school students at the court today that "I have yet to hear any discussion, in nine years, of partisan politics" among the justices.

"I plead with you that, whatever you do, don't try to apply the rules of the political world to this institution; they do not apply," Justice Thomas said, adding, "The last political act we engage in is confirmation."

Be that as it may, the events of the last few days were jarring even for people who pride themselves on being realists rather than romantics about how the court works.

One federal judge, a Republican appointee who was a Supreme Court law clerk decades ago, said today that he had long since become accustomed to watching the justices "making it up as they go along." That aspect of the majority opinion, which he called analytically weak and untethered to precedent, did not particularly bother him, he said.

"But the very peculiar aspect" of the case, the judge said, was "why they made it up."

He added, "It just seemed so politically partisan."

Another federal judge, a Democrat with many close Republican ties, wondered openly in conversation today about what steps the Supreme Court could take to "rehabilitate itself."
The way the court structured and then released its opinion, just before 10 o'clock at night, added to the sense of unease. The justices gave no hint of a reason for the unprecedented late-night release—whether to avoid pushing Florida over the midnight "safe harbor" deadline for immunizing its electors from Congressional challenge, or perhaps out of fear that the explosive and highly divisive decision might leak overnight if the court waited until morning to announce it. No matter. It resulted in an hour or more of frantic confusion that the court did nothing to prevent or alleviate.

While the sight of network correspondents fumbling in the dark on the court plaza to make sense of the decision was deeply unsettling to viewers who urgently wanted to know whether the 2000 election was over, the fault this time was much more the court's than television's. The 65-page document omitted the usual headnote, the synopsis that accompanies opinions and identifies which justices voted on which side.

Furthermore, the opinion was labeled "per curiam," meaning "by the court," a label used by courts almost exclusively for unanimous opinions so uncontroversial as to not be worth the trouble of a formal opinion-writing process. There was no indication of what the vote actually was. The names of Justices Sandra Day O'Connor and Anthony M. Kennedy, one or both of whom was likely the author, did not appear anywhere on the document.

Unlike the Florida Supreme Court, whose spokesman, Craig Waters, became almost a cult figure for his uninflected but informative announcements of the court's opinions in the election cases, the United States Supreme Court does not authorize its public information staff to make public statements or give any guidance about the decisions.

Since the justices themselves skipped the usual oral announcement of a decision, which takes place in public session in the courtroom and includes the opinion's author summarizing its main points, there was no interpretive guide at all for the correspondents who had to dash off to their waiting cameras. The crux of the per curiam opinion, the conclusion that there was no time to conduct any further counting of the votes in Florida, came deep inside and was highlighted neither at the beginning nor at the end.

Among the most baffling aspects of the opinion was its simultaneous creation of a new equal protection right not to have ballots counted according to different standards and its disclaimer that this new constitutional principle would ever apply in another case. "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities," the court said.
Joseph Goldstein, a Yale Law School professor who died this year, wrote in his book "The Intelligible Constitution" that the members of the court "have an obligation to maintain the Constitution, in opinions of the court and also in concurring and dissenting opinions, as something intelligible - something We the People of the United States can understand."

Mr. Goldstein wrote: "That the Constitution be intelligible and accessible to We the People of the United States is requisite to a government by consent."

The justices will not meet again until Jan. 5, the date for their next scheduled conference to review new and pending cases. The passions and pain revealed in Tuesday's opinions will undoubtedly have cooled by then; these are justices who are accustomed to both bitter division - often by the same 5-to-4 alignment - and to moving on to the next case.

But there is something different about Bush v. Gore that raises the question about whether moving on will be quite so easy. This was something more than a dispute rooted in judicial philosophy. In fact, as Prof. Suzanna Sherry of Vanderbilt Law School said today, had members of the majority been true to their judicial philosophy, the opinion would have come out differently.

"In the past, the 5-to-4 decisions have been jurisprudentially predictable," Professor Sherry said in an interview. "Some justices are for more federalism, some for less; some for more activism, some for less. Those are not political decisions. By and large, the opinions are consistent with consistent jurisprudential beliefs" and as such present little threat to the court's collegiality.

But in this case, Professor Sherry said, for conservatives "the politics and jurisprudence were in conflict." The conservative justices in the majority set aside their concern for states' rights, for judicial restraint, for limitations on standing, for their usual insistence that claims raised at the Supreme Court level have been fully addressed by the lower courts.

"There is really very little way to reconcile this opinion other than that they wanted Bush to win," Professor Sherry said. Those who oppose the decision, she said, are likely to conclude not only that it was a mistake but "a different kind of mistake, not just that they got the law wrong but that it exposed a different side of the court."
Seems like we have a provocative example of the well-known third-person effect in reactions to the Supreme Court decision. Confirming research that shows people assume bias when they are ego-involved in an issue, liberals assume that: (1) the 5-4 decision was unquestionably biased and prejudiced; (2) it reflected hostile, partisan intent (e.g., by Republican justices); and (3) it will have a strong impact (suggestions that it will erode confidence in the court for generations to come.)

Had the 5-4 decision gone the other way, conservative AAPORNETers -- a null set? -- would have perceived that the decision was biased against their side, reflected liberal jurors' long-standing judicial activist prejudices, and would erode confidence in the courts.

All of which is not to compliment the complex, reasoned, but arguably flawed majority position. It is to say that some views may be more steeped in ego-involved emotion than one would like to admit -- understandable and inevitable in such cases.

-- Rick Perloff

====================================================================
Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 11:40:15 -0600
From: "Diane O'Rourke" <DOrourke@SRL.UIC.EDU>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Supreme Court Decision Explained

I received this from another listserv and think it's a good addition to our conversation!

Diane O'Rourke
Univ. of IL Survey Research Lab.

-----------------------------------

I thought list members would enjoy this humorous explanation of the Supreme Court's decision in Bush v. Gore. I'm forwarding from the MinorityProfs listserv.

By Mark H. Levine, Attorney at Law.
Q: I'm not a lawyer and I don't understand the recent Supreme Court decision in Bush v. Gore. Can you explain it to me?
A: Sure. I'm a lawyer. I read it. It says Bush wins, even if Gore got the most votes.
Q: But wait a second. The US Supreme Court has to give a reason, right?
A: Right.
Q: So Bush wins because hand-counts are illegal?
A: Oh no. Six of the justices (two-thirds majority) believed the hand-counts were legal and should be done.
Q: Oh. So the justices did not believe that the hand-counts would find any legal ballots?
A: Nope. The five conservative justices clearly held (and all nine justices agreed) "that punch card balloting machines can produce an unfortunate number of ballots which are not punched in a clean, complete way by the voter." So there are legal votes that should be counted but can't be.
Q: Oh. Does this have something to do with states' rights? Don't conservatives love that?
A: Generally yes. These five justices have held that the federal government has no business telling a sovereign state university it can't steal trade secrets just because such stealing is prohibited by law.
Nor does the federal government have any business telling a state that it should bar guns in schools. Nor can the federal government use the equal protection clause to force states to take measures to stop violence against women.
Q: Is there an exception in this case?
A: Yes, the Gore exception. States have no rights to have their own state elections when it can result in Gore being elected President. This decision is limited to only this situation.
Q: C'mon. The Supremes didn't really say that. You're exaggerating.
A: Nope. They held "Our consideration is limited to the present
> > > circumstances, or the problem of equal protection in election processes
> > > generally presents many complexities."
> > >
> > > Q: What complexities?
> > >
> > > A: They don't say.
> > >
> > > Q: I'll bet I know the reason. I heard Jim Baker say this. The votes can't be counted because the Florida Supreme Court "changed the rules of the election after it was held." Right?
> > >
> > > A: Dead wrong. The US Supreme Court made clear that the Florida Supreme Court did not change the rules of the election. But the US Supreme Court found the failure of the Florida Court to change the rules was wrong.
> > >
> > > Q: Huh?
> > >
> > > A: The Legislature declared that the only legal standard for counting vote is "clear intent of the voter." The Florida Court was condemned for not adopting a clearer standard.
> > >
> > > Q: I thought the Florida Court was not allowed to change the Legislature's law after the election.
> > >
> > > A: Right.
> > >
> > > Q: So what's the problem?
> > >
> > > A: They should have. The US Supreme Court said the Florida Supreme Court should have "adopt[ed] adequate statewide standards for determining what is a legal vote"
> > >
> > > Q: I thought only the Legislature could "adopt" new law.
> > >
> > > A: Right.
> > >
> > > Q: So if the Court had adopted new standards, I thought it would have been overturned.
> > >
> > > A: Right. You're catching on.
> > >
> > > Q: If the Court had adopted new standards, it would have been overturned for changing the rules. And if it didn't, it's overturned for not changing the rules. That means that no matter what the Florida
Supreme Court did, legal votes could never be counted.

A: Right. Next question.

Q: Wait, wait. I thought the problem was "equal protection," that some counties counted votes differently from others. Isn't that a problem?

A: It sure is. Across the nation, we vote in a hodgepodge of systems.

Some, like the optical-scanners in largely Republican-leaning counties record 99.7% of the votes. Some, like the punchcard systems in largely Democratic-leaning counties record only 97% of the votes. So approximately 3% of Democratic votes are thrown in the trash can.

Q: Aha! That's a severe equal-protection problem!!!

A: No it's not. The Supreme Court wasn't worried about the 3% of Democratic ballots thrown in the trashcan in Florida. That "complexity"

was not a problem.

Q: Was it the butterfly ballots that violated Florida law and tricked more than 20,000 Democrats to vote for Buchanan or Gore and Buchanan.

A: Nope. The Supreme Court has no problem believing that Buchanan got his highest, best support in a precinct consisting of a Jewish old age home with Holocaust survivors, who apparently have changed their mind about Hitler.

Q: Yikes. So what was the serious equal protection problem?

A: The problem was neither the butterfly ballot nor the 3% of Democrats (largely African-American) disenfranchised. The problem is that somewhat less than .005% of the ballots may have been determined under slightly different standards because judges sworn to uphold the law and doing their best to accomplish the legislative mandate of "clear intent" may have a slightly opinion about the voter's intent.

Q: Hmmm. OK, so if those votes are thrown out, you can still count the votes where everyone agrees the voter's intent is clear?
A: Nope.

Q: Why not?

A: No time.

Q: No time to count legal votes where everyone, even Republicans, agree the intent is clear? Why not?

A: Because December 12 was yesterday.

Q: Is December 12 a deadline for counting votes?


Q: So why is December 12 important?

A: December 12 is a deadline by which Congress can't challenge the results.

Q: What does the Congressional role have to do with the Supreme Court?

A: Nothing.

Q: But I thought ---

A: The Florida Supreme Court had earlier held it would like to complete its work by December 12 to make things easier for Congress. The United States Supreme Court is trying to help the Florida Supreme Court by forcing the Florida court to abide by a deadline that everyone agrees is not binding.

Q: But I thought the Florida Court was going to just barely have the votes counted by December 12.

A: They would have made it, but the five conservative justices stopped the recount last Saturday.

Q: Why?

A: Justice Scalia said some of the counts may not be legal.

Q: So why not separate the votes into piles, indentations for Gore, hanging chads for Bush, votes that everyone agrees went to one candidate or the other so that we know exactly how Florida voted before determining who won? Then, if some ballots (say, indentations...
have to
> > >be thrown out, the American people will know right away who won Florida.
> > >
> > >A. Great idea! The US Supreme Court rejected it. They held that such
> > >counts would likely to produce election results showing Gore won and
> > >Gore's winning would cause "public acceptance" and that would "cast[] a
> > >cloud" over Bush's "legitimacy" that would harm "democratic stability."
> > >
> > >Q: In other words, if America knows the truth that Gore won, they won't
> > >accept the US Supreme Court overturning Gore's victory?
> > >
> > >A: Yes.
> > >
> > >Q: Is that a legal reason to stop recounts? or a political one?
> > >
> > >A: Let's just say in all of American history and all of American
> > >law, this reason has no basis in law. But that doesn't stop the
> > >five conservatives from creating new law out of thin air.
> > >
> > >Q: Aren't these conservative justices against judicial activism?
> > >
> > >A: Yes, when liberal judges are perceived to have done it.
> > >
> > >Q: Well, if the December 12 deadline is not binding, why not count the
> > >votes?
> > >
> > >A: The US Supreme Court, after admitting the December 12 deadline
> > >is not
> > >binding, set December 12 as a binding deadline at 10 p.m. on December
> > >12.
> > >
> > >Q: Didn't the US Supreme Court condemn the Florida Supreme Court for
> > >arbitrarily setting a deadline?
> > >
> > >A: Yes.
> > >
> > >Q: But, but --
> > >
> > >A: Not to worry. The US Supreme Court does not have to follow laws it
> > >sets for other courts.
> > >
> > >Q: So who caused Florida to miss the December 12 deadline?
> > >
> > >A: The Bush lawyers who first went to court to stop the recount, the
> > >rent-a-mob in Miami that got paid Florida vacations for
> > >intimidating officials, and the US Supreme Court for stopping the
Q: So who is punished for this behavior?
A: Gore, of course.
Q: Tell me this Florida's laws are unconstitutional?
A: Yes
Q: And the laws of 50 states that allow votes to be cast or counted differently are unconstitutional?
A: Yes. And 33 states have the "clear intent of the voter" standard that the US Supreme Court found was illegal in Florida
Q: Then why aren't the results of 33 states thrown out?
A: Um. Because...um.....the Supreme Court doesn't say...
Q: But if Florida's certification includes counts expressly declared by the US Supreme Court to be unconstitutional, we don't know who really won the election there, right?
A: Right. Though a careful analysis by the Miami Herald shows Gore won Florida by about 20,000 votes (excluding the butterfly ballot errors)
Q: So, what do we do, have a re-vote? throw out the entire state? count under a single uniform standard?
A: No. We just don't count the votes that favor Gore.
Q: That's completely bizarre! That sounds like rank political favoritism! Did the justices have any financial interest in the case?
A: Scalia's two sons are both lawyers working for Bush. Thomas's wife is collecting applications for people who want to work in the Bush administration.
Q: Why didn't they recuse themselves?
A: If either had recused himself, the vote would be 4-4, and the Florida Supreme Court decision allowing recounts would have been affirmed.
Q: I can't believe the justices acted in such a blatantly political way.
A: Read the opinions for yourself:
http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/supremecourt/00-949_dec12.fdf
(December 9 stay stopping the recount)
http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/00pdf/00-949.pdf
(December 12 opinion)

Q: So what are the consequences of this?

A: The guy who got the most votes in the US and in Florida and under our Constitution (Al Gore) will lose to America's second choice who won the all important 5-4 Supreme Court vote.

Q: I thought in a democracy, the guy with the most votes wins.

A: True, in a democracy. But America is not a democracy. In America in 2000, the guy with the most US Supreme Court votes wins.

Q: So what will happen to the Supreme Court when Bush becomes President.

A: He will appoint more justices in the mode of Thomas and Scalia to ensure that the will of the people is less and less respected. Soon lawless justices may constitute 6-3 or even 7-2 on the court.

Q: Is there any way to stop this?

A: YES. No federal judge can be confirmed without a vote in the Senate. It takes 60 votes to break a filibuster. If only 41 of the 50 Democratic Senators stand up to Bush and his Supremes and say that they will not approve a single judge appointed by him until a President can be democratically elected in 2004, the judicial reign of terror can end....and one day we can hope to return to the rule of law.

Q: What do I do now?

A: Email this to everyone you know, and write or call your senator, reminding him that Gore beat Bush by several hundred thousand votes (three times Kennedy's margin over Nixon) and that you believe that VOTERS rather than JUDGES should determine who wins an election by counting every vote. And to protect our judiciary from overturning the will of the people, you want them to confirm NO NEW JUDGES until 2004 when a president is finally chosen by most of the American people.

Mark H. Levine
Please stop sending these comments on everyone's individual email!

Virginia H. Bartot, Ph.D., Director
The University of Chicago Survey Lab vhbartot@midway.uchicago.edu
(773) 834-3667
FAX=(773) 834-7412
-----Original Message-----
From: Bill Thompson <bthompson@directionrsrch.com>
To: ande271@attglobal.net <ande271@attglobal.net>
Cc: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Friday, December 15, 2000 8:23 AM
Subject: Re: A Message from a Friend

> The bottom line is, we don't really know the truth, and each of us is applying a partisan filter to our opinions.
> We don't know why people voted the way they did. We don't know whether or not those who had no vote for President intended to leave it blank or simply mispunched. We don't know why the judges ruled as they did and we don't know whether Bush Jr. picked Olson because he felt he had an "in" with Scalia's son being on the team. Why don't we know the truth? Because we weren't there. All of this, then, is an academic exercise and an opportunity for some of us to vent our frustrations with the outcome of the election, by speculating that the other guys cheated. I guarantee you Bush supporters would have been screaming the same injustices if Gore won. > Whether we like it or not, we have a decision and a president-elect. More importantly, our system has survived a major crisis bruised but not broken. Even Gore had the decency to say a week or so ago that Bush would be "his president" if he won. If people want to go to the barricades they have that right and, frankly, that obligation, but they shouldn't expect their
opposition
>to sit quietly against their tirades. Not everyone shares their views
>and
>they
> should be willing to take what they dish out.
>
> AAPOR as an organization should dedicate itself to working toward
>ballot
>reform
>and to continuing to educate the media and the public about these
>important issues. From this point forward we should all focus our
>energies (and
>frustrations) on fixing problems, not pointing fingers. I will do my part
>by
>trying to respond on this issue in private from now on so that bandwith
>is reserved for more meaningful discussion of the broader issues of
>reform and education. Anyone want to get on the wagon?
>
>

========================================================================
Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 14:13:37 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
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Subject: Public trust info
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENLCLIIIBEFOCOAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
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Info from the National Conference on Public Trust and Confidence in the
Justice System, MAY 14 -- 15, 1999 is at
http://www.ncsc.dni.us/PTC/ptc2.htm, ...

"keynote speaker, William H. Rehnquist, Chief Justice of the United States, whose presence
underscored the importance of the occasion, not only to state judges but to
the federal judiciary as well. He stressed the link
between judicial independence and public trust."

How the public views the state courts, 1999 opinion study (also examined

========================================================================
Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 15:02:17 -0500
From: Harry Wilson <wilson@roanoke.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.73 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
Here's something that might get some folks as upset as activism on the Supreme Court (only the U.S. Court, not Florida, and only of the conservative persuasion, of course), the ultra-evil Bush brothers, the election-stealing Republican operatives in Seminole and Martin Counties, or even the lackey-filled FL Legislature (How dare they try to ensure the state's electoral votes be counted and vote along party lines! Democrats would never even dream of such chicanery.).

Even better, this item is related to polling!

2000 Election Winners: George W. Bush . and Online Polling

Harris Interactive scores unprecedented 99% accuracy in predicting 2000 election outcome

Rochester, NY, December 14, 2000 - Thirty six days after the votes were cast, the results are now in, and George W. Bush has ascended to the presidency while a second winner has also emerged. Harris Interactive (Nasdaq: HPOL), the global leader in internet-based market research, announced it had achieved 99% accuracy (races called correctly or within a +/- 2% of error) in predicting 73 political contests in November.

Research Business Report, an industry-leading market research newsletter, has provided the first independent assessment of the accuracy of Harris Interactive in forecasting the recent election. Making a direct comparison between the final Harris Interactive Internet-based poll with the final telephone based polls of other firms, the Research Business Report concluded:

"In average percentage points, online outperformed phone polls. Harris (Interactive) was off an average 1.8 points for Gore and 2.5 for Bush. Phone polling was off 3.9 points on the average Gore percentage and 4.4 for Bush."

"On the one hand, proponents of online research methods can breathe a sigh of relief and express thanks to Harris Interactive. At the same time, Harris (Interactive)'s results make an indelible impression on behalf of its sometimes controversial online surveying method, which includes "propensity weighting" - questioned by some researchers and derided by others during the last year."
Dr. Gordon S. Black, chairman and CEO of Harris Interactive commented on the results: "Harris Interactive's national forecast using the Internet outperformed every survey conducted by telephone while our state by state forecasts were about twice as accurate as the comparable telephone forecasts. We even predicted that Gore would end up with about 200,000 more popular votes than Bush — only about 100,000 off from the official difference of 300,000. The 99% accuracy of the Harris Interactive 2000 election results will stand as the turning point in the use of the Internet as a replacement technology for telephone-based market research. Harris Interactive is the only market research and polling firm that demonstrated in full public view that it has mastered the science of using Internet-based respondents to correctly project to the total population."

Election 2000 marks the second time that Harris Interactive has used the Internet to outperform the telephone in election polling. In 1998, Harris Interactive correctly predicted 21 out of 22 statewide races compared with 17 out of 22 by telephone. Stated Dr. George Terhanian, director of Internet research at Harris Interactive: "We were even more accurate in 2000 because we continue to perfect the use of propensity weighting, a statistical method that has been used routinely for about 20 years in the educational and medical sectors but infrequently in others. Harris Interactive has perfected its application to not only election forecasting but to all aspects of Internet-based market research."

Methodology

This Harris Interactive election study was conducted using only the Internet. From October 30 through November 6, 2000, over 300,000 members of the voting-age population participated in this poll — the largest online election study in history. During the peak of the interviewing, Harris Interactive processed more than 40,000 online interviews per hour, including 7,800 simultaneous interviews. Final data were weighted and tabulated in real-time, using Harris Interactive's proprietary systems.

About Harris Interactive

Harris Interactive (Nasdaq: HPOL), the global leader in online market research, uses Internet-based and traditional methodologies to provide its clients with information about the views, experiences, behaviors and attitudes of people worldwide. Known for its Harris Poll, Harris Interactive has over 40 years experience in providing its clients with market research and polling services including custom, multi-client and service bureau research, as well as customer relationship management services. Through its U.S. and Global Network offices, Harris Interactive conducts research in more than 100 countries in multiple, localized languages. Harris Interactive uses its proprietary technology to survey its database of more than 7 million online panelists. For more information about
Harris Interactive, please visit our website at www.harrisinteractive.com.
EOE M/F/D/V

For more information about this release or Harris Interactive, please contact:

Dan Hucko
Harris Interactive
(716) 214-7470
dhucko@harrisinteractive.com

Safe Harbor Statement

This media release includes statements that may constitute forward-looking information. We caution you that these forward-looking statements are subject to risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from those discussed. Additional detailed information concerning a number of factors that could cause actual results to differ is readily available in the "Risk Factors" section of the most recent Annual Report on form 10-K filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission pursuant to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Date: Fri, 15 Dec 2000 16:03:39 -0600
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
Subject: Trend data on confidence in institutions
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The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut has prepared a retrospective look at the confidence that Americans have had over the years in three institutions of national government: the White House, the Congress, and the Supreme Court. Data in our report come from Harris and Gallup polls and the LA Times exit polls. In addition to the trends, you will find a demographic breakdown of the 2000 Gallup poll on this subject and a report based upon the LA Times exit polls on issues that influenced voters to one or another candidate. These data may prove helpful to AAPOR members as they examine forthcoming data on these matters. I invite you to view these data from the Roper Center homepage under "What's New": http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/

--------------------
Richard C. ROCKWELL
Executive Director, The Roper Center & Institute for Social Inquiry Professor of Sociology 341 Mansfield Road, U-164 Storrs, CT 06269-1164 USA V +1 860 486-4440 F +1 860 486-6308 richard@opinion.isi.uconn.edu

--------------------
Your logic is wrong. Just because liberals or conservatives say something for ego involved reasons does not make their statements untrue. One has nothing to do with the other. You seem to think anything said for those reasons must be untrue. The only thing "obviously flawed" is your reasoning.

warren mitofsky

At 10:50 AM 12/15/00 -0500, you wrote:

> Seems like we have a provocative example of the well-known third-person effect in reactions to the Supreme Court decision. Confirming research that shows people assume bias when they are ego-involved in an issue, liberals assume that: (1) the 5-4 decision was unquestionably biased and prejudiced; (2) it reflected hostile, partisan intent (e.g., by Republican justices); and (3) it will have a strong impact (suggestions that it will erode confidence in the court for generations to come.)

> Had the 5-4 decision gone the other way, conservative AAPORNETers -- a null set? -- would have perceived that the decision was biased against their side, reflected liberal jurors' long-standing judicial activist prejudices, and would erode confidence in the courts.

> All of which is not to compliment the complex, reasoned, but arguably flawed majority position. It is to say that some views may be more steeped in ego-involved emotion than one would like to admit -- understandable and inevitable in such cases.

-- Rick Perloff

Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu>
As another view of the Supreme Court decision, I offer this note forwarded by Michael Moore (sorry for the length, but I think it's interesting).

Frank Rusciano

December 14, 2000 evening

Dear friends,

Please take a few moments and read this excellent piece on the Supreme Court's decision that made Bush "president." Pass it around to all your friends. It's the best thing I've seen.

Yours,

Michael Moore
mmflint@aol.com
www.michaelmoore.com

A LAYMAN'S GUIDE TO THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN BUSH V. GORE by Mark H. Levine, Attorney at Law.

Q: I'm not a lawyer and I don't understand the recent Supreme Court decision in Bush v. Gore. Can you explain it to me?

A: Sure. I'm a lawyer. I read it. It says Bush wins, even if Gore got the most votes.

Q: But wait a second. The US Supreme Court has to give a reason, right?

A: Right.

Q: So Bush wins because hand-counts are illegal?

A: Oh no. Six of the justices (two-thirds majority) believed the hand-counts were legal and should be done.

Q: Oh. So the justices did not believe that the hand-counts would find any legal ballots?

A. Nope. The five conservative justices clearly held (and all nine justices agreed) "that punch card balloting machines can produce an unfortunate number of ballots which are not punched in a clean,
complete way by the voter." So there are legal votes that should be counted but can't be.

Q: Oh. Does this have something to do with states' rights? Don't conservatives love that?

A: Generally yes. These five justices, in the past few years, have held that the federal government has no business telling a sovereign state university it can't steal trade secrets just because such stealing is prohibited by law. Nor does the federal government have any business telling a state that it should bar guns in schools. Nor can the federal government use the equal protection clause to force states to take measures to stop violence against women.

Q: Is there an exception in this case?

A: Yes, the Gore exception. States have no rights to have their own state elections when it can result in Gore being elected President. This decision is limited to only this situation.

Q: C'mon. The Supremes didn't really say that. You're exaggerating.

A: Nope. They held "Our consideration is limited to the present circumstances, or the problem of equal protection in election processes generally presents many complexities."

Q: What complexities?

A: They don't say.

Q: I'll bet I know the reason. I heard Jim Baker say this. The votes can't be counted because the Florida Supreme Court "changed the rules of the election after it was held." Right?

A. Dead wrong. The US Supreme Court made clear that the Florida Supreme Court did not change the rules of the election. But the US Supreme Court found the failure of the Florida Court to change the rules was wrong.

Q: Huh?

A: The Legislature declared that the only legal standard for counting vote is "clear intent of the voter." The Florida Court was condemned for not adopting a clearer standard.

Q: I thought the Florida Court was not allowed to change the Legislature's law after the election.

A: Right.

Q: So what's the problem?

A: They should have. The US Supreme Court said the Florida Supreme Court should have "adopt[ed] adequate statewide standards for determining what is a legal vote"
Q: I thought only the Legislature could "adopt" new law.

A: Right.

Q: So if the Court had adopted new standards, I thought it would have been overturned.

A: Right. You're catching on.

Q: If the Court had adopted new standards, it would have been overturned for changing the rules. And if it didn't, it's overturned for not changing the rules. That means that no matter what the Florida Supreme Court did, legal votes could never be counted.

A: Right. Next question.

Q: Wait, wait. I thought the problem was "equal protection," that some counties counted votes differently from others. Isn't that a problem?

A: It sure is. Across the nation, we vote in a hodgepodge of systems. Some, like the optical-scanners in largely Republican-leaning counties record 99.7% of the votes. Some, like the punchcard systems in largely Democratic-leaning counties record only 97% of the votes. So approximately 3% of Democratic votes are thrown in the trash can.

Q: Aha! That's a severe equal-protection problem!!!

A: No it's not. The Supreme Court wasn't worried about the 3% of Democratic ballots thrown in the trashcan in Florida. That "complexity" was not a problem.

Q: Was it the butterfly ballots that violated Florida law and tricked more than 20,000 Democrats to vote for Buchanan or Gore and Buchanan.

A: Nope. The Supreme Court has no problem believing that Buchanan got his highest, best support in a precinct consisting of a Jewish old age home with Holocaust survivors, who apparently have changed their mind about Hitler.

Q: Yikes. So what was the serious equal protection problem?

A: The problem was neither the butterfly ballot nor the 3% of Democrats (largely African-American) disenfranchised. The problem is that somewhat less than .005% of the ballots may have been determined under slightly different standards because judges sworn to uphold the law and doing their best to accomplish the legislative mandate of "clear intent of the voter" may have a slightly different opinion about the voter's intent.
Q: Hmmm. OK, so if those votes are thrown out, you can still count the votes where everyone agrees the voter's intent is clear?

A: Nope.

Q: Why not?

A: No time.

Q: No time to count legal votes where everyone, even Republicans, agree the intent is clear? Why not?

A: Because December 12 was yesterday.

Q: Is December 12 a deadline for counting votes?


Q: So why is December 12 important?

A: December 12 is a deadline by which Congress can't challenge the results.

Q: What does the Congressional role have to do with the Supreme Court?

A: Nothing.

Q: But I thought ---

A: The Florida Supreme Court had earlier held it would like to complete its work by December 12 to make things easier for Congress. The United States Supreme Court is trying to help the Florida Supreme Court out by forcing the Florida court to abide by a deadline that everyone agrees is not binding.

Q: But I thought the Florida Court was going to just barely have the votes counted by December 12.

A: They would have made it, but the five conservative justices stopped the recount last Saturday.

Q: Why?

A: Justice Scalia said some of the counts may not be legal.

Q: So why not separate the votes into piles, indentations for Gore, hanging chads for Bush, votes that everyone agrees went to one candidate or the other so that we know exactly how Florida voted before determining who won? Then, if some ballots (say, indentations) have to be thrown out, the American people will know right away who won Florida.

A: Great idea! The US Supreme Court rejected it. They held that such counts would likely to produce election results showing Gore won and Gore's winning would cause "public acceptance" and that would "cast[] a cloud" over Bush's "legitimacy" that would harm "democratic stability."
Q: In other words, if America knows the truth that Gore won, they won't accept the US Supreme Court overturning Gore's victory?

A: Yes.

Q: Is that a legal reason to stop recounts? or a political one?

A: Let's just say in all of American history and all of American law, this reason has no basis in law. But that doesn't stop the five conservatives from creating new law out of thin air.

Q: Aren't these conservative justices against judicial activism?

A: Yes, when liberal judges are perceived to have done it.

Q: Well, if the December 12 deadline is not binding, why not count the votes?

A: The US Supreme Court, after admitting the December 12 deadline is not binding, set December 12 as a binding deadline at 10 p.m. on December 12.

Q: Didn't the US Supreme Court condemn the Florida Supreme Court for arbitrarily setting a deadline?

A: Yes.

Q: But, but --

A: Not to worry. The US Supreme Court does not have to follow laws it sets for other courts.

Q: So who caused Florida to miss the December 12 deadline?

A: The Bush lawyers who first went to court to stop the recount, the mob in Miami that got paid Florida vacations for intimidating officials, and the US Supreme Court for stopping the recount.

Q: So who is punished for this behavior?

A: Gore, of course.

Q: Tell me this: Florida's laws are unconstitutional, right?

A: Yes

Q: And the laws of 50 states that allow votes to be cast or counted differently are unconstitutional?

A: Yes. And 33 of those states have the "clear intent of the voter" standard that the US Supreme Court found was illegal in Florida.

Q: Then why aren't the results of 33 states thrown out?

A: Um. Because...um.....the Supreme Court doesn't say...
Q: But if Florida's certification includes counts expressly declared by the US Supreme Court to be unconstitutional, we don't know who really won the election there, right?

A: Right. Though a careful analysis by the Miami Herald shows Gore won Florida by about 20,000 votes (excluding the butterfly ballot errors).

Q: So, what do we do, have a re-vote? Throw out the entire state? Count all ballots under a single uniform standard?

A: No. We just don't count the votes that favor Gore.

Q: That's completely bizarre! That sounds like rank political favoritism! Did the justices have any financial interest in the case?

A: Scalia's two sons are both lawyers working for Bush. Thomas's wife is collecting applications for people who want to work in the Bush administration.

Q: Why didn't they recuse themselves?

A: If either had recused himself, the vote would be 4-4, and the Florida Supreme Court decision allowing recounts would have been affirmed.

Q: I can't believe the justices acted in such a blatantly political way.

A: Read the opinions for yourself:
http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/supremecourt/00-949_dec12.fdf
(December 9 stay stopping the recount), and
http://www.supremecourtus.gov/opinions/00pdf/00-949.pdf
(December 12 final opinion)

Q: So what are the consequences of this?

A: The guy who got the most votes in the US and in Florida and under our Constitution (Al Gore) will lose to America's second choice who won the all important 5-4 Supreme Court vote.

Q: I thought in a democracy, the guy with the most votes wins.

A: True, in a democracy. But America is not a democracy. In America, in the year 2000, the guy with the most US Supreme Court votes wins.

Q: Is there any way to stop the Supreme Court from doing this again?

A: YES. No federal judge can be confirmed without a vote in the Senate. It takes 60 votes to break a filibuster. If only 41 of the 50 Democratic Senators stand up to Bush and his Supremes and say that they will not approve a single judge appointed by him
until a President can be democratically elected in 2004, the judicial reign of terror can end... and one day we can hope to return to the rule of law.

Q: What do I do now?

A: E-mail this to everyone you know, and write or call your senator, reminding him that Gore beat Bush by several hundred thousand votes (three times Kennedy's margin over Nixon) and that you believe that VOTERS rather than JUDGES should determine who wins an election by counting every vote. And to protect our judiciary from overturning the will of the people, you want them to confirm NO NEW JUDGES until 2004 when a president is finally chosen by most of the American people.

-- MarkLevineEsq@aol.com

--
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During the course of a discussion this evening on PBA's News Hour Michael Novak (American Enterprise Institute) made a statement that church going people tended to vote for Bush while those who didn't attend Church or whose attendance was infrequent tended to vote for Gore. The comment was disputed by Alan Wolfe (Boston College) who claimed it was totally untrue. He went on to say that this was the kind of rhetoric that serves no useful purpose if Republicans truly believe that the country needs to heal and want to help in that process. To him, the remark

Does anyone have information about the relationship between church going and voting behavior? While this issue may strike some of us as "What?!?!", we have to remember that Novak is well known and does represent a highly politically conservative organization. The implications of his remark, namely that God is on the side of the Republicans does reflect the thinking of many right wing conservatives. The implications for political discourse are rather obvious.

Dick Halpern

--
No, no. He's saying that those on the side of God vote Republican. That God is on the side of the Republicans goes without saying. He may not have made so many of them but he sure made them mostly richer than Democrats. (Republicans also are strict constructionists and know that all the seemingly pro-po' stuff in the Bible has to be constructed mighty strictly and that absolutely nobody goes to Hades in a Mercedes.) I expect you will be bombarded with the references showing Novak has plenty of poll data he can cite. All of which leads me to say, "Thank God I'm an atheist!"

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

dick halpern wrote:
> > During the course of a discussion this evening on PBA's News Hour
> > Michael Novak (American Enterprise Institute) made a statement that
> > church going people tended to vote for Bush while those who didn't
> > attend Church or whose attendance was infrequent tended to vote for
> > Gore. The comment was disputed by Alan Wolfe (Boston College) who
> > claimed it was totally untrue. He went on to say that this was the
> > kind of rhetoric that serves no useful purpose if Republicans truly
> > believe that the country needs to heal and want to help in that
> > process. To him, the remark
> > > Does anyone have information about the relationship between church
> > going and voting behavior? While this issue may strike some of us as
> > "What??!", we have to remember that Novak is well known and does
> > represent a highly politically conservative organization. The
> > implications of his remark, namely that God is on the side of the
> > Republicans does reflect the thinking of many right wing
> > conservatives. The implications for political discourse are rather
> > obvious.
> > > Dick Halpern

========================================================================
According to Voter News Service election day voter polls, those who attend religious services frequently were more likely to vote for Bush than those who attend less frequently. This relationship has been observed for many years in U.S. politics. It also holds within the major religious traditions of mainline Protestants, evangelicals, and Catholics. Among black Protestants, there is evidence that frequent churchgoers are more likely to vote Democratic than are those who attend less frequently.

Here is the breakdown from VNS (all voters):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attend religious services</th>
<th>Gore</th>
<th>Bush</th>
<th>Nader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once a month</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On Sat, 16 Dec 2000, dick halpern wrote:

> During the course of a discussion this evening on PBA's News Hour
> Michael
> Novak (American Enterprise Institute) made a statement that church going
> people tended to vote for Bush while those who didn't attend Church or
> whose attendance was infrequent tended to vote for Gore. The comment was
> disputed by Alan Wolfe (Boston College) who claimed it was totally untrue.
> He went on to say that this was the kind of rhetoric that serves no useful
> purpose if Republicans truly believe that the country needs to heal and
> want to help in that process. To him, the remark
> Does anyone have information about the relationship between church
> going
> and voting behavior? While this issue may strike some of us as "What?!?!",
> we have to remember that Novak is well known and does represent a highly
> politically conservative organization. The implications of his remark,
> namely that God is on the side of the Republicans does reflect the thinking
> of many right wing conservatives. The implications for political discourse
> are rather obvious.
> Dick Halpern
>

---------------------------
Scott Keeter
Dept. of Public and International Affairs
George Mason University MSN 3F4
Fairfax, VA 22030-4444
Voice 703 993 1412
Department fax 703 993 1399
Personal fax 703 832 0209
E-mail skeeter@gmu.edu
Web site http://mason.gmu.edu/~skeeter
Democrats and minorities in substantial numbers do not consider the soon-to-be presidency of Republican George W. Bush as legitimate, a new Reuters/NBC/Zogby survey reveals.

The survey was conducted Wednesday December 13 of 521 likely voters nationwide who voted in the 2000 presidential elections showed that an overall 59% of those surveyed called the Bush presidency legitimate with 37% who believe the presidency is not legitimate. Another 5% were undecided.

The survey has a margin of sampling error of +/- 4.5%. (Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding).

A strong majority of Democrats (65%) said the presidency was "not legitimate" while 27% said "legitimate." Of the Independent likely voters, 61% said "legitimate" and 34% said "not legitimate" compared to 92% of Republican respondents who said "legitimate" and 6% who said not legitimate.

Three-fourths (77%) of the African American respondents deemed the presidency "not legitimate" compared to 17% who said "legitimate." At the same time more than half of the Hispanic respondents (53%) also termed the presidency "not legitimate" compared to 39% who said "legitimate."

"If you define legitimacy as the will of the people, do you consider a George W. Bush presidency legitimate or not legitimate?"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOP</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------

Copyright 2000 by Zogby International

*****

Date: Sat, 16 Dec 2000 12:12:36 -0500
From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012160903110.29571-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Bush presidency judged as "not legitimate" by minorities, Dems. (Zogby)

Jim Beniger: Isn't the Zogby release misleading when it says they interviewed 521 people and the margin of error is plus or minus 4.5%, but the crucial figures are for subcategories (Blacks, Hispanics) which are maybe 50 people, with a much larger margin of error? Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Saturday, December 16, 2000 12:03 PM
Subject: Bush presidency judged as "not legitimate" by minorities, Dems. (Zogby)
Democrats and minorities in substantial numbers do not consider the
soon-to-be presidency of Republican George W. Bush as legitimate, a
new Reuters/NBC/Zogby survey reveals.

The survey was conducted Wednesday December 13 of 521 likely voters
nationwide who voted in the 2000 presidential elections showed that an
overall 59% of those surveyed called the Bush presidency legitimate
with 37% who believe the presidency is not legitimate. Another 5%
were undecided.

The survey has a margin of sampling error of +/- 4.5%. (Percentages
may not add up to 100 due to rounding).

A strong majority of Democrats (65%) said the presidency was "not
legitimate" while 27% said "legitimate." Of the Independent likely
voters, 61% said "legitimate" and 34% said "not legitimate" compared
to 92% of Republican respondents who said "legitimate" and 6% who
said not legitimate.

Three-fourths (77%) of the African American respondents deemed the
presidency "not legitimate" compared to 17% who said "legitimate." At
the same time more than half of the Hispanic respondents (53%) also
tered the presidency "not legitimate" compared to 39% who said
"legitimate."

"If you define legitimacy as the will of the people, do you consider
a George W. Bush presidency legitimate or not legitimate?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is misleading is the headline itself inasmuch as it implies that the election result is due to some contravention of legitimate procedures for selecting a president. Since most people believe that Gore won the popular election, and that "the will of the people" is a reference to plurality, the wording of the question makes the finding completely unremarkable except as an exercise in propaganda.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Allen Barton <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Saturday, December 16, 2000 12:13 PM
Subject: Re: Bush presidency judged as "not legitimate" by minorities, Dems. (Zogby)

Jim Beniger: Isn't the Zogby release misleading when it says they interviewed 521 people and the margin of error is plus or minus 4.5%, but the crucial figures are for subcategories (Blacks, Hispanics) which are maybe 50 people, with a much larger margin of error? Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Saturday, December 16, 2000 12:03 PM
Subject: Bush presidency judged as "not legitimate" by minorities, Dems.

(Zogby)

New Reuters/NBC/Zogby survey reveals: by minorities, Democrats

Democrats and minorities in substantial numbers do not consider the soon-to-be presidency of Republican George W. Bush as legitimate, a new Reuters/NBC/Zogby survey reveals.

The survey was conducted Wednesday December 13 of 521 likely voters nationwide who voted in the 2000 presidential elections showed that an overall 59% of those surveyed called the Bush presidency legitimate with 37% who believe the presidency is not legitimate. Another 5% were undecided.

The survey has a margin of sampling error of +/- 4.5%. (Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding).

A strong majority of Democrats (65%) said the presidency was "not legitimate" while 27% said "legitimate." Of the Independent likely voters, 61% said "legitimate" and 34% said "not legitimate" compared to 92% of Republican respondents who said "legitimate" and 6% who
said not legitimate.

Three-fourths (77%) of the African American respondents deemed the presidency "not legitimate" compared to 17% who said "legitimate." At the same time more than half of the Hispanic respondents (53%) also termed the presidency "not legitimate" compared to 39% who said "legitimate."

"If you define legitimacy as the will of the people, do you consider a George W. Bush presidency legitimate or not legitimate?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Legitimate</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOP</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Copyright 2000 by Zogby International

---

Date: Sat, 16 Dec 2000 10:17:19 -0800 (PST)
From: James Beniger <beniger@rcf.usc.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu
On Sat, 16 Dec 2000, Allen Barton wrote:

> JIm Beniger: Isn't the Zogby release misleading when it says they
> interviewed 521 people and the margin of error is plus or minus 4.5%,
> but the crucial figures are for subcategories (Blacks, Hispanics) which are
> maybe 50 people, with a much larger margin of error? Allen Barton

Allen,

Yes and no. Yes, your own point is of course correct. But, no, the
release clearly makes the claim only for "the survey":

>> The survey has a margin of sampling error of +/- 4.5%. (Percentages
> may not add up to 100 due to rounding).

As for the subcategories and cells of the table, yes, what you say is a
point well worth keeping in mind. That said, I feel that
it's usually better to measure something crudely than not measure it at all
(not always, of course, but when not, we cannot say),
and the point estimates of the cell percentages remain the best (that is,
MLE, or maximum
likelihood) unbiased estimates that we have of the actual percentages in
the
cells, quite apart from sample size. In other words,
they may not be very accurate, and in any case we cannot know--but we can
say
that they are unbiased. That's unbiased only in the
statistical sense, of course-- whether there is bias in question wording,
question order, or data processing (among many other
possibilities) we cannot say.

In short, the answer is clearly "yes and no"!

-- Jim

******

=========================================================================
James,

Because I posted the poll release, I feel obligated to respond to you, but I'm afraid I have no idea what you mean here. The "headline" is attached only to the press release, and applies only to the poll findings, as interpreted by those who conducted the poll--the headline does not influence the poll results, nor must the headline be retained by any who wish to report the findings. Nor do I believe that Reuters or NBC or Zogby are particularly biased against George W. Bush. So what is your point--what am I missing here?

If you are worried about the fact that Gore received the plurality of the total votes, I note that the release makes no claim about the meaning of the term "legitimacy." I must say that, were this seen to be "misleading," then virtually all poll releases ever written would have to be viewed as such. Don't we all already know that responses are never any better than the questions asked?

-- Jim

On Sat, 16 Dec 2000, James P. Murphy wrote:

> What is misleading is the headline itself inasmuch as it implies that > the election result is due to some contravention of legitimate > procedures for selecting a president. Since most people believe that > Gore won the popular election, and that "the will of the people" is a > reference to plurality, the wording of the question makes the finding > completely unremarkable except as an exercise in propaganda.

========================================
Date: Sat, 16 Dec 2000 16:39:29 -0500
From: "Allen Barton" <allenbarton@mindspring.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
References: <Pine.GSO.4.21.0012160954300.29571-100000@almaak.usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Bush presidency judged as "not legitimate" by minorities, Dems. (Zogby)
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400
To Jim Beniger: When lay people read "the survey" is accurate to +/- 4.5% and then see figures both for the total sample and various subgroups, they are very likely to assume the error range applies to all the figures, especially when a big point is made of the subgroups as it was here. Are the subgroup figures not part of "the survey"? I have seen surveys which added the disclaimer that "figures for subgroups have a wider range of error." which I think is the least that an ethical researcher can do to avoid misleading non-technical readers. It is probably too much to expect reporting of the significance levels of group differences, or their error range.

As for another discussant's complaint that the report's use of the term "legitimacy" is misleading, the researchers at least defined it for the respondents and reported that definition. However the wording used certainly confused the issue of whether the legitimacy problem arises because the electoral college system didn't give the presidency to the winner of the national popular vote ("the will of the people"), or because Bush shouldn't even win in the electoral college because of the failure to properly count the Florida vote (the will of the Florida people). I suspect that the minority respondents thought the whole damn thing was illegitimate from the obstacles to minority voters voting at all to the inaccurate counting in punch-card districts which included most minorities to the electoral college problem. It would be useful for a survey to distinguish the sources of perceptions of illegitimacy, if only with a simple "why?" question. "Vox populi est vox machinae," and "Non illegitimi carborundum," as we Latinists say.

Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "James Beniger" <beniger@rcf.usc.edu> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Saturday, December 16, 2000 1:17 PM 
Subject: Re: Bush presidency judged as "not legitimate" by minorities, Dems. (Zogby) 

> >
> > On Sat, 16 Dec 2000, Allen Barton wrote:
> >
> > Jim Beniger: Isn't the Zogby release misleading when it says they
> > interviewed 521 people and the margin of error is plus or minus
> > 4.5%,
> >
> > the crucial figures are for subcategories (Blacks, Hispanics) which are
> > maybe 50 people, with a much larger margin of error? Allen Barton
> >
> > Allen,
> >
> > Yes and no. Yes, your own point is of course correct. But, no, the
release clearly makes the claim only for "the survey":

The survey has a margin of sampling error of +/- 4.5%. (Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding).

As for the subcategories and cells of the table, yes, what you say is a point well worth keeping in mind. That said, I feel that it's usually better to measure something crudely than not measure it at all (not always, of course, but when not, we cannot say), and the point estimates of the cell percentages remain the best (that is, MLE, or maximum likelihood) unbiased estimates that we have of the actual percentages in the cells, quite apart from sample size. In other words, they may not be very accurate, and in any case we cannot know--but we can say that they are unbiased. That's unbiased only in the statistical sense, of course--whether there is bias in question wording, question order, or data processing (among many other possibilities) we cannot say.

In short, the answer is clearly "yes and no"!

-- Jim

*******

Just to be more precise about this topic -- Gallup polling has also shown that those who attend religious service weekly or more gave Bush a big lead; those who attend infrequently gave Gore a modest lead; and those who attend "never" gave Gore a big lead (big=double digit; modest = single digit). So, the more frequently one attends Church service, the more likely the person was to support Bush over Gore.

However, Gallup polling also shows that among black voters, there is no difference in support for Gore by frequency of attending religious service -- those who attend weekly or more are about as likely to vote for Gore over Bush as those who attend less frequently. (And blacks...
supported Gore by about a 9-1 ratio.)

So, to say that Bush supporters are on the side of "God" REALLY means that white Bush supporters are more likely to attend religious service frequently than white Gore supporters. In fact, when one looks at it that way, we find that only about half of Bush's white supporters (53% or so) attend weekly, while a third attend infrequently, and 11% never attend. (The numbers among white voters who supported Gore indicate less frequent attendance: 35% weekly, 42% infrequently, and 20% never).

Among black voters, we had too few in our sample who chose Bush, but those who supported Gore show the following attendance: 53% weekly, 42% infrequently, and 3% "never" -- clearly as "religious" as Bush's white supporters. (With all the examples, a small percentage gave no response, which is why the numbers do not add to 100%).

So, while the figures are not likely to support a divine interpretation of the election outcome (unless one wants to speculate how "God" judges white vs. black voters), the figures do reflect what Alan Wolfe is loathe to admit (based on his extensive focus grouping among middle class Americans...and how can we doubt such results?!?) that there is a cultural/religious devotion divide in America that is related to, and cross cuts with, our political and racial divisions. Regardless of one's spiritual and partisan orientation, those cross-cutting divisions would seem to be of considerable interest in understanding the recent election and the political environment in America today, and probably ought not to be confused with whatever steps toward "healing" the pundits feel are necessary.

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hulfish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-9600
david_moore@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Albert D. Biderman [mailto:abider@american.edu]
Sent: Saturday, December 16, 2000 12:50 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Do Church Goers tend to vote Republican?

No, no. He's saying that those on the side of God vote Republican. That God is on the side of the Republicans goes without saying. He may not have made so many of them but he sure made them mostly richer than Democrats. (Republicans also are strict constructionists and know
that all the seemingly pro-po' stuff in the Bible has
to be constructed mighty strictly and that absolutely nobody goes to Hades in
a Mercedes.) I expect you will be bombarded with the
references showing Novak has plenty of poll data he can cite. All of which
leads me to say, "Thank God I'm an atheist!"

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

dick halpern wrote:
>
> During the course of a discussion this evening on PBA's News Hour
> Michael Novak (American Enterprise Institute) made a statement that
> church going people tended to vote for Bush while those who didn't
> attend Church or whose attendance was infrequent tended to vote for
> Gore. The comment was disputed by Alan Wolfe (Boston College) who
> claimed it was totally untrue. He went on to say that this was the
> kind of rhetoric that serves no useful purpose if Republicans truly
> believe that the country needs to heal and want to help in that
> process. To him, the remark
> > Does anyone have information about the relationship between church
> > going and voting behavior? While this issue may strike some of us as
> > "What?!?!", we have to remember that Novak is well known and does
> > represent a highly politically conservative organization. The
> > implications of his remark, namely that God is on the side of the
> > Republicans does reflect the
> > thinking
> > of many right wing conservatives. The implications for political
> > discourse are rather obvious.
> >
> > Dick Halpern

---

Date: Sun, 17 Dec 2000 22:31:33 -0500
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: dick halpern <rshalpern@mindspring.com>
Subject: KMiami Herlad: Punch card problems were ignored for years in
Florida
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary=""==_2236485==.ALT"

--_2236485==.ALT
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

From the Miami Herald..........how local politics can influence the
outcome of the presidential election. Aside from updating old equipment,
the need for agreement on some sort of overall standard seems obvious.

Dick Halpern

Published Sunday, December 17, 2000, in the Miami Herald
Punch card problems were ignored for years

BY PETER WHORISKEY AND JOSEPH TANFANI
Florida elections supervisors continued to use punch-card ballots despite numerous signs over 20 years that they botched thousands of votes and could throw into doubt the outcome of any close race.

The 2000 election debacle erupted because these warnings were largely ignored:

Thousands of punch-card votes were being rejected every election. In the 1992 and 1996 elections, the earliest for which complete data are available, the presidential votes on more than 20 of every 1,000 ballots were not counted because ballots were either double-punched, unpunched or incompletely punched, a survey of Florida's 12 most populous counties shows.

Manufacturers of voting machines knew that "hanging chad" was a significant problem throughout the '70s, when the machines became widespread in Florida, patent documents show. Hanging chads prevent the counting machines from accurately recording ballots.

Candidates in close races were complaining about "overvotes" and "undervotes" as far back as the '70s. Sometimes these candidates sued. But canvassing boards and judges typically dismissed their complaints.

Two large counties, Brevard and Volusia, recognized the problems with punch cards and switched to "optical scan" systems in which voters shade in ovals. The proportion of discarded ballots in these counties dropped from 26 per 1,000 to three or fewer per 1,000. But most of the large counties kept the punch-card ballots, shrugging off evidence that thousands of voters were being silenced in every election.

Many of these problems were summarized in a 1988 National Bureau of Standards report that recommended abandoning pre-scored punch-card ballots. The report was distributed to elections offices around the country.

The presidential election just months later rendered that federal warning prophetic: One in 12 Miami-Dade voters cast a ballot on which the machine did not find a valid presidential vote. Similar problems erupted in that year's U.S. Senate contest in Palm Beach, Broward and Hillsborough counties.

"The question you have to ask is, 'Why did elections supervisors continue with punch cards?'" said Roy Saltman, the author of the report. "All the evidence said there was a serious problem."
Elections supervisors in most large counties say they either did not recognize the ruined ballots as a significant issue or believed that no other voting method was significantly more accurate.

Miami-Dade Supervisor of Elections David Leahy: "Until we got to this election, no one ever looked at undervotes or overvotes. I didn't think of them."

Later, asked about a number of undervote and overvote complaints brought by candidates in Miami-Dade, he said: "I've always been concerned about hanging chads. It's always been a flaw in the system."

However, Leahy said he is skeptical of using the optical scan equipment -- because counting ballots at the precinct rather than in a central location raises the possibility of far-flung mistakes or manipulation. The ballots are counted at precincts so they can be rejected immediately if voters make mistakes such as double-punching.

"Optical scan is not utopia," he said. "There's no perfect system. There's no system that's put on the market that prevents a voter from making an error."

SIGNS MISREAD

Elections supervisors have long viewed the rejection of thousands of ballots as a natural part of elections, not as an ominous warning sign.

Some people accidentally mark too many candidates on a ballot. These so-called "overvote" ballots are not counted.

Some people intentionally do not vote in some races, particularly when they lack familiarity with the candidates. These are called "undervote" ballots, and they aren't counted either.

As a result some elections supervisors and some Republicans argue that the proportion of uncounted ballots in the 2000 presidential election was not unacceptable.

"I don't get it," Joan Brock, deputy supervisor of elections in Pinellas County, said of the furor over this year's undervotes. "Not everyone votes for president, and it wouldn't surprise me to see that two percent of them didn't want to vote for president."
A closer look at voting records, however, suggests that very few people go to the polls in presidential elections without intending to vote for president, and that thousands of would-be voters every election are thwarted by punch-card ballots.

Consider, for example, the experience of Brevard County, the largest Florida county that has used both punch cards and fill-in-the-oval ballots.

In 1996, the last presidential election tallied on punch cards, 26 of every 1,000 voters failed to cast a valid presidential vote.

In 2000, after the switch to fill-in-the-oval ballots, the proportion fell to fewer than two of every 1,000 presidential ballots cast.

``We knew we had voters out there who were being disenfranchised because of overvotes and undervotes,'' said Gayle Graham, the assistant supervisor of elections in Brevard. ``So we switched. Using a pencil to mark a ballot is just so much simpler. It's like filling in a lottery ticket.''

**BEFTER SYSTEM**

Swapping from punch-card ballots to fill-in-the-oval ballots in Volusia County also led to a steep drop in rejected ballots. With punch cards, 26 of every 1,000 voters failed to cast valid presidential votes; after the switch, that number fell to just three of every 1,000.

Optical scan systems work better for two reasons, election supervisors in those counties said.

First, using a pencil to fill in ovals on a ballot comes naturally to most people. They've done something similar on SAT tests and lottery tickets. Few people ever punch cards with a stylus, aside from when they vote.

Second, the fill-in-the-ovals method often has counting machines in every precinct that kick back ballots to voters who overvote, so they can make corrections immediately.

``Voters find the optical scan ballots much easier to use,'' said Deanie Lowe, supervisor of elections in Volusia. ``They are much more user-friendly.''

Punch-card ballot machines became widespread in Florida during the '70s, typically replacing the old closet-sized, lever-operated voting booths.
Punch-card salesmen boasted that their voting systems could count votes faster and were easier to store and set up.

Almost immediately, however, users of punch-card systems confronted a serious problem -- "hanging chad," patent documents show.

One of the first patents for punch-card voting machines, submitted by Votomatic inventor Joseph Harris in 1964, boasted that, by design, "complete punching out of the chip is insured."

Four years later, however, another inventor, Ira G. Laws of Tulsa, working for Seismograph Service Corp., recognized the need for more accuracy in punch-card counts, because some voters were not punching completely through the ballot.

"Anyone who worked on these things noticed that every once in a while at least some of the holes will not punch cleanly. It wasn't uncommon at all," Laws said in an interview.

"It's not the fault of the voters that the chad does not punch out occasionally. I think it's just inherent in the device."

He proposed and patented alterations to the stylus that were supposed to avoid such inaccuracies.

"We didn't think we had eliminated the hanging chad problem, but we thought we had made an improvement," he said.

Twelve years later, after thousands of the punch-card balloting devices were sold around the country, the chads were still hanging. A third inventor, John Ahmann, who testified during the Leon County legal proceedings this year, filed still another plan to fix the Votomatic.

His patent identified "hanging chad" as "one of the main detractors of punch card voting." He proposed a number of changes to address the problem, including a way to align the punch holes and the cards better to reduce the possibility of dimples and hanging chads.

He said many of those features are incorporated into the voting devices of
Miami-Dade County, which ordered new equipment in the 1980s. Broward, Palm Beach and other Florida counties have the older equipment, Ahmann said.

Even newer equipment, if it's not maintained properly, can cause problems, particularly if the rubber or plastic strips that help pull off chads become worn.

``On any of the machines, if the t-strips are worn to the point where they don't hold the chad, you might get hanging chad,'' Ahmann said. ``They need to be maintained. Depending on how many elections you have and how many times you punch in the same punch position, they can last 20 years or more without replacement of the t-strips.''

The punch card manufacturers were not the only ones noticing the pitfalls of the punch cards.

Candidates complained -- even after the design changes the manufacturers made to eliminate problems. Canvassing boards and courts frequently dismissed the complaints, citing issues such as the cost and impracticality of hand counts.

CANDIDATE COMPLAINS

In 1977, in one of the first Miami-Dade races run on punch cards, a Miami Beach City Council candidate complained to a judge that 710 votes were tossed out because people had punched too many times. The judge dismissed the case.

In 1984, David Anderson, a candidate to become Palm Beach County property appraiser filed suit over, among other things, ``hanging chad.'' He lost that legal battle -- on what Anderson says was a technicality -- but now feels vindicated.

``To all of a sudden to say `Oh, we're so surprised by these problems!' -- they're not surprised,'' Anderson said. ``Those Votomatics should have been changed a long time ago.''

In 1991, taxpayer activist Al Hogan lost a seat on the Oakland Park City Council in Broward County by three votes.

He appealed to the canvassing board for a recount but lost, even though the board acknowledged hanging chads might have cost him votes.

Hogan, now 90 years old, still believes hanging chads undid his candidacy.

``I always felt it was that way,'' he said. ``I'm just about positive I won. I didn't think
it was fair all the way through.''

WHO SUFFERS MOST

None of this would matter if lost votes affected all candidates equally. But they don't.

The use of punch cards in Florida appears to favor Republican candidates at the expense of Democrats, who are much more likely to overvote or undervote, possibly because of socioeconomic factors.

Democrat Buddy MacKay believes his 1988 Senate candidacy became a casualty of punch card voting, when he lost by just 33,612 votes out of more than four million cast. About one in five Miami-Dade voters failed to cast a valid vote in that race.

``There was a 200,000 vote undercount in the four largest Democratic counties,'' said MacKay, formerly the state's lieutenant governor. ``It's about the same situation that Al Gore is in.''

MacKay says it's unthinkable that so many Florida counties still use punch-card ballots.

``This was the technology used at the University of Florida when I was there, and that was before the Earth cooled,'' he said. ``If anybody ever focuses on it, it's an outrage.

``We do like to think every vote counts.''

WHY CARDS REMAINED

Elections supervisors in Florida's large counties offer various reasons for sticking with punch cards.

Palm Beach County Supervisor of Elections Theresa LePore said she thought that past undervote problems had been solved four years ago when the county bought new styluses: ``We thought they were fixed and didn't look anymore,'' she said.

Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections Pam Iorio said: ``Whether it's punch-card or optical scan . . . what you're accepting going on in elections is, there's a certain amount of voter error.''

She said optical-scan devices, at about $5,700 per precinct, offer only a marginal
improvement in accuracy for millions of dollars in expense.

Only one elections office among Florida's five largest counties recognized serious problems in the punch-card ballots and sought a change: In memos to the County Commission, Broward's then-Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll criticized punch cards as antiquated, confusing and inaccurate.

For seven years, she tried to switch to the optical scan system. She couldn't get the money. County commissioners fretted that something better would come along and they'd be stuck with an expensive but outdated system.

Their stance drew a biting rebuke from Carroll.

``If the theory of waiting to see what will come along in the future had been employed, we would still be on a manual registration system and hand-counting paper ballots brought in by horse-drawn carriages,'' she wrote in a 1993 memo.

Carroll blames politics. She says she had the votes lined up for a new system in 1993 until a competitor hired lobbyists to influence commissioners. Carroll, though, was criticized at the time for not seeking bids.

``Literally overnight, support evaporated,'' Carroll said. ```I think it was definitely the lobbying.''

Broward Commissioner Lori Parrish, a Democrat and a consistent opponent of buying new voting technology, said she now regrets her opposition. ```All of us are kicking ourselves in the rear end,'' Parrish said. --

From the Miami Herald ............ how local politics can influence the outcome of the presidential election. Aside from updating old equipment, the need for agreement on some sort of overall standard seems obvious.

Punch card problems were ignored for years by Peter Whoriskey and Joseph Tanfani

Florida elections supervisors continued to use punch-card ballots despite numerous signs over 20 years that they botched thousands of votes and could throw into doubt the outcome of any close race. The 2000 election debacle erupted because these warnings were largely ignored:
rejected every election. In the 1992 and 1996 elections, the earliest for which complete data are available, the
presidential votes on more than 20 of every 1,000 ballots were not counted because ballots were either
double-punched, unpunched or incompletely punched, a survey of Florida's 12 most populous counties shows.
Manufacturers of voting machines knew that "hanging chad" was a significant problem throughout the '70s,
when the machines became widespread in Florida, patent documents show. Hanging chads prevent the counting machines
from accurately recording ballots. Candidates in close races were complaining about "overvotes" and "undervotes" as far back as the '70s. Sometimes these candidates sued. But canvassing boards and judges typically dismissed their complaints. Two large counties, Brevard and Volusia, recognized the problems with punch cards and switched to "optical scan" systems in which voters shade in ovals. The proportion of discarded ballots in these counties dropped from 26 per 1,000 to three or fewer per 1,000. But most of the large counties kept the punch-card ballots, shrugging off evidence that thousands of voters were being silenced in every election.
Many of these problems were summarized in a 1988 National Bureau of Standards report that recommended abandoning pre-scored punch-card ballots. The report was distributed to elections offices around the country. The presidential election just months later rendered that federal warning prophetic: One in 12 Miami-Dade voters cast a ballot on which the machine did not find a valid presidential vote. Similar problems erupted in that year's U.S. Senate contest in Palm Beach, Broward and Hillsborough counties.
"The question you have to ask is, 'Why did elections supervisors continue with punch cards?' " said Roy Saltman, the author of the report. "All the evidence said there was a serious problem." Elections supervisors in most large counties say they either did not recognize the ruined ballots as a significant issue or believed that no other voting method was significantly more accurate. Miami-Dade Supervisor of Elections David Leahy: "Until we got to this election, no one ever looked at undervotes or overvotes. I didn't think of them." Later, asked about a number of undervote and overvote complaints brought by candidates in Miami-Dade, he said: "I've always been concerned about hanging chads. It's always been a flaw in the system." However, Leahy said he is skeptical of using the optical scan equipment because counting ballots at the precinct rather than in a central location raises the possibility of far-flung mistakes or manipulation. The ballots are counted at precincts so they can be rejected immediately if voters
make mistakes such as double-punching. "Optical scan is not utopia," he said. "There's no perfect system. There's no system that's put on the market that prevents a voter from making an error." Elections supervisors have long viewed the rejection of thousands of ballots as a natural part of elections, not as an ominous warning sign. Some people accidentally mark too many candidates on a ballot. These so-called "overvote" ballots are not counted. Some people intentionally do not vote in some races, particularly when they lack familiarity with the candidates. These are called "undervote" ballots, and they aren't counted either. As a result some elections supervisors and some Republicans argue that the proportion of uncounted ballots in the 2000 presidential election was not unacceptable. "I don't get it," Joan Brock, deputy supervisor of elections in Pinellas County, said. Not everyone votes for president, and it wouldn't surprise me to see that two percent of them didn't want to vote for president. A closer look at voting records, however, suggests that very few people go to the polls in presidential elections without intending to vote for president, and that thousands of would-be voters every election are thwarted by punch-card ballots. Consider, for example, the experience of Brevard County, the largest Florida county that has used both punch cards and fill-in-the-oval ballots. In 1996, the last presidential election tallied on punch cards, 26 of every 1,000 voters failed to cast a valid presidential vote. In 2000, after the switch to fill-in-the-oval ballots, the proportion fell to fewer than two of every 1,000 presidential ballots cast. "We knew we had voters out there who were being disenfranchised because of overvotes and undervotes," said Gayle Graham, the assistant supervisor of elections in Brevard. "So we switched. Using a pencil to mark a ballot is just so much simpler. It's like filling in a lottery ticket." Swapping from punch-card ballots to fill-in-the-oval ballots in Volusia County also led to a steep drop in rejected ballots. With punch cards, 26 of every 1,000 voters failed to cast valid presidential votes; after the switch, that number fell to just three of every 1,000. Optical scan systems work better for two reasons, election supervisors in those counties said. First, using a pencil to fill in ovals on a ballot comes naturally to most people. They've done something similar on SAT tests and lottery tickets. Few people ever punch cards with a stylus, aside from when they vote. Second, the fill-in-the-ovals method often has counting machines in every precinct that kick back ballots to voters who overvote, so they can make corrections immediately. "Voters find the optical scan ballots much easier to use," said Deanie
Lowe, supervisor of elections in Volusia. "They are much more user-friendly." Punch-card ballot machines became widespread in Florida during the '70s, typically replacing the old closet-sized, lever-operated voting booths. Punch-card salesmen boasted that their voting systems could count votes faster and were easier to store and set up. Almost immediately, however, users of punch-card systems confronted a serious problem -- "hanging chad," patent documents show. One of the first patents for punch-card voting machines, submitted by Votomatic inventor Joseph Harris in 1964, boasted that, by design, "complete punching out of the chip is insured." Four years later, however, another inventor, Ira G. Laws of Tulsa, working for Seismograph Service Corp., recognized the need for more accuracy in punch-card counts, because some voters were not punching completely through the ballot. Anyone who worked on these things noticed that every once in a while at least some of the holes will not punch cleanly. It wasn't uncommon at all," Laws said in an interview. "It's not the fault of the voters that the chad does not punch out occasionally. I think it's just inherent in the device." He proposed and patented alterations to the stylus that were supposed to avoid such inaccuracies. "We didn't think we had eliminated the hanging chad problem, but we thought we had made an improvement," he said. Twelve years later, after thousands of the punch-card balloting devices were sold around the country, the chads were still hanging. A third inventor, John Ahmann, who testified during the Leon County legal proceedings this year, filed still another plan to fix the Votomatic. His patent identified "hanging chad" as "one of the main detractors of punch card voting." He proposed a number of changes to address the problem, including a way to align the punch holes and the cards better to reduce the possibility of dimples and hanging chads. He said many of those features are incorporated into the voting devices of Miami-Dade County, which ordered new equipment in the 1980s. Broward, Palm Beach and other Florida counties have the older equipment, Ahmann said. Even newer equipment, if it's not maintained properly, can cause problems, particularly if the rubber or plastic strips that help pull off chads become worn. "On any of the machines, if the t-strips are worn to the point where they don't hold the chad, you might get hanging chad," Ahmann said. "They need to be maintained. Depending on how many elections you have and how many times you punch in the same punch position, they can last 20 years or more without replacement of the t-strips." The punch card manufacturers were not the only ones noticing the pitfalls of the punch cards. Candidates complained -- even after the design changes the manufacturers made to eliminate problems. Canvassing boards and courts...
frequently dismissed complaints, citing issues such as the cost and impracticality of hand counts.

In 1977, in one of the first Miami-Dade races run on punch cards, a Miami Beach City Council candidate complained to a judge that 710 votes were tossed out because people had punched too many times. The judge dismissed the case.

In 1984, David Anderson, a candidate to become Palm Beach County property appraiser filed suit over, among other things, "hanging chad." He lost that legal battle -- on what Anderson says was a technicality -- but now feels vindicated. "To all of a sudden to say 'Oh, we're so surprised by these problems!' -- they're not surprised," Anderson said. "Those Votomatics should have been changed a long time ago." In 1991, taxpayer activist Al Hogan lost a seat on the Oakland Park City Council in Broward County by three votes. He appealed to the canvassing board for a recount but lost, even though the board acknowledged hanging chads might have cost him votes. Hogan, now 90 years old, still believes hanging chads undid his candidacy. "I always felt it was that way," he said. "I'm just about positive I won. I didn't think it was fair all the way through."

None of this would matter if lost votes affected all candidates equally. But they didn't. He lost. The use of punch cards in Florida appears to favor Republican candidates at the expense of Democrats, who are much more likely to overvote or undervote, possibly because of socioeconomic factors.

Democrat Buddy MacKay believes his 1988 Senate candidacy became a casualty of punch card voting, when he lost by just 33,612 votes out of more than four million cast. About one in five Miami-Dade voters failed to cast a valid vote in that race.

"There was a 200,000 vote undercount in the four largest Democratic counties," said MacKay, formerly the state's lieutenant governor. "It's about the same situation that Al Gore is in." MacKay says it's unthinkable that so many Florida counties still use punch-card ballots. "This was the technology used at the University of Florida when I was there, and that was before the Earth cooled," he said. "If anybody ever focuses on it, it's an outrage." We do like to think every vote counts."

Elections supervisors in Florida's large counties offer various reasons for sticking with punch cards. Theresa LePore said she thought past undervote problems had been solved four years ago when the county bought new styluses: "We thought they were fixed and didn't look anymore," she said. Pam Iorio said: "Whether it's..."
card or optical scan . . . what you're accepting going on in elections is, there's a certain amount of voter error.''

She said optical-scan devices, at about $5,700 per precinct, offer only a marginal improvement in accuracy for millions of dollars in expense. Only one elections office among Florida's five largest counties recognized serious problems in the punch-card ballots and sought a change: In memos to the County Commission, Broward's then-Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll criticized punch cards as antiquated, confusing and inaccurate. For seven years, she tried to switch to the optical scan system. She couldn't get the money. County commissioners fretted that something better would come along and they'd be stuck with an expensive but outdated system.

Their stance drew a biting rebuke from Carroll. If the theory of waiting to see what will come along in the future had been employed, we would still be on a manual registration system and hand-counting paper ballots brought in by horse-drawn carriages,'' she wrote in a 1993 memo. Carroll blames politics. She says she had the votes lined up for a new system in 1993 until a competitor hired lobbyists to influence commissioners. Carroll, though, was criticized at the time for not seeking bids. ``Literally overnight, support evaporated,'' Carroll said. ``I think it was definitely the lobbying.'' Broward Commissioner Lori Parrish, a Democrat and a consistent opponent of buying new voting technology, said she now regrets her opposition. ``All of us are kicking ourselves in the rear end,'' Parrish said.

---
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> Methodology
> This Harris Interactive election study was conducted using only the Internet.
> From October 30 through November 6, 2000, over 300,000 members of the voting-age population participated in this poll - the largest online election study in history. During the peak of the interviewing, Harris Interactive processed more than 40,000 online interviews per hour,
greater than 7,800 simultaneous interviews.
>  Final data were weighted and tabulated in real-time, using Harris
>  Interactive's proprietary systems.
>
It is my understanding that Harris' "proprietary" weighting system involves using telephone surveys to determine the appropriate weights. If that is correct, then the accuracy of their web survey is not what they claim it to be.

Richard Rands
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Washington-Baltimore Chapter of AAPOR     December 2000

Update from the President

Happy Holidays, fellow chapter members!

It has been an exciting year for the chapter. In this millenium year we have sponsored or co-sponsored almost a dozen seminars (including eight since September) on a variety of topics ranging from ethnographic research of colonias along the Texas-Mexico border, to the latest in RDD telephone sample designs, to perspectives of public opinion polling in the 2000 election. At our annual meeting this June, we adopted an aggressive agenda which included a full review and revision of our Chapter by laws, and the implementation of formal election of council officers. Now as the end of the year approaches, it is important to reflect on our Year 2000 activities and what to expect in the coming year. Accordingly, the topics to be discussed in this email message include:

1) upcoming Chapter elections
2) revision of Chapter By Laws
3) ad hoc Program Committee
4) Member outreach initiative
5) collaborations
6) looking forward to next year.

ELECTIONS. Our Committee on Nominations did an excellent job recruiting candidates for the upcoming Chapter Council elections. The committee was comprised of Rob Simmons (chair), Clyde Tucker (National AAPOR Council representative), Nancy Belden, Betsy Martin, and Rob Santos. This fall the committee put together the following list of candidates:
Vice President (President Elect):
Claudia Deane, Washington Post
Dina Smeltz, US Department of State

Associate Secretary:
Nancy Clusen, Mathematica
Theresa DeMaio, US Bureau of the Census

Associate Treasurer:
Wendy Landers, Institute for Survey Research, Temple University (D.C. office)

Ballots will be sent out the week of December 18, and should be returned by January 19, 2001. This schedule is about a month later than what we originally planned, but that should not pose any problems for a smooth transition.

The Chapter would like to thank the candidates for participating in the election and agreeing to serve, if elected. Special thanks is also due to the Nominations Committee members for their dedicated service for developing the list of nominees and their efforts in contacting nominees and securing agreement to participate as candidates.

BY LAWS. This fall the Committee on By Laws met on several occasions to review the current set of by laws. The committee deliberated a number of important issues and drafted a revision for your consideration in an upcoming referendum. Their work is now complete, and a referendum to accept the revised by laws will be included with the officer election ballots. (The proposed revision of the by laws will be included in the ballot package being mailed to members).

The Committee on By Laws was chaired by Brad Edwards, and included Karen Goldenberg, Carl Ramirez, Jennifer Reed, and Dawn Von Thurn-Nelson (representing National AAPOR). The members of this committee have performed exceptionally, and the chapter hails their efforts.

AD HOC PROGRAM COMMITTEE. This fall, the chapter appointed an ad hoc program committee to assist the Council in the development of a winter program. The committee is composed of Sylvia Fisher (chair), Claudia Deane, Fran Featherston, and Gail Kutner. The committee is currently busy arranging seminars for January and February, and we will issue announcements as soon as events are finalized. If you have any suggestions for seminar topics, please communicate them to Sylvia Fisher at fisher_s@bls.gov.

The committee is also organizing our annual WINTER SOCIAL! Tentatively, we are planning this event for WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18. So mark your calendars! Details are forthcoming.
MEMBER OUTREACH INITIATIVE. Early in 2001, a qualitative research initiative will be conducted to gather information about the needs of members and the quality of services provided by the chapter. Both current and former members of the chapter will be contacted and asked to participate. Interviews will be semi-structured. Upon completion, results will be shared with the members and the information will be used in planning chapter activities and services. This effort is being undertaken by Jennifer Reed and Sylvia Fisher. We highly encourage your cooperation if you are contacted. (NOTE: a suggestions/feedback form will accompany the ballots in your upcoming election mailing packet; also, your comments and suggestions are always welcomed & encouraged.)

COLLABORATIONS. This year the Chapter has had productive collaborations with its sister organization, the Washington Statistical Society (WSS). WSS is a much larger organization than our chapter, yet we have found common interests in the development of seminars for our members. This has resulted in a number of co-sponsorship opportunities with the WSS Data Collection Methods Section and the WSS Methodology Section. By jointly sponsoring and cross-referencing our seminars, we almost doubled the number of seminar offerings to you, our members.

An equally if not more important area of collaboration and (indeed) integration has been with National AAPOR. Our National Membership Chair, Mickey Blum, and the Associate Chair, Dawn Von Thurn Nelson, have been in regular contact with the Chapter to explore ways in which National AAPOR could improve service to its chapters. As a result of these integration activities, we will be able to pay our Chapter dues at the time we renew our AAPOR (national) membership. Moreover, AAPOR will be providing each chapter a web page linked to its National web site. This web page will be available for posting newsletters, updates, news, job postings, seminar and social schedules, etc.

NEXT YEAR. The year 2001 should mark a milestone for the Washington-Baltimore Chapter. By midyear, the chapter should enjoy a level of infrastructure and support that it has not seen in recent years. We hope and expect that this will translate into better service to our cherished chapter members. Of course, this will not be possible without your cooperation, your participation, and (yes) your contributions. So we look forward to our continued outreach to you, as well as your feedback, your volunteerism, and your support.

This holiday season, let's celebrate and cherish the experience of wonderful Year 2000, and contemplate the intrigue and opportunity offered by a new year!

Happy Holidays!

Rob Santos
Washington-Baltimore Chapter President
As a sidenote, Miller and Shanks noted in THE NEW AMERICAN VOTER that while the Evangelical Christians tended more toward the Republican side after the 1980 election, that movement was matched by a similar growth in the secular, non-religious voters turning toward the Democrats (perhaps in reaction to the Christian Right?). Perhaps, then, the religious/cultural split is partially defined by those who desire a more defined role for religion in politics against those who fear it. (These findings are on p. 227 of their book).

Frank Rusciano

David_Moore@gallup.com wrote:

> Just to be more precise about this topic -- Gallup polling has also shown that those who attend religious service weekly or more gave Bush a big lead; those who attend infrequently gave Gore a modest lead; and those who attend "never" gave Gore a big lead (big=double digit; modest = single digit). So, the more frequently one attends Church service, the more likely the person was to support Bush over Gore.
> However, Gallup polling also shows that among black voters, there is no difference in support for Gore by frequency of attending religious service -- those who attend weekly or more are about as likely to vote for Gore over Bush as those who attend less frequently. (And blacks supported Gore by about a 9-1 ratio.)
>
> So, to say that Bush supporters are on the side of "God" REALLY means that white Bush supporters are more likely to attend religious service frequently than white Gore supporters. In fact, when one looks at it that way, we find that only about half of Bush's white supporters (53% or so) attend weekly, while a third attend infrequently, and 11% never attend. (The numbers among white voters who supported Gore indicate less frequent attendance: 35% weekly, 42% infrequently, and 20% never).
>
> Among black voters, we had too few in our sample who chose Bush, but those who supported Gore show the following attendance: 53% weekly,
42% infrequently, and 3% "never" -- clearly as "religious" as Bush's white supporters. (With all the examples, a small percentage gave no response, which is why the numbers do not add to 100%).

So, while the figures are not likely to support a divine interpretation of the election outcome (unless one wants to speculate how "God" judges white vs. black voters), the figures do reflect what Alan Wolfe is loathe to admit (based on his extensive focus grouping among middle class Americans...and how can we doubt such results?!)

that there is a cultural/religious devotion divide in America that is related to, and cross cuts with, our political and racial divisions.

Regardless of one's spiritual and partisan orientation, those cross-cutting divisions would seem to be of considerable interest in understanding the recent election and the political environment in America today, and probably ought not to be confused with whatever steps toward "healing" the pundits feel are necessary.

David W. Moore
The Gallup Organization
47 Hulfish Street
Princeton, NJ 08542
(609) 924-9600
david_moore@gallup.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Albert D. Biderman [mailto:abider@american.edu]
Sent: Saturday, December 16, 2000 12:50 AM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Do Church Goers tend to vote Republican?

No, no. He's saying that those on the side of God vote Republican. That God is on the side of the Republicans goes without saying. He may not have made so many of them but he sure made them mostly richer than Democrats. (Republicans also are strict constructionists and know that all the seemingly pro-po' stuff in the Bible has to be constructed mighty strictly and that absolutely nobody goes to Hades in a Mercedes.) I expect you will be bombarded with the references showing Novak has plenty of poll data he can cite. All of which leads me to say, "Thank God I'm an atheist!"

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

dick halpern wrote:

During the course of a discussion this evening on PBA's News Hour
Michael Novak (American Enterprise Institute) made a statement that church going people tended to vote for Bush while those who didn't attend Church or whose attendance was infrequent tended to vote for Gore. The comment was disputed by Alan Wolfe (Boston College) who claimed it was totally untrue. He went on to say that this was the kind of rhetoric that serves no useful purpose if Republicans truly believe that the country needs to heal and want to help in that process. To him, the remark

Does anyone have information about the relationship between church going and voting behavior? While this issue may strike some of us as
"What?!?!", we have to remember that Novak is well known and does represent a highly politically conservative organization. The implications of his remark, namely that God is on the side of the Republicans does reflect the thinking of many right wing conservatives. The implications for political discourse are rather obvious.

Dick Halpern

Is there any public data that shows a parallel increase in concerns about the "decline in morals/morality" either in government or in the country as a whole (I'm sure there is but I can't reference any offhand). I would wager those church goers support the GOP more as a result of things like the Monica scandal or abortion rights expansion and other issues exemplifying (for them) a decline in morality in recent decades than solely a desire "to put God back into politics".

With the advent of televangelists leading the way in rallying the troops, the gap in partisan support has become more pronounced as Democrats are identified by them as "the enemy" of what is moral.

Frank Rusciano <rusciano@rider.edu> on 12/18/2000 02:19:24 PM

Please respond to aapornet@usc.edu

To: aapornet@usc.edu
cc: (bcc: Bill Thompson/DRI)

Subject: Re: Do Church Goers tend to vote Republican?

As a sidenote, Miller and Shanks noted in THE NEW AMERICAN VOTER that while the Evangelical Christians tended more toward the Republican side after the 1980 election, that movement was matched by a similar growth in the secular, non-religious voters turning toward the Democrats (perhaps in reaction to the Christian Right?). Perhaps,
then, the religious/cultural split is partially
defined by those who desire a more defined role for religion in politics
against those who fear it. (These findings are on p. 227
of their book).

Frank Rusciano

David_Moore@gallup.com wrote:

> Just to be more precise about this topic -- Gallup polling has also
> shown that those who attend religious service weekly or more gave Bush
> a big lead; those who attend infrequently gave Gore a modest lead;
> and those who attend "never" gave Gore a big lead (big=double digit;
> modest = single digit). So, the more frequently one attends Church
> service, the more likely the person was to support Bush over Gore.
> >
> > However, Gallup polling also shows that among black voters, there is
> > no difference in support for Gore by frequency of attending religious
> > service
> > -- those who attend weekly or more are about as likely to vote for Gore
> > over
> > Bush as those who attend less frequently. (And blacks supported Gore by
> > about a 9-1 ratio.)
> >
> > So, to say that Bush supporters are on the side of "God" REALLY means
> > that white Bush supporters are more likely to attend religious service
> > frequently than white Gore supporters. In fact, when one looks at it
> > that way, we find that only about half of Bush's white supporters (53%
> > or so) attend weekly, while a third attend infrequently, and 11% never
> > attend. (The numbers among white voters who supported Gore indicate
> > less frequent attendance: 35% weekly, 42% infrequently, and 20%
> > never).
> >
> > Among black voters, we had too few in our sample who chose Bush, but
> > those who supported Gore show the following attendance: 53% weekly,
> > 42% infrequently, and 3% "never" -- clearly as "religious" as Bush's
> > white supporters. (With all the examples, a small percentage gave no
> > response, which is why the numbers do not add to 100%).
> >
> > So, while the figures are not likely to support a divine
> > interpretation of the election outcome (unless one wants to speculate
> > how "God" judges white vs. black voters), the figures do reflect what
> > Alan Wolfe is loathe to admit (based on his extensive focus grouping
> > among middle class Americans...and how can we doubt such results?!)
> > that there is a cultural/religious devotion divide in America that is
> > related to, and cross cuts with, our political and racial divisions.
> > Regardless of one's spiritual and partisan orientation, those
> > cross-cutting divisions would seem to be of considerable interest in
> > understanding the recent election and the political environment in
> > America today, and probably ought not to be confused with whatever
> > steps toward "healing" the pundits feel are necessary.
> >
> > David W. Moore
> > The Gallup Organization
> > 47 Hulfish Street
> > Princeton, NJ 08542
No, no. He's saying that those on the side of God vote Republican. That God is on the side of the Republicans goes without saying. He may not have made so many of them but he sure made them mostly richer than Democrats. (Republicans also are strict constructionists and know that all the seemingly pro-po' stuff in the Bible has to be constructed mighty strictly and that absolutely nobody goes to Hades in a Mercedes.) I expect you will be bombarded with the references showing Novak has plenty of poll data he can cite. All of which leads me to say, "Thank God I'm an atheist!"

Albert D. Biderman
abider@american.edu

Dick Halpern wrote:

During the course of a discussion this evening on PBA's News Hour Michael Novak (American Enterprise Institute) made a statement that church going people tended to vote for Bush while those who didn't attend Church or whose attendance was infrequent tended to vote for Gore. The comment was disputed by Alan Wolfe (Boston College) who claimed it was totally untrue. He went on to say that this was the kind of rhetoric that serves no useful purpose if Republicans truly believe that the country needs to heal and want to help in that process. To him, the remark

Does anyone have information about the relationship between church going and voting behavior? While this issue may strike some of us as "What?!?!", we have to remember that Novak is well known and does represent a highly politically conservative organization. The implications of his remark, namely that God is on the side of the Republicans does reflect the thinking of many right wing conservatives. The implications for political discourse are rather obvious.

Dick Halpern
This from a CNN Poll released tonight:

Asked of registered voters: Suppose that the presidential election of 2004 were being held today, and it included Al Gore as the Democratic candidate and George W. Bush as the Republican candidate. Would you vote for Al Gore, the Democrat or George W. Bush, the Republican?

Gore  50%
Bush  41

Sampling error: +/-3% pts

More details at:


This report in Newsweek magazine, released Sunday and spread via the Reuters wire, received a great deal of media attention today, especially from the cable news networks (which suddenly have a lot of time to fill once again). It would have been unimaginable even two months ago that such a story could have appeared in a major U.S. newsmagazine, or drawn so much media attention. Thus has Election 2000 changed public perceptions and trust, at the expense of the prestige of the U.S. Supreme Court.

-- Jim
JUSTICE O'CONNER UPSET WHEN SEEMED GORE WON -- REPORT

NEW YORK (Reuters) - Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor was upset during an election-night party when she heard Florida was first called for Vice President Al Gore, exclaiming, "this is terrible," according to a report in Newsweek magazine released on Sunday.

The report said O'Connor made the comment at about 8 p.m. on Nov. 7, and declared that meant the election was "over" because Gore had also won two other key states.

Quoting two eyewitnesses to her comments, Newsweek said that O'Connor then walked off to get a plate of food, and her husband, John, explained to friends and acquaintances that she was upset because they wanted to retire to Arizona and a Gore presidency meant they would have to wait another four years because she did not want a Democrat to name her successor.

Not long after Florida was called for Gore, news organizations retracted the call and said Florida was too close to be awarded to either candidate. The state was then called for Bush, but again that call was retracted and the race remained in limbo for five weeks.

O'Connor, 70, had been Republican majority leader of the Arizona State Senate before being appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court by President Ronald Reagan in 1981.

The magazine said in its edition due out on Monday her remarks would likely fuel criticism that high court justices "sought to influence" election returns in their ruling in George W. Bush v. Albert Gore Jr. that ended the impasse over the presidential election.

Bush, the Republican governor of Texas, won the White House when Gore, who had sought a hand recount of thousands of contested ballots in Florida, conceded defeat on Wednesday, one day after a 5-4 Supreme Court ruling that prevented any new recounts from going forward.

Newsweek, seeking a response from Justice O'Connor to the accounts of her election-night comment, said that a high court spokesman
said she had no comment.

In its story, Newsweek noted that Justice O'Conner had no way of knowing when she let her guard down that the networks' early call that Gore won Florida's key 25 electoral votes was premature and that five weeks later she would play a direct and decisive role in the election of his Republican rival.

The magazine added that O'Connor could not possibly have foreseen that she would be one of two swing votes in the court's 5-4 decision.

The Newsweek report came a day after the magazine released a poll that said Americans remained deeply divided over the Supreme Court's ruling that gave the presidency to Bush, and nearly two out of three thought politics played a role in the decision.

While 51 percent said the court's decision that hand counts of contested ballots in Florida could not resume was fair, 44 percent considered it unfair, Newsweek said.

Sixty-five percent of those surveyed believed politics or partisanship played a role in the U.S. Supreme Court justices' decision, according to the poll.

A larger proportion -- 81 percent -- saw politics playing a role in the decisions of Florida state courts, which in some cases ruled in favor of Gore during the legal battle to determine the 43rd U.S. president.


Copyright (C) 2000 Reuters Limited

******

Date: Tue, 19 Dec 2000 14:15:40 -0500
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Harris Interactive
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

Richard Rands [rrands@cfmc.com] said

> It is my understanding that Harris' "proprietary" weighting
> system involves
> using telephone surveys to determine the appropriate weights.

According to their website: "Completed interviews are weighted to figures
obtained from the Current Population Survey (CPS) as well as key questions administered in Harris Poll monthly telephone surveys of national cross-sectional samples of 1,000 adults, aged 18 and older. We use several demographic variables (e.g., sex, age, education, race and ethnicity) as well as a variable representing the propensity of an individual respondent to be online—a composite of several factors—to generalize survey results to the national population."

Which in principle does not seem too different than the way most telephone pollsters weight their data. If one wanted to argue that they could not do their web survey without doing the telephone poll you could certainly do so.

> If that is correct, then the accuracy of their web survey is not what they claim it to be.

Could this statement be made about any poll that weights data back to probability of being called and population statistics?

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing, for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)

Snowbird Voters
More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's also possible that they can vote in both places."

---

Date: Tue, 19 Dec 2000 17:36:45 -0500
From: "Jim Caplan" <caplanjr@iname.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Oh, come on. How many people do you think voted in New Jersey and then flew to South Florida and voted again? Many of them couldn't get it right the first time!

Jim Caplan
Miami

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <RFunk787@aol.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:42 PM
Subject: weighting Florida recount

> I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing,
> for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme
> for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)
> 
> > Snowbird Voters
> > More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also
> > registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the
> > New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything
> > wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's
> > also possible that they can vote in both places."
> 

========================================================================
Date: Tue, 19 Dec 2000 17:45:11 -0500
From: John Mitchell <jmitchell@elementusa.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: weighting Florida recount
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"
Absentee ballots only require a stamp.

-----Original Message-----
From: Jim Caplan [mailto:caplanjr@iname.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 5:37 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: weighting Florida recount

Oh, come on. How many people do you think voted in New Jersey and then flew to South Florida and voted again? Many of them couldn't get it right the first time!

Jim Caplan
Miami
----- Original Message ----- 
From: <RFunk787@aol.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:42 PM
Subject: weighting Florida recount

> I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing, for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)
>
>
> Snowbird Voters
> More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's also possible that they can vote in both places."
>
========================================================================
Date: Tue, 19 Dec 2000 18:23:36 EST
From: BLUMWEP@aol.com
Received: from BLUMWEP@aol.com
          by imo-r12.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.35.) id 5.12.65b45e8 (4590)
          for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Tue, 19 Dec 2000 18:23:37 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <12.65b45e8.277147f8@aol.com>
Subject: Re: weighting Florida recount
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Mailer: AOL 5.0 for Windows sub 128
The retirees and "snowbirds" probably registered in FL, never intending to vote in NY again. While NYC and Nassau County haven't purged their names from the NY registration lists yet, the new FL voters are probably not aware they are still registered in their old election districts.

Mickey Blum

This acquisition by VNU of ACNielsen will not exactly "reunite" the market research firm with its former corporate sibling, Nielsen Media Research Inc., as reported in the Business Day section of this morning's New York Times (via Bloomberg News), but VNU does expect that the two Nielsen's "will certainly cooperate closely," according to this report from Reuters.

-- Jim

Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc.


Tuesday December 19 1:09 AM ET

Dutch media firm buys ACNielsen for $2.3 bln

By Douwe Miedema

AMSTERDAM, Dec 18 (Reuters) - Dutch publisher VNU said on Monday it would buy U.S. marketing information company ACNielsen in a $2.3 billion cash deal aimed at expanding its market ratings business.

The move reunites ACNielsen with sister company and television ratings giant Nielsen Media Research, which VNU bought in November 1999.

ACNielsen has 21,000 employees and annual revenues of $1.5 billion, and its Entertainment Data Information (EDI) unit is a leading provider of box office data.

``The purchase hits the bull's eye. We become the world leader in marketing information, with a 19 percent share,'" VNU Chief
Financial Officer Frans Cremers told a press conference.

VNU said it would also very likely sell its consumer and educational information units.

The purchase, combined with the divestments, would see 56 percent of VNU's operational income coming from North America, up from 47 percent, and would turn it into an exclusively professional information company.

VNU said it would pay $36.75 per ACNielsen share. The all cash deal is expected to close in first quarter 2001. ACNielsen stock soared $11.37, or 46 percent, to $36 on the New York Stock Exchange (news - web sites). VNU stock ended 5.8 percent higher at 53.25 euros ($47) on the Dutch bourse.

VNU said it was considering a share issue to raise 500 million euros ($443 million), but that it had arranged a one-year interim banking facility with Merrill Lynch large enough to fund the deal.

VNU said it might be able to swiftly pay back that money with a possible sale of its consumer and education groups. It might then use the proceeds of the share issue for more buys.

``The sale of these two groups alone might yield enough. We're not in talks with any specific partners yet... but you can safely assume it's going to happen,'' Cremers told Reuters in an interview.

Market Welcomes Strategic Step

``Shedding their consumer information is what the market's been waiting for for some time. Strategically it's a good step,'' said Gert Jan Geels, a fund manager at Eureffect brokers. Despite the widespread expectations, VNU had, as recently as six weeks ago, denied it would sell the division.

VNU said the purchase would boost its 2001 earnings per share before goodwill amortization and extraordinaries ("cash EPS") by five percent.

Without the sale of the consumer and educational unit, that figure would be higher, because sales by the units would then contribute. VNU gave no figure for next year's cash EPS.

VNU said the forecast excluded special charges of $135 million until the year 2002, related to an ACNielsen efficiency boosting program.

Analysts viewed the price, a multiple of 9.8 times EBITDA (earnings before interest, tax, depreciation and amortization of goodwill) as low.

VNU's Cremers said one of the possible reasons for the low price was a pending $350 million lawsuit against ACNielsen by a third party in the United States that VNU believed to be without merit.
Eps Boosted

For this year, VNU said it expected `cash EPS' to rise by at least five percent, up from a previous forecast of three percent. That rise, however, is not related to the buy.

VNU expects synergy gains of at least 10 to 15 million dollars from the deal as a `conservative' estimate, Cremers said.

He added VNU did not plan to merge the two Nielsens, `but they will certainly cooperate closely.''

---------------------------------------------------------------------------
Copyright (C) 2000 Yahoo! Inc.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Gore would have gained votes in Lake

By David Damron, Ramsey Campbell and Roger Roy
of the Sentinel Staff
Posted December 19, 2000 8:31 AM EST

Email this story to a friend
Printer friendly version
Blaze claims couple's home

Crash kills man, puts 2 in hospital

Old rail line has Leesburg's attention

TAVARES -- An inspection of more than 6,000 discarded presidential ballots in Lake County on Monday revealed that Vice President Al Gore lost a net 130 votes that were clearly his even in a conservative, GOP bastion that president-elect George W. Bush dominated as a whole.

The tally of uncounted ballots by the Orlando Sentinel was the first outside review to be completed in any Florida county since the U.S. Supreme Court halted a statewide recount on Dec. 9. At that point Bush's ever-fluctuating lead over Gore was just 154 votes -- and the margin might have been shaved to a mere two dozen had the Lake ballots been counted. Similar ballots were counted elsewhere.

The review found 376 discarded ballots in Lake that were clearly intended as votes for Gore: In each case, an oval next to his name was filled in with a pencil and the voter mistakenly filled in another oval next to a spot reserved for write-in candidates, writing in Gore's name or running mate Joe Lieberman's there as well. Another 246 such ballots showing clear votes for Bush and running mate Dick Cheney were thrown out. Had all such ballots been counted, the result would have been a net gain of 130 votes for Gore.


Andy Beveridge
This story illustrates nicely a point I have been reiterating here about the reasons why election laws evolved in Florida and elsewhere to rest a count on judgments of the intent of the voter and to reject explicit, pre-set, per se standards. The reason for voter error here seems to have been an attempt of these voters to make absolutely clear what their choice was. Yet how many of you would have looked at the general design of these ballots and expected this frequent source of rejections for "multiple voting."

Extraneous markings to make intent absolutely clear were a frequent source of ballot rejections in my experience at polling places. We see them on questionnaires that use mark sense scoring. People who make a small unintended mark leave big scrawls and smudges read as double choices when they attempt to obliterate their mistakes. On punch cards, as a counter example, there is no mistaking as anything but an attempt to vote "dimples" made in the card where a bent stylus has just missed the pre perforated target and these marks don't resemble to an objective observer any likely nicks from a ring or watchband buckle. Too bad this experience getting swamped by the tides of partisanship and the highly risky expedient of universal machines and standards elevated as the Holy Grail.

Albert D, Biderman
abider@american.edu

"Andrew A. Beverage" wrote:

> Gore would have gained votes in Lake
> By David Damron, Ramsey Campbell and Roger Roy
> of the Sentinel Staff
> Posted December 19, 2000 8:31 AM EST
> Email this story to a friend
> Printer friendly version
> PHOTOS
> Al Gore (ASSOCIATED PRESS)
> Dec 14, 2000
> GRAPHICS
> Finding new votes in Lake County (JESSICA MANN & MONTY COOK/ORLANDO SENTINEL)
> Dec 19, 2000
TAVARES -- An inspection of more than 6,000 discarded presidential ballots in Lake County on Monday revealed that Vice President Al Gore lost a net 130 votes that were clearly his even in a conservative, GOP bastion that president-elect George W. Bush dominated as a whole.

The tally of uncounted ballots by the Orlando Sentinel was the first outside review to be completed in any Florida county since the U.S. Supreme Court halted a statewide recount on Dec. 9. At that point Bush's ever-fluctuating lead over Gore was just 154 votes -- and the margin might have been shaved to a mere two dozen had the Lake ballots been counted. Similar ballots were counted elsewhere.

The review found 376 discarded ballots in Lake that were clearly intended as votes for Gore: In each case, an oval next to his name was filled in with a pencil and the voter mistakenly filled in another oval next to a spot reserved for write-in candidates, writing in Gore's name or running mate Joe Lieberman's there as well. Another 246 such ballots showing clear votes for Bush and running mate Dick Cheney were thrown out. Had all such ballots been counted, the result would have been a net gain of 130 votes for Gore.


BLUMWEP@aol.com wrote:

> The retirees and "snowbirds" probably registered in FL, never intending to vote in NY again. While NYC and Nassau County haven't purged their names from the NY registration lists yet, the new FL
voters are probably not aware they are still registered in their old election districts.

Those snowbirds also present challenges for those of us involved in statewide surveys in Florida, Texas, Arizona and other states with a significant percentage of part-time residents.

How do we define "usual place of residence"? My in-laws physically spend less than half the year here most years, but own property and vote here, partly in order to avoid the steep income tax up north.

But more significantly for my research purposes, they tend to have their surgeries and major medical procedures up there (although they do have a doctor here for emergencies.)

When our response rate for our '99 study was turning out kinda low, I did a mailout effort. We got several letters and emails back from seniors who were in other states for the summer. We fielded from April to September, thinking to miss them in person to avoid the usual residence decision, but not realizing we would face a ton of chronic ring-no-answers in return.

So our response rates will never be close to those in places like Kansas or Minnesota, with mostly full-time residents. Does anybody try to do statistical adjustments for snowbirds, perhaps based on time of year?

Personally, I wish the snowbirds would vote up north, because they refuse to vote for anything to improve our children's education or recreation.

If there has been one lesson from the Florida counting debacle, perhaps it will be to highlight how badly rotten our infrastructure is. Texas at least has oil revenues.

I know, you're probably wondering why I choose to live here, with all the whining. But for all the Southern good-old boy politics and underfunded libraries and poorly equipped schools, there are these other compensations....

Basking in the sun on the beach--on Veteran's Day. Watching a golden sunset over the Keys. Floating lazily down the Ichetucknee river, being observed by birds and protected from the sun by a delicate canopy of trees and Spanish moss.

Besides, where else could you decorate a living room in purple and green and have it considered perfectly normal?

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-016
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195
Date: Tue, 19 Dec 2000 23:23:09 -0500
From: "James P. Murphy" <jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com>
To: <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>, "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Florida Infrastructure

Our older daughter, now at the University of Chicago, just completed a two-year MS program at UF in Gainesville. If there are infrastructure problems in Florida, we surely did not see them there. Many outstanding departments. And we have heard much the same about FSU. So you can smile as those of us up here start to freeze. (My foot-warming space heater is on as I type this!)

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Colleen K. Porter <cporter@hp.ufl.edu>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 10:24 PM
Subject: Re: weighting Florida recount

>BLUMWEP@aol.com wrote:
>>
>>> The retirees and "snowbirds" probably registered in FL, never
>>> intending
to
>>> vote in NY again. While NYC and Nassau County haven't purged their
>>> names from the NY registration lists yet, the new FL voters are
>>> probably not
>>> aware
>>> they are still registered in their old election districts.
>
>Those snowbirds also present challenges for those of us involved in
>statewide surveys in Florida, Texas, Arizona and other states with a
>significant percentage of part-time residents.
>
>How do we define "usual place of residence"? My in-laws physically
>spend less than half the year here most years, but own property and
>vote here, partly in order to avoid the steep income tax up north.
>
>But more significantly for my research purposes, they tend to have
>their surgeries and major medical procedures up there (although they do
>have a doctor here for emergencies.)
>
When our response rate for our '99 study was turning out kinda low, I
did a mailout effort. We got several letters and emails back from
seniors who were in other states for the summer. We fielded from April
to September, thinking to miss them in person to avoid the usual
residence decision, but not realizing we would face a ton of chronic
ring-no-answers in return.

So our response rates will never be close to those in places like
Kansas or Minnesota, with mostly full-time residents. Does any body
try to do statistical adjustments for snowbirds, perhaps based on time
of year?

Personally, I wish the snowbirds would vote up north, because they
refuse to vote for anything to improve our children's education or
recreation.

If there has been one lesson from the Florida counting debacle, perhaps
it will be to highlight how badly rotten our infrastructure is. Texas
at least has oil revenues.

I know, you're probably wondering why I choose to live here, with all
the whining. But for all the Southern good-old boy politics and
underfunded libraries and poorly equipped schools, there are these
other compensations....

Basking in the sun on the beach—on Veteran's Day. Watching a golden
sunset over the Keys. Floating lazily down the Ichetucknee river,
being observed by birds and protected from the sun by a delicate canopy
of trees and Spanish moss.

Besides, where else could you decorate a living room in purple and
green and have it considered perfectly normal?

Colleen K. Porter
Project Coordinator, Florida Health Insurance Study cporter@hp.ufl.edu
phone: 352/392-6919, Fax: 352/392-7109
UF Department of Health Services Administration
Location: 1600 SW SW Archer Road, Rm. G1-016
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 100195, Gainesville, FL 32610-0195

Date: Wed, 20 Dec 2000 00:15:21 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Counting the Votes
Message-ID: <WEBBIBIOIKDKWCMFPFJBPKEEH CIAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
  charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
In-Reply-To: <3A40197F.3A637909@american.edu>
Dear All:

Al makes a very good point. With optically scanned ballots (which according to a Miami Herald article on Sunday) there is a 0.3 % error rate (3 per thousand), with the votomatic it is 26 per thousand (2.6%). This is a vast difference, one that might even get to an "equal protection" violation.

With the optically scanned ballots, like these 6,000 in lake county, one can easily discern intent from looking at the physical ballot, which includes the name of the candidate.

Clinton was wonderful on TV tonight discussing the Supreme Court Decision. "We have to support it, because we must support judicial review. This decision will be discussed one hundred years from now." We definitely have not heard the end of this. There are 67 counties in Florida. Counting should be starting up soon in many of them. The Miami Herald has filed in all 67 and they have hired an accounting firm. They plan to count all of the disputed ballots.

Any predictions on the final outcome?

Andy Beveridge

> This story illustrates nicely a point I have been reiterating here
> about the reasons why election laws evolved in Florida and elsewhere
> to rest a count on judgments of the intent of the voter and to reject
> explicit, pre-set, per se standards. The reason for voter error here
> seems to have been an attempt of these voters to make absolutely clear
> what their choice was. Yet how many of you would have looked at the
> general design of these ballots and expected this frequent source of
> rejections for "multiple voting." Extraneous markings to make intent
> absolutely clear were a frequent source of ballot rejections in my
> experience at polling places. We see them on questionnaires that use
> mark sense scoring. People who make a small unintended mark leave big
> scrawls and smudges read as double choices when they attempt to
> obliterate their mistakes. On punch cards, as a counter example,
> there is no mistaking as anything but an attempt to vote "dimples"
> made in the card where a bent stylus has just missed the pre
> perforated target and these marks don't resemble to an objective
> observer any likely nicks from a ring or watchband buckle. Too bad
> this experience getting swamped by the tides of partisanship and the
> highly risky expedient of universal machines and standards elevated as
> the Holy Grail.
> >
> > Albert D, Biderman
> > abider@american.edu
> >
> > "Andrew A. Beverage" wrote:
> >
> > Gore would have gained votes in Lake
> >
> > By David Damron, Ramsey Campbell and Roger Roy
> > of the Sentinel Staff
> > Posted December 19, 2000 8:31 AM EST
TAVARES -- An inspection of more than 6,000 discarded presidential ballots in Lake County on Monday revealed that Vice President Al Gore lost a net 130 votes that were clearly his even in a conservative, GOP bastion that president-elect George W. Bush dominated as a whole.

The tally of uncounted ballots by the Orlando Sentinel was the first outside review to be completed in any Florida county since the U.S. Supreme Court halted a statewide recount on Dec. 9. At that point Bush's ever-fluctuating lead over Gore was just 154 votes -- and the margin might have been shaved to a mere two dozen had the Lake ballots been counted. Similar ballots were counted elsewhere.

The review found 376 discarded ballots in Lake that were clearly intended as votes for Gore: In each case, an oval next to his name was filled in with a pencil and the voter mistakenly filled in another oval next to a spot reserved for write-in candidates, writing in Gore's name or running mate Joe Lieberman's there as well. Another 246 such ballots showing clear votes for Bush and running mate Dick Cheney were thrown out. Had all such
First, regardless of whether or not there were ill intentioned double registrants, the New York Post's effort smacks of ill intention. If the NY Post wishes to counter the "We wuz robbed!" contentions of Democrats by suggesting that large scale illegal double voting took place, the attempted match should employ lists of actual voters in the same election in the two jurisdictions rather than lists of registrants. As it is, the effort is implying evil without evidence of it. I saw Podhoretz of the NY Post using a battery of other arguments to deprecate the ballot examination project now underway In Florida. This seems more like a thrust in a broad campaign of psychological civil warfare than journalism.

Secondly, as someone who once sought vainly to find records matching methods, even extravagantly expensive methods, that would be adequate for the task of validating self report surveys, I would expect high inaccuracy in this bit of case matching, too. Are there any statisticians among us who know how many persons with identical names and birthrates there would be in these two, not ethnically dissimilar jurisdictions? But there I go presuming that I know how they went about the matching when I don't. The perils of case matching (in this case, perils to citizens and parties) are also illustrated by error rates in the contracted purging of alleged felons from Florida voter lists.

When the NAACP had aggrieved voter hearings in South Florida that were carried by SPAN, one woman told of her difficulty with the Palm Beach ballot and contrasted it with the many ballots she had experienced before, including in Florida and, this year, in the NY primary. I was taken aback at first, But on second thought, I reasoned, the attitudes toward legal residence of our agrarian past need not apply more rigidly to snowbirds and recent retirees than to geographically shifty characters like Dick Cheyenne and Hillary Clinton.
RFunk787@aol.com wrote:
>
> I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing,
> for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme
> for taking account of the information below (from today's
> opinionjournal.com)
>>
> Snowbird Voters
> More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are
> also
> registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the
> New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything
> wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's
> also possible that they can vote in both places."
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From: "Albert D. Biderman" <abider@american.edu>
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.7 [en] (Win98; U)
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Netscape Messenger's spell checker changed "Cheney" to "Cheyenne" in
the last line of my post, which I guess qualifies as a fairly close
miss.
ADB

"Albert D. Biderman" wrote:
>
> First, regardless of whether or not there were ill intentioned double
> registrants, the New York Post's effort smacks of ill intention. If
> the NY Post wishes to counter the "We wuz robbed!" contentions of
> Democrats by suggesting that large scale illegal double voting took
> place, the attempted match should employ lists of actual voters in the
> same election in the two jurisdictions rather than lists of
> registrants. As it is, the effort is implying evil without evidence
> of it. I saw Podhoretz of the NY Post using a battery of other
> arguments to deprecate the ballot examination project now underway In
> Florida. This seems more like a thrust in a broad campaign of
> psychological civil warfare than journalism.
>
> Secondly, as someone who once sought vainly to find records matching
> methods, even extravagantly expensive methods, that would be adequate
> for the task of validating self report surveys, I would expect high
> inaccuracy in this bit of case matching, too. Are there any
> statisticians among us who know how many persons with identical names
> and birthrates there would be in these two, not ethnically dissimilar
> jurisdictions? But there I go presuming that I know how they went
> about the matching when I don't. The perils of case matching (in this
> case, perils to citizens and parties) are also illustrated by error
rates in the contracted purging of alleged felons from Florida voter lists.

When the NAACP had aggrieved voter hearings in South Florida that were carried by SPAN, one woman told of her difficulty with the Palm Beach ballot and contrasted it with the many ballots she had experienced before, including in Florida and, this year, in the NY primary. I was taken aback at first, But on second thought, I reasoned, the attitudes toward legal residence of our agrarian past need not apply more rigidly to snowbirds and recent retirees than to geographically shifty characters like Dick Cheyenne and Hillary Clinton.

RFunk787@aol.com wrote:

I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing, for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)

> Snowbird Voters
> More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's also possible that they can vote in both places."

Can someone point me to recent (1999 or 2000) data on what Americans know, or at least say they know, about different events and people of the past couple of years? For example, what percentage can identify Monica Lewinsky as against the percentage that can identify Putin? And similar indicators of attention to news of different kinds.

Thanks, Howard
The suspicion that dual voting had occurred on a scale that would have made a difference in the election rests on the improbable assumption that a large enough proportion of these 14k+ registered voters would be (1) ingenious enough to realize their dual-registered status, and (2) dishonest enough to act upon it.

-----Original Message-----
From: RFunk787@aol.com [mailto:RFunk787@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:42 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: weighting Florida recount

I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing, for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)

Snowbird Voters
More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's also possible that they can vote in both places."

Dear All:
For a variety of reasons the NYC board of elections, as well as the boards in other counties have great difficulty "purging" their lists of people who have not voted or have died or have moved. Often people try to remove their name on numerous occasions. If the NY Post wanted to really work on this they could easily track down instances of dual voting. Of course they don't
for obvious reasons.

I have had lots of experience with voter lists in NY (I work on jury system composition cases) and as many as 20-30% of mailings come back as "not at this address."

This is one more example of disinformation. Plainly we are going to find out who got the most votes in Florida. Also, it is obvious that the GOP does not want this pursued and is willing to do what it can to confuse the issue.

Thanks to the Florida Sunshine Laws it looks like they will not be able to stop this recount.

Andrew A. Beveridge
209 Kissena Hall
Department of Sociology
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY
Flushing, NY 11367-1597
Phone: 718-997-2837
Fax: 718-997-2820
E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

Home Office
50 Merriam Avenue
Bronxville, NY 10708
Phone: 914-337-6237
Fax: 914-337-8210

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
> Cooney, Brendan
> Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2000 10:12 AM
> To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
> Subject: RE: weighting Florida recount
> >
> > The suspicion that dual voting had occurred on a scale that would
> > have made
> > a difference in the election rests on the improbable assumption
> > that a large
> > enough proportion of these 14k+ registered voters would be (1) ingenious
> > enough to realize their dual-registered status, and (2) dishonest
> > enough to
> > act upon it.
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: RFunk787@aol.com [mailto:RFunk787@aol.com]
> > Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:42 PM
> > To: aapornet@usc.edu
> > Subject: weighting Florida recount
> > >
I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing, for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)

Snowbird Voters
More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's also possible that they can vote in both places."

Attention to news available at this link on the People & Press site.

http://www.people-press.org/database.htm

Howard Schuman wrote:

Can someone point me to recent (1999 or 2000) data on what Americans know, or at least say they know, about different events and people of the past couple of years? For example, what percentage can identify Monica Lewinsky as against the percentage that can identify Putin? And similar indicators of attention to news of different kinds.

Thanks, Howard
Andy's figures below are amazingly close to Illinois figures.

The Chicago suburban county of McHenry which recently adopted an optical scan system had a 0.3% undervote - down from 2.4% - 2.7% in 1992, 1996, and 1998. I understand that this system allows the voter to verify that their vote has registered before they leave the polling place.

Outside of Cook County, where the great majority of counties/election jurisdictions use punch cards, the undervote was 2.1% to 2.3% in 1992, 1996, 2000, somewhat less than below.

Suburban Cook has matched the balance of the state in earlier years. Chicago's undervote has generally been a point higher than the rest of the state. Both jurisdictions use punch card systems.

As has been reported, this year showed an increase in Cook County including Chicago which is being investigated.

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> Dear All:
> 
> Al makes a very good point. With optically scanned ballots (which according
> to a Miami Herald article on Sunday) there is a 0.3% error rate (3 per
> thousand), with the votomatic it is 26 per thousand (2.6%). This is a vast
> difference, one that might even get to an "equal protection" violation.

Yes, I have a prediction. George Bush will be the president and the Miami Herald will be poorer for paying $262 per hour for these clerks to hold up ballots. Given that the media has less experience, less training, and less credibility on these issues than the Palm Beach canvassing board, why should I believe
the results they obtain unless they fit my own underlying biases?

Date: Wed, 20 Dec 2000 12:28:11 -0500
From: "Mark David Richards" <mark@bisconti.com>
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: RE: Counting the Votes
Message-ID: <JAEPJNNBGDEENNLCLIIIBKEHICOAA.mark@bisconti.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
In-Reply-To: <FCDC58EC0F22D4119F0800A0C9E589950647@exchange.chep.udel.edu>
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400

Yep. I have a prediction too. There will be agreement that these error issues need to be sorted through to avoid these messy situations in the future. Those who are interested in the ballots (or who can sell stories to an interested public) will recount the ballots and we'll probably hear how Al Gore WOULD have won, had we (U.S.) been more careful with our methodology/electoral machinery BEFORE the election. Those who are happy George W. won won't believe (or give a damn about) any recount, regardless of who does it (we'll hear more about chads falling out due to handling by all these counters...). Those who do care will have the proof they're looking for. But, regardless, new counts won't change the fact that the official count is over and he won the contest ... we now get to live with the outcome, for better on some things and worse on others (I think?!). The clothes in shops around town will probably become even more conservative (down with hemlines, out with Hollywood). The White House press will give him hell, starting yesterday (EX: Helen Thomas interrupts him after his comment that Clinton didn't have to host him: "Yes he did," she snapped.). Comedians will have as much fun with George W. as they had with Clinton, a balm to those who feels he deserves to be called "Your Illegitimacy" or "The Accidental President" (The Economist). And, all the talk of bipartisanship is mostly Holiday cheer for a fatigued public. A friend who works in a local "bipartisan" restaurant got a preview of feelings: A Republican group came in for dinner, all happy, with G.W. balloons and much holiday cheer. A Democratic group arrived, to discover the happy Republicans. They made a scene and left—the room could not hold the two groups comfortably. The ones in the middle (in this case, the waiter) are not in an easy location—let's wish them luck. No reason to panic, really. But Florida does sound wonderful...! Count your blessings along with the ballots this holiday—all in good cheer, mark

-----------------------------Other: Cute local story—the political is personal....

D.C., We've Got a Problem

By Colbert I. King (Editorial Page Writer, Washington Post)

Saturday, December 16, 2000 ; Page A27

Mayor Anthony Williams
Dear Mr. Mayor:

I may not be telling you anything you don't already know, suspect or fear. But sir, you've got a problem. For the first time since the onset of D.C. home rule, city leaders will have to contend with a federal establishment that is in Republican hands from Capitol Hill to the White House. That alone is no laughing matter. But, Mr. Mayor, GOP control of the machinery of government is only half of your troubles.

If memory serves me correctly, sir, didn't you do everything within your power to personally keep George W. Bush from taking up residence in the White House? I raise that indelicate question at this hour because, as you know, he's coming to town on Monday to start measuring the drapes and stuff like that, and I didn't know if you had plans to join the welcoming party or if you were considering the possibility of making yourself scarce. Something to think about anyway.

I'm certainly in no position to know whether the new White House occupant will or will not hold a grudge against District leaders who went all out for Al Gore. I suspect president-elect George W. Bush would not be surprised that you worked your butt off trying to deliver the nation's capital to the vice president's column. After all, you are mayor of an overwhelmingly Democratic city and a good Democrat yourself. Besides, it would have been an act of supreme ingratitude for you to sit on your hands during the election.

The Clinton-Gore administration has been good to the city, sticking up for you and the city council in battles with Congress, threatening vetoes, even taking over government functions that the city couldn't perform itself. The fact that you labored to ensure that the District's three votes are cast for Gore when the electoral college meets on Dec. 18 is something the Republicans probably presumed. But that, sir, is not the problem.

It's hard to imagine that George W.'s inner circle is going to take kindly to news that the District's mayor campaigned against the Republican standard-bearer in voting precincts far beyond the city's borders. Wait until they find out that you were doing your thing for Gore in St. Louis and, of all places, Florida.

One of your aides told me that on Election Night you pointed with pride to the returns that piled up for Al Gore in Miami, where you had worked the crowds.

You now may be recalling that heady moment with unease, if not alarm. But sir, it can't be undone. You were down there in the Sunshine State doing all in your power to make Al Gore the victor and George W. Bush the vanquished. Don't get me wrong, Mr. Mayor. A number of your fellow Washingtonians, including yours truly, were also pulling for the vice president. But (and I don't wish to sound like we're bugging out on you or anything) we aren't dependent upon the president to review our budget, sign our appropriation into law. Pardon me, sir, but you are.

Now, as you ponder that thought at the deepest level, here's something else
that goes hand in hand with your troubles. You've got some real competition for the next president's attention, and your challengers are right there in the building where you work. Reach for the Rolaids, sir: they are two of your major city council nemeses, Republicans David Catania and Carol Schwartz.

Unlike you, they have earned some brownie points with Dubya. During the campaign, they carried water for him in this town where the local Republican Party is on the endangered species list. They were also at the GOP convention in Philadelphia last summer wearing those silly hats. And Catania, as part of a contingent of gay Republicans, has even enjoyed some face time with Bush down in Austin. Bottom line: Schwartz and Catania have an in; you're on the outs, at least at the moment.

What's more, you now have to contend with a gloating Catania who, rumor has it, was spreading the word about how his relationship with you would change should George Bush be elected president. I shall take that point no further, except to say you owe a debt to those who require you to move about with bodyguards.

But how you make out in the contest with Catania and Schwartz for Bush's affections would be none of my business if it weren't for the not insignificant matter of the District's financial well-being and the continued revitalization of the nation's capital.

The question for you, sir, is how are you going to get along with a president who assumes power in January knowing that on Election Day 2000, you did not wish him well.

Aren't you, 'round about now, beginning to wonder whose side president George W. Bush will take when Congress starts micromanaging District affairs and telling you and the council how to spend locally raised tax dollars? Do you expect Bush to ride to the rescue with his veto pen (as did Clinton) when House Republican leader, and Bush's fellow Texan, Dick Armey, reintroduces his voucher plan to provide federal money for District children to pay for tuition at private schools? Can you imagine George Bush entertaining your plea to veto any District budget laden with anti-D.C. social riders? And with the D.C. financial control board slated to leave the scene next year, what do you think will be the Bush White House's response should it come to pass that your administration needs a little extra federal cash?

To recap, sir: Come high noon on Jan. 20, your days as White House darling are over; your friend Alice Rivlin and her financial control board colleagues expect to close up shop in the coming months; the city council that regards you with malice is now inflated with two members with better White House access--including one who wants your job, and it's not her.

On top of it all, with the bloom soon to leave our rosy local economy and with several campaign promises still unfulfilled--schools, public safety, clean and drivable streets--you must face reelection in two years. All in all, rather dismaying isn't it?

But here's perhaps, a comforting, "misery loves company" thought: In general, as the District's mayor goes, so goes the city. In that respect, your conundrum with the new Congress and president is not Tony Williams's alone.
In truth, the real message should be: "tighten the ol' chin strap, D.C., we've got a problem." But more on that later, Mr. Mayor.

Every good wish.
C.I.K.

e-mail: kingc@washpost.com
(c) 2000 The Washington Post

-----Original Message-----
From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of Ratledge, Edward
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2000 11:13 AM
To: 'aapornet@usc.edu'
Subject: RE: Counting the Votes

Yes, I have a prediction. George Bush will be the president and the Miami Herald will be poorer for paying $262 per hour for these clerks to hold up ballots. Given that the media has less experience, less training, and less credibility on these issues than the Palm Beach canvassing board, why should I believe the results they obtain unless they fit my own underlying biases?

Edward Freeland
besides, the purpose of the files is to enable citizens to vote, not to keep track of their whereabouts. Better to keep hundreds of old records in the file than to have even one single person mistakenly turned away from the polls on election day.

Ed

"Cooney, Brendan" wrote:

> The suspicion that dual voting had occurred on a scale that would have made a difference in the election rests on the improbable assumption that a large enough proportion of these 14k+ registered voters would be (1) ingenious enough to realize their dual-registered status, and (2) dishonest enough to act upon it.

> -----Original Message-----
> From: RFunk787@aol.com [mailto:RFunk787@aol.com]
> Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2000 4:42 PM
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> Subject: weighting Florida recount
> 
> I wonder if any of our statistical mavens would be interested in proposing, for the benefit of the people now "recounting" ballots in Florida, a scheme for taking account of the information below (from today's opinionjournal.com)

> Snowbird Voters
> More than 14,000 registered voters in New York City and Long Island are also registered to vote in Florida's Palm Beach, Miami-Dade or Broward county, the New York Post reports. "It is possible that they didn't mean to do anything wrong," said Broward County Supervisor of Elections Jane Carroll. "But it's also possible that they can vote in both places."
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There's always been a fair, simple, objective way to determine whether dimpled chads should count.

Start with the assumption that people in punch card counties are no more or less decisive in their choice of President that people in optical scan counties.

Then manually count only the hanging chads. Does adding in that number of votes get you near to the 0.3% undervotes of the optical scan counties? If so, stop there.

If not, count the dimpled ones. Add them in. Unless adding them gets you too far under the 0.3% undervote figure, they should have been counted.

I am not sure if "dimpled" and "pregnant" chads are two names for the same thing or they are fairly clearly distinct. If the latter, count them separately and add in the clearer group first in a separate step.

Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
Creative Research Systems
www.surveysystem.com
Obviously, if one was not only interested in getting Bush elected one would count dimpled chads and pregnant chads as they do in Texas, based upon the law Bush signed in 1997.

This whole argument is nonesense. The real question in all of this has been how many of Gores vote should not be counted. Shall we exclude the people who voted for Buchanan by mistake? Shall we exclude others who messed up the ballot in Palm Beach and voted accidentally for Gore and Buchanan? Shall we include the illegally applied for GOP absentee ballots in Seminole and Martin? Shall we stop the recount of undervotes?

Note the courts answered yes to each one of these questions, but a no answer to any we would have a different President.

Andy Beveridge

Andrew A. Beveridge                 Home Office
209 Kissena Hall              50 Merriam Avenue
Department of Sociology Bronxville, NY 10708
Queens College and Grad Ctr/CUNY Phone: 914-337-6237
Flushing, NY 11367-1597 Fax: 914-337-8210
Phone: 718-997-2837 E-Mail: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Fax: 718-997-2820 Website: http://www.soc.qc.edu/Maps

On Wed, 20 Dec 2000, Hank Zucker wrote:

> There's always been a fair, simple, objective way to determine whether
> dimpled chads should count.
> 
> Start with the assumption that people in punch card counties are no more or
> less decisive in their choice of President that people in optical scan
> counties.
> 
> Then manually count only the hanging chads. Does adding in that number of
> votes get you near to the 0.3% undervotes of the optical scan counties? If
> so, stop there.
> 
> If not, count the dimpled ones. Add them in. Unless adding them gets you
> too far under the 0.3% undervote figure, they should have been counted.
> 
> I am not sure if "dimpled" and "pregnant" chads are two names for the same
> thing or they are fairly clearly distinct. If the latter, count them
> separately and add in the clearer group first in a separate step.
> 
> Hank Zucker, Ph.D.
> Creative Research Systems
> www.surveysystem.com
> 
>
Nielsen Media Research (NMR) is seeking applicants for an open salaried position at the level of Senior Research Analyst to support its growing Interactive Services Department. This position will be responsible for managing all telephone surveys associated with the Nielsen//NetRatings project, which maintains the largest and highest quality Internet research panel in the U.S. Nielsen//NetRatings is a joint venture of Nielsen Media Research, the standard in television audience ratings in North America, and NetRatings, the leading provider of Internet audience measurement and analysis worldwide.

The position is full-time and is expected to be located in our Tampa (Dunedin) Florida area offices. However, there is a possibility that it will be located in our New York City offices.

DESCRIPTION

This position is responsible for designing and conducting complex research telephone and mail surveys. The main objectives of the position are to:

* Design survey panel recruitment and data collection telephone scripts
* Work closely with internal Nielsen Media telephone survey centers to execute studies
* Participate in telephone center briefing and training sessions
* Monitor calling procedures for quality assurance
* Perform data analysis of survey results
* Design mail recruitment and panel communication materials
* Ensure consistency in methodology across phone and mail treatments
* Contribute to the initiation of research ideas

* REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS:
* BS/BA in a Social Science research discipline, Statistics or equivalent
* Knowledge of mechanics of planning and implementing research designs for telephone and mail surveys
* Knowledge of Microsoft Office (Excel, PowerPoint, and Word)
* Solid oral and written communication skills

DESIRED QUALIFICATIONS:

* Master's degree in a Social Science research discipline, Statistics or equivalent
Experience with research techniques, statistics and project management. In addition, specialized skill in sample design, questionnaire design, data collection and data analysis techniques and reporting for telephone, mail, Internet, and in-person survey research.

- General media industry knowledge
- Knowledge of project costing procedures
- Human relations skills successfully necessary to interact, correspond and maintain effective communications with management, peers, support departments and external suppliers

Likely salary range, if located in the Florida office, will be the middle to high $30s. Full benefits package available.

Interested parties should contact Kelly Feeney, Nielsen Media Research, 375 Patricia Avenue, Dunedin, FL 34698-8190; Office: 727-738-3476; Fax: 727-738-3012; Email: FeeneyK@TVRatings.com

Please indicate JOB POSTING # KF112800SRA on all correspondence.

NMR strongly encourages the application of women and minorities to all open positions.

---

Date: Wed, 20 Dec 2000 17:32:20 -0500
From: "Lavrakas, Paul" <pjlavrakas@tvratings.com>
To: "'aapornet@usc.edu'" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Post-election response rates
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2651.58)
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="iso-8859-1"

A few weeks ago I posted a query to AAPORnet asking to be contacted about whether or not survey organizations had been experiencing any "changes" in their response rates after the election, compared to what they would have expected in November and December after a "typical" general election.

I heard back from nine organizations (a mix of both commercial and academic). No group reported higher than expected rates. Four indicated no change compared to what they had expected to achieve. Five indicated their rates were lower than expected, with the observed drop in rates reported by four of the five groups being in the 5-20 percentage point range. The groups that reported lower than expected rates where both commercial and academic.

Thanks to those of you who were able to share this information.

********************************************************************************
Paul J. Lavrakas, Ph.D.
Vice President & Senior Research Methodologist
NEILSEN MEDIA RESEARCH
299 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10171
Tonight's three-hour PBS special, "The First Measured Century," ought to interest more than a few AAPORNETters. If you are one, you must check your local tv listings for the starting times (those below are for the Los Angeles area stations only). This program is certain to include survey and market research, public opinion polling, and the development of social science and social statistics more generally. I can't imagine that, in three hours of programming, we won't see at least a few of our favorite AAPOR members.

-- Jim

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times

Wednesday, December 20, 2000

'Measured Century' Offers a Retrospective That Counts

Television: PBS special examines the last 100 years through a statistical prism and how the information has affected life in the U.S.

By ELIZABETH JENSEN, Times Staff Writer

NEW YORK--The "end-of-the-century" television retrospectives started almost two years ago, in the lead up to New Year's Eve 1999, but PBS has found room for one more, tonight's "The First Measured Century."

The three-hour special stands apart in many ways from the other programs riding on the hoopla of the occasion. Most of the specials that took over the airwaves last year tended to look at the time period through its monumental anecdotes: Lindbergh crossing the Atlantic; the
The last 100 years were marked by a dramatic rise in social science, which offers a different way of telling the country's story, by looking at such factors as immigration, life expectancy, religion and income, which allow "you and me and the guy behind the counter" to enter the picture, he says.

The program looks at how the influence of statistics has affected the country, in the interrelation between the data and public policy. At the same time, it tells a story of how America has changed, as told through the numbers. Some statistics were gathered specifically for the program and companion book: in particular, the team revisited Muncie, Ind., already perhaps the most-measured city in America, as the site of the "Middletown" studies of 1924 and 1977.

Wattenberg's conclusion from all the number-crunching: "If you look at the 20th century through a data lens, America is not only the most successful country, but it is successful in many respects that are quite different from other countries."

His approach couldn't be more timely, coming off the finally concluded presidential election, which drew much of its initial drama from the election night foul-ups of the major television networks. The networks all relied on exit polling data for their now-notorious botched projections of a winner. The program looks back to the origins and establishment of such polling, and George Gallup's 1936 wager, a successful one, that he could pick the winner of that year's presidential contest using just a small representative sample, shaming the pollsters who relied on asking millions of people--an upscale, atypical group drawn from driver's license and phone records--for whom they planned to vote.

Wattenberg, who was highly critical of the network rush to judgment in a recent newspaper column (He wrote: "They should now be slapped across the wrist by the Feds, perhaps with a machete"), now has a chance to get a close, practical look at the result of what Gallup wrought: He is serving on a panel of outsiders engaged by CNN to evaluate what went wrong on election night. He calls television's hurry to project a winner before all the polls close "irresponsible," adding that "in my judgment, they have no damn business screwing around with a federal election." But he says he is "still trying to keep an open mind" as the CNN investigation proceeds.

It's not the existence of the polling data that is problematic, Wattenberg argues, but how the numbers are used. The information is valuable, but the networks and the public "can wait three hours," he says.

The data aren't necessarily so benign with earlier episodes of data-gathering now discredited as scientific racism explored in "First Measured Century," including: the use of culturally rigged IQ tests and measurement of head shapes to develop a body of "evidence" used to discriminate against the waves of immigrants entering the country from southern and eastern Europe. But there are also tales of how social
science was put to use to reduce such factors as infant mortality in the cities at the beginning of the century, and a look at the public policy implications of Daniel Patrick Moynihan's controversial mid-1960s study on the breakdown of the black family.

This constant measurement that has marked the century, starting with the most-extensive-ever U.S. Census of 1890, which asked about 250 questions, is still "the best game in town," Wattenberg argues, praising "the imperfect method of accountability inherent in the great data-gathering machine" that exists today.

"That's not to say there are not a lot of people working agendas through the data," he says. But with the companion book of annotated charts ("The First Measured Century: An Illustrated Guide to Trends in America, 1900-2000" by Theodore Caplow, Louis Hicks and Wattenberg) and a Web site (http://www.pbs.org/fmc), Wattenberg wants viewers to look at the data themselves and draw their own conclusions. "You too can be an expert," he says.

------

* "The First Measured Century" can be seen tonight at 8:30 on KVCR-TV, and at 9 on KCET-TV. The network has rated it TV-G (suitable for all ages).

--------------------------------------

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times

--------------------------------------

*****

==================================================
Date: Wed, 20 Dec 2000 19:32:59 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: "Nick Trippel" <ntrippel@aperture.org>,
    "Craig Gurian" <craiggurian@igc.org>,
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: FW: portrait of the electorate
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGCPIBFJPRFEDCIAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
    charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700

I got this message today from Marjorie Connelly at the Times. If you want to know how support for the various Presidential Candidates have changed over time, here it is.

Andy

> -----Original Message-----
Andy -- the portrait of the electorate chart is finally up on The Times' website.

At this address, http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/index-polls.html, there's a link on the right to the chart.

Sorry it's taken so long.

Have a nice holiday.

Marjorie

This is fantastic. Take a look at the gender gap between white men and white women in support for the Democratic presidential candidate. There is a 12 point gap between them in 2000 - the widest gap to date.

At 07:32 PM 12/20/2000 -0500, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:
I got this message today from Marjorie Connelly at the Times.
If you want to know how support for the various Presidential Candidates have changed over time, here it is.

Andy

-----Original Message-----
From: Marjorie Connelly [mailto:connelly@nytimes.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2000 6:06 PM
To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Subject: portrait of the electorate

Andy -- the portrait of the electorate chart is finally up on The Times' website.

At this address,
http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/index-polls.html, there's
a link on
the right to the chart.
Sorry it's taken so long.
Have a nice holiday.
Marjorie

Ashley Grosse
Director of Studies
National Election Studies
University of Michigan
ISR, office 4118
voice: 734.764.5494  fax: 734.764.3341

He didn't even call it on election night!

In 1555, Nostradamus wrote:

"Come the millennium, month 12,
In the home of greatest power,
The village idiot will come forth
To be acclaimed the leader."
He didn't even call it on election night!

In 1555, Nostradamus wrote:

"Come the millennium, month 12,
In the home of greatest power,
The village idiot will come forth
To be acclaimed the leader."

No, he didn't. That is not one of his quatrains.

He has a vaguely similar one about the weak son of a king coming to power, though.

--

Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Ashley is correct. Here's the question for us-- why was the gap so large in this election?

Ashley Grosse wrote:

This is fantastic. Take a look at the gender gap between white men and white women in support for the Democratic presidential candidate. There is a 12 point gap between them in 2000 - the widest gap to date.

At 07:32 PM 12/20/2000 -0500, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:
If you want to know how support for the various Presidential Candidates have changed over time, here it is.

> This is fantastic. Take a look at the gender gap between white men and white women in support for the Democratic presidential candidate. There is a 12 point gap between them in 2000 - the widest gap to date.

> At 07:32 PM 12/20/2000 -0500, Andrew A. Beveridge wrote:
> If you want to know how support for the various Presidential Candidates have changed over time, here it is.

> >
> > >> -----Original Message-----
From: Marjorie Connelly [mailto:connelly@nytimes.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2000 6:06 PM
To: andy@troll.soc.qc.edu
Subject: portrait of the electorate

Andy -- the portrait of the electorate chart is finally up on The Times' website.
At this address, http://www.nytimes.com/library/national/index-polls.html, there's a link on the right to the chart.
Sorry it's taken so long.
Have a nice holiday.

Marjorie

Ashley Grosse
Director of Studies
National Election Studies
University of Michigan
ISR, office 4118
voice: 734.764.5494   fax: 734.764.3341

ENOUGH ALREADY! I think it may be the idiots sending such e-mail.
An article by Seth Mnookin

"VNS, and the television networks it works for, failed so spectacularly because it didn't factor in the massive shifts in how Americans vote. Brill's Content gained access to VNS documents, including screen grabs of the VNS numbers that resulted, first, in the calling of Florida for Vice-President Al Gore and, later, the calling of the state, and the presidency, for Texas governor George W. Bush. Network and VNS officials have been predictably parsimonious with their comments, but the VNS documents, combined with interviews and transcripts of the networks' election-night coverage, explain how a multimillion-dollar project designed to serve the public ended up doing exactly the opposite."


--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Date: Thu, 21 Dec 2000 10:56:38 -0800 (PST)
From: Paul J Lavrakas PhD <pjlavrakas@yahoo.com>
Subject: Brill Conent "news"
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

For anyone, such as myself, who worked with VNS during this past election and on election night, the so-called journalism that is reflected by the bit of the Mnookin article that Leo cites is so seriously flawed as to render the article worthless as a source of accurate "news."

I am very proud to have been a small part of the very careful and rigorous effort that Murray Edelman and others at VNS mounted this year to serve their owners and our democracy with the high quality data they generated.

PJL

-------------------------------------
An article by Seth Mnookin

"VNS, and the television networks it works for, failed so spectacularly because it didn't factor in the massive shifts in how Americans vote. Brill's Content gained access to VNS documents, including screen grabs of the VNS numbers that resulted, first, in the calling of Florida for
Vice-President Al Gore and, later, the calling of the state, and the presidency, for Texas governor George W. Bush. Network and VNS officials have been predictably parsimonious with their comments, but the VNS documents, combined with interviews and transcripts of the networks' election-night coverage, explain how a multimillion-dollar project designed to serve the public ended up doing exactly the opposite."


--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Do You Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Shopping - Thousands of Stores. Millions of Products.  
http://shopping.yahoo.com/

Date: Thu, 21 Dec 2000 14:04:41 EST
From: JAnnSelzer@aol.com
Received: from JAnnSelzer@aol.com
    by imo-r08.mx.aol.com (mail_out_v28.35.) id 5.33.e59362e (3966)  
    for <aapornet@usc.edu>; Thu, 21 Dec 2000 14:04:42 -0500 (EST)
Message-ID: <33.e59362e.2773ae49@aol.com>
Subject: Archives
To: aapornet@usc.edu
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="part1_33.e59362e.2773ae49_boundary"
Content-Disposition: Inline
X-Mailer: 6.0 sub 171

--part1_33.e59362e.2773ae49_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I recently returned to aapornet and wonder if there is some way to access the list's archives. Does anyone know?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company
Des Moines, Iowa

--part1_33.e59362e.2773ae49_boundary
Content-Type: text/html; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
I recently returned to aapornet and wonder if there is some way to access the list's archives. &nbsp;Does anyone know?

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer &amp; Company
Des Moines, Iowa

---part1_33.e59362e.2773ae49_boundary---

In response to an increasingly asked question...

HOW TO ACCESS THE AAPORNET ARCHIVES

(Yes, every word ever posted to AAPORNET is available to all members of the list, any time, day nor night, even on major holidays.)

*** To: listproc@usc.edu , with *NO* subject header, send the one-line command:  get aapornet logYYMM
where YY is the two-digit year (1999 is 99, etc.) and
where MM is the two-digit month (03 is March, etc.)

NOTE: The archives are available in one-month chunks only; they are
*NOT* available by days, weeks, years, decades, or centuries

*** FOR EXAMPLE, to get the January 1999 archive,
send to:  listproc@usc.edu
the one-line command:  get aapornet log9901
and *ABSOLUTELY NOTHING ELSE*
Within a minute or two after sending this, you will receive, from listproc@usc.edu, and with your own one-line command in the subject header, a massive file with every message received during January 1999, in the order posted.

To find then the topic of interest to you, you will do best to search the archive by keywords using your own internet mail software.

Because of the size of most monthly archives, I cannot personally recommend that you order more than one in a single message--the server can handle more, but I'm not sure you wish to have more than one sitting in your mail files at any one time.

-- Jim

Here's the beginning of the January 1999 archive, just mailed to me...

---------- Forwarded message ----------
Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2000 09:14:13 PST
From: "CREN ListProcessor(tm) at USC" <listproc@usc.edu>
To: beniger@rcf.usc.edu
Subject: GET aapornet log9901 (1/1)

Archive aapornet, file log9901.
Part 1/1, total size 199495 bytes:

------------------------------ Cut here ------------------------------
========================================================================
Date: Fri, 1 Jan 1999 21:27:01 -0500
From: "Albert Parker" <acep@sprintmail.com>
To: "AAPORNET" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Census Sampling and New Speaker
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
            charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 4.72.2106.4
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V4.72.2106.4

AAPOR might have gained an important supporter of its position on Census sampling estimation. The latest estimates reported in the Washington Post today are that Illinois will just barely miss losing a seat in the 2000 reapportionment. Thus, Illinois might be one of the states that would...
A thousand thank yous! And, happy holidays! JAS

J. Ann Selzer, Ph.D.
Selzer & Company
Des Moines, Iowa

My sentiments exactly. Life goes on!!!!!!!!!!!!

-----Original Message-----
From: HOneill536@aol.com [mailto:HOneill536@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2000 1:34 PM
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Nostradamus Predicts the Election

ENOUGH ALREADY! I think it may be the idiots sending such e-mail.

Date: Thu, 21 Dec 2000 18:28:35 -0500
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
Reply-To: jwerner@jwdp.com
X-Mailer: Mozilla 4.76 [en] (Win98; U)
X-Accept-Language: en
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: aapornet@usc.edu
Subject: Re: Brill Content "news"
References: <20001221185638.29493.qmail@web4401.mail.yahoo.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

The only objection to the VNS forecasting model that Mr. Mnookin can come up with is the one stated by Murray Edelman himself in the purloined memo to the VNS Board that Brill published along with the article, namely that VNS underestimated the impact of absentee ballots.

The memo makes fascinating reading, otherwise, the article is a typical mish-mash of first person reporting padded with half-digested information and second hand news. The only person quoted at length is Warren Mitofsky, but it is not clear whether Mnookin interviewed Warren or just lifted passages from public statements made after the election.

If you actually plow through the entire article (not a pleasant task), it isn't VNS that really looks bad, but the network news organizations, although that does not seem to be what the author had in mind.

One thing Brill's Content really could use is a competent editor.

Jan Werner

-------------

Paul J Lavrakas PhD wrote:
> For anyone, such as myself, who worked with VNS during
> this past election and on election night, the
> so-called journalism that is reflected by the bit of
> the Mnookin article that Leo cites is so seriously
> flawed as to render the article worthless as a source
> of accurate "news."
> >
> > I am very proud to have been a small part of the very
> > careful and rigorous effort that Murray Edelman and
> > others at VNS mounted this year to serve their owners
> > and our democracy with the high quality data they
> > generated.
> > > PJL
> > >
> > An article by Seth Mnookin
"VNS, and the television networks it works for, failed so spectacularly because it didn't factor in the massive shifts in how Americans vote. Brill's Content gained access to VNS documents, including screen grabs of the VNS numbers that resulted, first, in the calling of Florida for Vice-President Al Gore and, later, the calling of the state, and the presidency, for Texas governor George W. Bush. Network and VNS officials have been predictably parsimonious with their comments, but the VNS documents, combined with interviews and transcripts of the networks' election-night coverage, explain how a multimillion-dollar project designed to serve the public ended up doing exactly the opposite."


--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com


---
'T was the night before Chanukah, as it is said
And Santa was sitting and hocking his head
He had all the toys wrapped up nice in his zeckel
For maidlach and boys to give each one a peckel
The reindeer were saddled and ready to fly
Like a crew of brave astronauts all through the sky
But Santa was starving to eat a good meichel
Some regular food that would stick to his beichel
Not plum cakes or mincemeat or peppermint candy
But some kosher cooking he thought would be dandy
So he called to his reindeer, "Hey, kinder, let's go
To a Jewish balbusta and don't be so slow."
The house had no chimney, so he went through the door
And kissed the mezuzah and jumped on the floor
Then the man of the house said, "Santa you devil
Come on, don't be shy and see our split level
The night is still early, there's plenty of zeit
So come in the den and please have a bite

If only we knew you were coming, by gosh
But I'll call out the wife and she'll give you a nosh
A slice of stuffed derma, a few little strudels
Some chicken salami, some flanken with noodles
Some blintzes, some kreplach, some lox and bialy
A bissel chopped herring, an end piece of chaleh
And if all of these goodies don't fill up your gatkes
Last but not least, some Chanukah latkes."
"A latke?" cried Santa, "what is this delight?"

On the outside it's golden and inside it's white.
On the outside so crisp and inside it's yummy
And he gobbled them up 'til he filled his fat tummy.
Then they gave him a dreidel and showed him the plays
And he took a menorah to light for eight days
And to give Santa some spirit and to show how they felt
For mazel they gave him some Chanukah gelt.
He beamed and he chuckled and said "Kine-ahaora,

I don't want to feel like a Chanukah schnorrer
To show you how much I enjoyed your Jewish snack
I'm leaving you everything, even my sack."
Then he called to his reindeer and said, "Luz mir gehn."
And each one got ready as he schlepped on the rein
"Giddypap Irving, Hoo Ha Sidney, Hi ho Sadie, Let's go Yetta,
Onward Gussie, Upward Solly, Ole Becky, Oy Vey Molly

Twas the night before Chanukah, boychicks and maidels
Not a sound could be heard, not even the draidels.
The Menorah was set on the chimney, alight
In the kitchen the Bubba hut gechapt a bite.

Salami, pastrami, a glessala tay
And zayerah pickles with bagels, oy vay!
Gezunt and geschmack, the kinderlech felt
While dreaming of tagelach and Chanukah gelt.
The clock on the mantlepiece away was tickin'
And Bubba was serving a schtickala chicken.
A tumult arose like a thousand brauches,
Santa had fallen and broken his tuches.

I put on my slippers, eins, tvay, drei,
While Bubba was now on the herring and rye.
I grabbed for my bathrobe and buttoned my gotkes
While Bubba was busy devouring the latkes.
To the window I ran and to my surprise
A little red yarmulka greeted my eyes.
Then he got to the door and saw the Menorah,
"Yiddishe kinder," he said, "Kenehora
I thought I was in a goyisha hoise,
But as long as I'm here, I'll leave a few toys."
With much gesshray, I asked, "Du bist a Yid?"
"Avada, mein numen is Schloimey Claus, kid."
"Come into the kitchen, I'll get you a dish,
A guppell, a schtickala fish."
With smacks of delight, he started his fressen,
Chopped liver, knaidlach and kreplah gegessen.
Along with his meal, he had a few schnapps,
When it came to eating, this boy was the tops.
He asked for some knishes with pepper and salt
Unbuttoning his haizen, he rose from the tisch,
And said, "Your Kosher essen is simply delish."
As he went to the door, he said "I'll see you later,
I'll be back next Pesach, in time for the Seder."
More rapid than eagles his prancers they came,
As he whistled and shoutened and called them by name:
"Now Izzy, now Morris, now Yitzak, now Sammy,
Now Irving and Maxie, and Moishe and Mannie."
He gave a gesshray as he drove out of sight:
"Gooten Yomtov to all, and to all a good night."

A few year's ago, I accidentally sent a Cajun Christmas poem to AAPORnet. Many thanked me and found it serendipitous. This year, again accidentally, truly, I sent a Chanukah poem. Enjoy it please and forgive my oversight. Happy Holidays!
Dear fellow "Net" members:
As promised, I have sent a contribution to the AAPOR Endowment Fund. Having planned to send a gift anyhow, I increased the planned amount by $100, $50 for each of the bets I lost (to Warren Mitofsky and, I believe, Jan Werner).

To turn this loss into a "win," please take pity on this dewy-eyed optimist who was willing to wager that the Supreme Court would quickly send the Gore-Bush case back to the FL Supreme Court and that, with the completed recount showing Gore won the FL popular and electoral votes and the intervention of of the FL legislature to appoint Republican electors, the decision would be made by Congress, which would have to award the Presidency to Gore.

This could be a win, not only for my extremely bruised ego, but also for AAPOR and possibly, American democracy if the Endowment Fund grows and is used to sponsor research that helps the American public participate more fully in the political process.

Jeanne Anderson

The following article appears on page one of today's Washington Post.
Before taking it too seriously, note that the author is Howard Kurtz, who is given to inflating the facts he reports, e.g., "the biggest blunder in television history" in the first paragraph.

Errors Plagued Election Night Polling Service  
VNS Report Also Faults Networks in Fla. Blunder  
By Howard Kurtz  
Washington Post Staff Writer  
Friday, December 22, 2000; Page A01  

The polling organization responsible for the biggest blunder in television history on election night was plagued by a series of errors that distorted the Florida vote all night long, a confidential report concludes.

The internal investigation by Voter News Service also makes clear
that its techniques were inherently risky for the networks that rely on its data.

The group had no reliable way of estimating the number of Florida's absentee ballots in the presidential race, which were almost double what it had expected. What's more, the news service dramatically underestimated the number of Florida votes still uncounted at 2 a.m.

"Budget limitations" have "placed heavy burdens on all VNS staff and [have] made the task of covering elections far more difficult than necessary," says the report, a copy of which was obtained by The Washington Post. VNS was created in 1990 as a cost-cutting measure by the major television networks and the Associated Press.

While CBS, NBC, ABC, CNN and Fox decided to project Vice President Gore and, six hours later, George W. Bush the Florida winner -- and had to retract both calls in humiliating fashion -- those decisions were based heavily on bad VNS data.

This was more than just a media embarrassment. The calling of Florida for Gore gave many viewers the impression, especially after the vice president won Michigan and Pennsylvania, that he was on his way to the White House, a situation Republicans say may have discouraged some Bush voters from turning out. The later projection that Bush had won Florida fostered a national mind-set that he had been elected president, which Gore supporters say made their recount battle that much harder.

VNS spokeswoman Lee C. Shapiro said she could not comment on the inquiry.

At 7:50 p.m. on Nov. 7, when the network calls for Gore began, VNS was wildly underestimating the size of Florida's absentee vote. The group thought absentee ballots would make up 7.2 percent of the overall vote, instead of the actual figure of 12 percent.

VNS also projected that absentees would vote 22.4 percent more for Bush than Election Day voters, when the actual figure was 23.7 percent. That mistake alone accounted for 1.3 percentage points of the 7.3 percent lead that Gore was projected to hold at that moment.

VNS was operating in the dark because the organization did no telephone polling in Florida to try to estimate the size and shape of the absentee vote, largely because of "the very considerable costs" involved. The group did such surveys in California, Oregon and Washington because of the traditionally heavy absenteeballoting in those states.

"The absentee vote has been growing over the years, and we have had to deal with it in a patchwork method," the report says.

Another 2.8 percentage points of Gore's projected lead was inflated by problems with the exit polls, specifically the sampling of voters in the group's 45 selected precincts. The report says this degree of error is "within the normal range" for exit polls.

The remaining 3.2 percentage points of the Gore lead were due to
flaws in the exit poll "model" itself. One of VNS's key techniques is to compare its exit-poll findings to the results of past elections.

VNS says it used Florida Gov. Jeb Bush's 1998 victory as the best predictor of how his brother would fare this year, but that Robert J. Dole's 1996 bid -- more voters turn out in a presidential year -- would have produced a better estimate. There also "may be errors in the past vote file for the 1998 gubernatorial race," the report says.

Finally, VNS uses raw vote totals to help correct any exit-poll errors. At 7:50, the exit poll in Tampa was off by 16 percentage points, inflating Gore's estimated lead. But Tampa and Miami, which had the biggest overstatement of Gore's lead in the exit polls, had not reported any votes at 7:50, leaving VNS unable to modify its errors.

If any one of these four mishaps had not occurred, the report says, VNS might not have called Florida for Gore. While some "bad luck" was involved, says the report by editorial director Murray Edelman, the networks also bear responsibility for making projections without consulting VNS.

"It would appear that calls are being made at the minimum acceptable tolerances for risk, with very little allowance for error," he writes. "If we are to continue in this manner, our decision procedures must be redesigned."

The network projections that Bush had won Florida, and with it the presidency, began at 2:16 a.m. They also were based on bad VNS numbers (although neither the news service nor the AP declared Bush the winner).

At 2:10, with 97 percent of the state's precincts reporting, VNS estimated that there were 179,713 votes outstanding. In fact, more than 359,000 votes came in after 2:10. In Palm Beach County alone, VNS projected there were 41,000 votes outstanding, but 129,000 votes came in.

This was compounded by local problems with reporting the vote. At 2:08, Gore's total in Volusia County mysteriously dropped by more than 10,000 votes, while nearly 10,000 votes were added to Bush's total. This mistake boosted Bush's lead by 20,348 votes, giving him a 51,433-vote lead over Gore -- or so VNS believed.

Brevard County later increased Gore's total by 4,000, with none for Bush, in what appeared to be a correction of an earlier mistake. Given the tightness of the contest, Edelman writes, "I was very concerned to see the race called by the networks."

Among other problems, VNS's quality-control system was so inadequate that it failed to reject an early report that 95 percent of Duval County had voted for Gore.

And thanks to exit-poll samples that are smaller than the networks used before VNS was created, "there is some evidence that we
overstated the size of the black vote and underestimated the size of the Cuban vote in Florida, and both of these errors could have contributed to the overstatement of the vote for Gore."

Network executives and anchors have repeatedly apologized for their election night mistakes and launched internal inquiries. ABC says it will insulate its decision desk from competitive pressures and describe all future projections as estimates. Fox says it will probably drop VNS and start a new polling consortium.

© 2000 The Washington Post Company

Does anyone have an e-mail address for contacting VNS about obtaining data? I've tried their web site but it is under construction. Please reply to me off-list at the e-mail address below. Thank you.

Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Ph.D.
Senior Project Director
Research Department
United Jewish Communities
111 Eighth Avenue, Suite 11E
New York, NY 10011-5201

telephone: 212.284.6578
fax: 212.284.6805
e-mail: laurence.kotler-berkowitz@ujc.org
Does anyone have an e-mail address for contacting VNS about obtaining data? I've tried their web site but it is under construction.

Please reply to me off-list at the e-mail address below. Thank you.

Laurence Kotler-Berkowitz, Ph.D.
Senior Project Director
Research Department
United Jewish Communities
111 Eighth Avenue, Suite 11E
New York, NY 10011-5201

telephone: 212.284.6578
fax: 212.284.6805
e-mail: laurence.kotler-berkowitz@ujc.org
I'd like to see the responses to this query; could they be put on the list, or
sent out privately if that is preferable? thanks, JH

Howard Schuman wrote:

> Can someone point me to recent (1999 or 2000) data on what Americans know,
> or at least say they know, about different events and people of the past
> couple of years? For example, what percentage can identify Monica
Lewinsky as against the percentage that can identify Putin? And similar indicators of attention to news of different kinds.

Thanks, Howard

I received only 3 or 4 responses, one of which mainly criticized my message for not distinguishing between recall & recognition (I would be glad to have both, and osmosis as well). The positive responses all pointed to a People & Press website, which is indeed useful (and a kind of recognition): http://www.people-press.org/database.htm

Probably POLL at the Roper Center has data also, but it was not mentioned and I don't have an immediate way of locating relevant data there. The ICPSR may well have data also, and of course Gallup, etc., but again I have no specific locations. Perhaps some knowledgeable souls will provide sites or other references.

Howard

On Fri, 22 Dec 2000, Jennifer Hochschild wrote:
I'd like to see the responses to this query; could they be put on the list, or sent out privately if that is preferable? thanks, JH

Howard Schuman wrote:

Can someone point me to recent (1999 or 2000) data on what Americans know, or at least say they know, about different events and people of the past couple of years? For example, what percentage can identify Monica Lewinsky as against the percentage that can identify Putin? And similar indicators of attention to news of different kinds.

Thanks, Howard

===================================================================
Date: Thu, 21 Dec 2000 21:59:06 -0700
From: "Michael O'Neil" <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
To: "Aapornet@Usc.Edu" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: A Holiday Season Message
Message-ID: <NEBBKEFNONIIEECEAPMEFPCDAAMike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="-----_NextPart_000_0035_01C06B99.3D149020"
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2910.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2615.200

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----_NextPart_000_0035_01C06B99.3D149020
Content-Type: text/plain;
 charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I got this message some time ago and saved it- I found it to be a moving story.

Giving Blood--
Many years ago, when I worked as a volunteer at Stanford Hospital, I got to know a little girl named Liz who was suffering from a rare and serious disease. Her only chance of recovery appeared to be a blood transfusion from her 5-year old brother, who had miraculously survived the same disease and had developed the antibodies, needed to combat the illness. The doctor explained the situation to her little brother, and asked the boy if he would be willing to give his blood to his sister.
I saw him hesitate for only a moment before taking a deep breath and saying, "Yes, I'll do it if it will save Liz."
As the transfusion progressed, he lay in bed next to his sister and smiled, as we all did, seeing the color returning to her cheeks. Then his face grew pale and his smile faded. He looked up at the doctor and asked with a trembling voice, "Will I start to die right
away?"

Being young, the boy had misunderstood the doctor; he thought he was going to have to give his sister all of his blood.

Best Wishes of the Season

Mike O'Neil

O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282 USA

oneil@oneilresearch.com as appropriate.
www.oneilresearch.com Company web site w/link to company email.

--------=_NextPart_000_0035_01C06B99.3D149020
Content-Type: text/html;
    charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
    <META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =
    http-equiv=3DContent-Type><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 =
    HTML//EN">
    <META content=3D"MSHTML 5.00.2614.3500" name=3DGENERATOR></HEAD>
<body bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<div><font face=3Darial size=3D2><span class=3D050152918-10122000>I got this message=20
    some time ago and saved it- I found it to be a moving =
    story.</span></font></div>
</body></html>
trembling voice, "Will I start to die right away?" Being young, the boy had misunderstood the doctor; he thought he was going to have to give his sister all of his blood.

Best Wishes of the Season

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Michael O’Neil <mike.oneil@alumni.brown.edu>
I got this message some time ago and saved it— I found it to be a moving story.

Giving Blood—
Many years ago, when I worked as a volunteer at Stanford Hospital, I got to know a little girl named Liz who was suffering from a rare and serious disease. Her only chance of recovery appeared to be a blood transfusion from her 5-year old brother, who had miraculously survived the same disease and had developed the antibodies, needed to combat the illness. The doctor explained the situation to her little brother, and asked the boy if he would be willing to give his blood to his sister.

I saw him hesitate for only a moment before taking a deep breath and saying, "Yes, I'll do it if it will save Liz."

As the transfusion progressed, he lay in bed next to his sister and smiled, as we all did, seeing the color returning to her cheeks. Then his face grew pale and his smile faded. He looked up at the doctor and asked with a trembling voice, "Will I start to die right away?"

Being young, the boy had misunderstood the doctor; he thought he was going to have to give his sister all of his blood.

Best Wishes of the Season

Mike O'Neil.

O'Neil Associates, Inc.
412 East Southern Avenue
Tempe, Arizona 85282 USA

oneil@oneilresearch.com as appropriate.
www.oneilresearch.com Company web site w/link to company email.

Thanks, Mike.
Giving Blood---<BR>Many years ago, when I worked as a volunteer at =

Stanford Hospital,<BR>I got to know a little girl named Liz who was =
suffering=20
from a rare<br>and serious disease. Her only chance of recovery =
appeared to be=20
a<br>blood transfusion from her 5-year old brother, who had=20
miraculously<br>survived the same disease and had developed the =
antibodies,=20
needed to<br>combat the illness.&nbsp; The doctor explained the =
situation to=20
her little<br>brother, and asked the boy if he would be willing to =
give his=20
blood to<br>his sister.<BR>I saw him hesitate for only a moment before =
taking=20
a deep breath and<br>saying, "Yes, I'll do it if it will save =
Liz."<BR>As the=20
transfusion progressed, he lay in bed next to his sister =
and<br>smiled, as we=20
all did, seeing the color returning to her cheeks.<BR>Then his face =
grew pale=20
and his smile faded. He looked up at the<br>doctor and asked with a =
trembling=20
voice, "Will I start to die right<br>away?"<BR>Being young, the boy =
had=20
misunderstood the doctor; he thought he<br>was going to have to give =
his=20
sister all of his blo<br>
Jan Werner informs me that it was Andy Beveridge, not Jan, who took me up on the bet I subsequently lost. I apologize publicly now for the error.

Jeanne
AAPOR Conferences where she was the Conference Book Exhibit coordinator extraordinaire.

Phyllis' sister, Corinne Kirchner, informed AAPOR today that apparently Phyllis died quietly in her sleep, while recovering in the hospital from an operation, following a fall in her apartment lobby.

Corrine's e-mail address: corinne@afb.net

Marlene at AAPOR

========================================================================
Date: Thu, 28 Dec 2000 10:16:44 -0800
To: aapornet@usc.edu
From: John Tarnai <tarnai@wsu.edu>
Subject: Surveys in Japan and Europe
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed

AAPOR members:

I am forwarding a request from Linda Young, who is the Agricultural Policy Coordinator at the Trade Research Center, at Montana State University. She is submitting a proposal to the National Research Initiative to conduct a household telephone survey with 400 completes in Japan and 400 completes in one country in Europe (which country has not yet been decided). The topic of the survey is household preferences on genetically modified foods, and is likely to be around 15 minutes in length. She is interested in contacting survey organizations that have experience conducting surveys in Japan and in Europe, and that may be interested in participating in this proposal. Please respond directly to her at <lmyoung@montana.edu>. Thanks so much for any help you (AAPOR) can give.

John Tarnai, Ph.D., Director
Social and Economic Sciences Research Center
Wilson Hall 133
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164-4014
Tel: 509-335-1511 Fax: 509-335-0116

========================================================================
Date: Thu, 28 Dec 2000 14:11:32 -0500
From: Leo Simonetta <simonetta@artsci.com>
To: "Aapornet (E-mail)" <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2650.21)
Content-Type: text/plain;
       charset="iso-8859-1"

Chicago Sun Time Columnist Richard Roeper takes on two quotes that have figured prominently in our recent discussions:

"Come the millennium, month 12, in the home of the greatest power, the village idiot will come forth to be acclaimed the leader."

Only one problem, and you don't have to be Nostradamus to see this one coming: The man never wrote anything like that. "

"Nor, for that matter, is there any validity to another quotable quote that's been making the rounds over the last several weeks: the claim that Joseph Stalin once said, "It's not the people who vote that count. It's the people that count the votes." As if Stalin ever had to worry about such things."

He also eviscerates a misquoted monologue from "Key Largo" which I haven't heard about yet.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artscl.com

Dear All:
Then there was Gail Collins take on the same e-mail. If anybody thought it was legit, I have a bridge I want to sell them!


Andy Beveridge
> figured prominently in our recent discussions:
> "Come the millennium, month 12, in the home of the greatest power, the
> village idiot will come forth to be acclaimed the leader."
> Only one problem, and you don't have to be Nostradamus to see this one
> coming: The man never wrote anything like that. "
> "Nor, for that matter, is there any validity to another quotable quote
> that's been making the rounds over the last several weeks: the claim that
> Joseph Stalin once said, "It's not the people who vote that
> count. It's the
> people that count the votes." As if Stalin ever had to worry about such
> things."
> He also eviscerates a misquoted monologue from "Key Largo" which I haven't
> heard about yet.
> --
> Leo G. Simonetta
> Art & Science Group, Inc.
> simonetta@artsci.com
>
>=========================================================================
> Date: Fri, 29 Dec 2000 10:36:11 -0600
> To: aapornet@usc.edu
> From: "Richard C. Rockwell" <richard@opinion.isi.uconn.edu>
> Subject: Re: What Americans say they know about events
> In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.4.10.10012221640020.2570-100000@galaxian.gpcc.itd .umich.edu>
> References: <3A43AFEE.6E52081B@princeton.edu>
> Mime-Version: 1.0
> Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Howard, the interactive version of the Roper Center database, POLL, is
available at
http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/
If you can get to the Internet, you can get to this service. It is now
called iPOLL, but that may change. You can try a limited free trial, sign
up for iPOLL select, or, if you need just the last 12 months data, use
iPOLL limited. The latter is currently priced at $69.95 annually.

At 04:54 PM 12/22/2000 -0500, you wrote:
>I received only 3 or 4 responses, one of which mainly criticized my
>message for not distinguishing between recall & recognition (I would be
>glad to have both, and osmosis as well). The positive responses all
>pointed to a People & Press website, which is indeed useful (and a kind of
>
>Probably POLL at the Roper Center has data also, but it was not mentioned
>and I don't have an immediate way of locating relevant data there. The
>ICPSR may well have data also, and of course Gallup, etc., but again I
>have no specific locations. Perhaps some knowledgeable souls will provide
On Fri, 22 Dec 2000, Jennifer Hochschild wrote:

>> I'd like to see the responses to this query; could they be put on the list, or
>> sent out privately if that is preferable? thanks, JH

>> Howard Schuman wrote:

>> > Can someone point me to recent (1999 or 2000) data on what Americans know,
>> > or at least say they know, about different events and people of the past
>> > couple of years? For example, what percentage can identify Monica
>> > Lewinsky as against the percentage that can identify Putin? And similar
>> > indicators of attention to news of different kinds.
>> >
>> > Thanks, Howard

>-----Original Message-----
>From: Andrew A. Beveridge [mailto:andy@troll.soc.qc.edu]
>Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2000 7:36 PM
>
>Dear All:
>
>Then there was Gail Collins take on the same e-mail. If anybody thought it was legit, I have a bridge I want to sell them!
>

The Stalin "quote" appears to have more legs.
"The high court entered the political thicket by its intrusion into an election where many believed that Gore had won the popular vote in Florida while the Republicans controlled the machinery of counting. The state of Florida's conduct brought to mind Joseph Stalin's comment, "Those who cast the votes decide nothing; those who count the votes decide everything." Florida had no independent overseer of the votes. Every official was in one party's camp or the other's."

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

Sampling Operations Coordinator:

The Survey Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois at Chicago has an opening at the Urbana campus for a Visiting Sampling Operations Coordinator. The primary responsibilities of this position include developing and implementing survey sample designs, monitoring sample dispositions throughout the survey period, preparing and monitoring budgets, calculating response rates and sample weights, and consulting with clients. The position involves the coordination of multiple tasks for many projects, so the candidate must be organized and detail-oriented. The position also requires a high degree of self-motivation and the ability to work with other staff as team members.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR POSITION: B.S./B.A. degree with major in social science, business, education, communications, or related field with at least 1 year experience in research methods, sampling procedures and techniques; or a Master's degree in social science, business, education, communications or related field with demonstrated research capabilities. Familiarity with statistical software, spreadsheets, and database programs a must (preferably Microsoft products).

SALARY RANGE: Low to mid 30's

For full consideration, send your resume by February 1, 2001 to:

Linda Owens
Sampling Operations Supervisor
Survey Research Laboratory (MC-036)
It appears we have another "urban legend" in the making.

"Andrew A. Beveridge" wrote:

> Dear All:
>
> Then there was Gail Collins take on the same e-mail. If anybody thought it
> was legit, I have a bridge I want to sell them!
>
>
> Andy Beveridge
>
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: owner-aapornet@usc.edu [mailto:owner-aapornet@usc.edu]On Behalf Of
> > Leo Simonetta
> > Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2000 2:12 PM
> > To: Aapornet (E-mail)
> > Subject: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes
> > 
> > Chicago Sun Time Columnist Richard Roeper takes on two quotes that have
> > figured prominently in our recent discussions:
> > 
> > 
> > "Come the millennium, month 12, in the home of the greatest power, the
> > village idiot will come forth to be acclaimed the leader."
> > 
> > Only one problem, and you don't have to be Nostradamus to see this one
> > coming: The man never wrote anything like that."
> "Nor, for that matter, is there any validity to another quotable quote
> that's been making the rounds over the last several weeks: the claim that
> Joseph Stalin once said, "It's not the people who vote that
> count. It's the
> people that count the votes." As if Stalin ever had to worry about such
> things."
> He also eviscerates a misquoted monologue from "Key Largo" which I haven't
> heard about yet.

--
Leo G. Simonetta
Art & Science Group, Inc.
simonetta@artsci.com

2001 A Data Odyssey
Collaborative Working in the Social Science Cyber Space

The International Association for Social Science Information Services and Technology (IASSIST) will hold its 27th annual conference with the International Federation of Data Organizations (IFDO) from May 14 19, 2001.

IASSIST/IFDO conferences bring together data professionals, data producers, providers, and users from all around the world.

The conference will be convened in Amsterdam, capital of The Netherlands. Call for Papers
The conference program committee invites submissions for paper presentations, panel discussions, poster & demonstration sessions and workshops for the IASSIST/IFDO Conference.

Proposals due by January 22nd 2001
The conference program committee will send notification of arrival when the (first) proposal has been received. The committee will send notification of acceptance by February 9th 2001.

There is no mandatory length of the proposals, but it should contain enough information to review the proposal. Abstracts from last year's IASSIST conference can be found at: www.src.uchicago.edu/datalib/ia2000
During concurrent sessions speakers will have about 15 minutes time. Workshops are three hours in the morning and/or three hours in the afternoon. Poster sessions are on Thursday afternoon from 2 till 4 p.m.

Completed papers can be submitted to the IASSIST Quarterly after the conference. Other types of presentations, like PowerPoint presentations, or a summary of the presentation, can be sent to the Committee's Mailbox iassist2001@niwi.knaw.nl. We will put them on the web site of IASSIST before, during, or after the conference.

Address
Please send submissions, proposed title and abstract to:

iassist2001@niwi.knaw.nl.

about 15 minutes time. Workshops are three hours in the morning and/or three hours in the afternoon. Poster sessions are on Thursday afternoon from 2 till 4 p.m.

Completed papers can be submitted to the IASSIST Quarterly after the conference. Other types of presentations, like PowerPoint presentations, or a summary of the presentation, can be sent to the Committee's Mailbox iassist2001@niwi.knaw.nl. We will put them on the web site of IASSIST before, during, or after the conference.

Please send submissions, proposed title and abstract to: iassist2001@niwi.knaw.nl. More information can be found on the web site www.niwi.knaw.nl/us/ia2001.

--=====================_1934891==_.ALT--

The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W. and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.

Here's a little parody, not totally devoid of wisdom, that I wish to pass on. After all the bogus Nostradamus/Stalin quotes, VNS apologists, and blame-shifters, I do not feel that it is at all out of line.

Subject: Press Release

NEW YORK AP -- The New York Mets announced today that they are going to court to get an additional inning added to the end of game 5 of the World Series. The batting pitching and bench coaches for the Mets held a press conference earlier today. They were joined by members of the Major League Players Union.

We meant to hit those pitches from the Yankee pitchers.
said the Mets batting coach We were confused by the irregularities of the pitches we received and believe we have been denied our right to hit One claim specifically noted that a small percentage of the Mets batters had intended to swing at fast balls but actually swung at curve balls It was clear that these batters never intended to swing at curve balls though a much higher percentage were not confused by the pitches

Reporters at the press conference pointed out that the Mets had extensively reviewed film of the Yankees pitchers prior to the World Series and had in fact faced the Yankees in inter-league play earlier in the year The fact remains that some of the pitches confused us and denied us of our right to hit said the Mets batting coach The World Series is not over yet and the Yankees are celebrating prematurely Major League Baseball has reviewed the telecast of all the World Series games and recounted the balls and strikes called by the umpires of each game While some of the strikes called against the Mets were in fact balls there were not enough of them to change the outcome of the World Series the commissioner said Another portion of the Mets legal claim stated that based on on-base percentage the Mets had actually won the World Series regardless of the final scores of the games

It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees said a Mets spokesman The World Series crown is rightly ours. The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging in some light jogging for exercise He has stated that he believes we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.

=========================================================================  
Date: Sat, 30 Dec 2000 15:54:19 -0600  
From: "Jan Kiley" <jankiley@soltec.net>  
To: <aapornet@usc.edu>  
Subject: new web site--longtime AAPOR member  
MIME-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;  
boundary="---_NextPart_000_0009_01C07278.C57FC160"  
X-Priority: 3  
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal  
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 5.50.4133.2400  
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.50.4133.2400  

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-------_NextPart_000_0009_01C07278.C57FC160  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable  

A week or so ago, in haste, I sent an email to aapornet without a message! Please look at our new website researchsurveyservice.com

I am a longtime member (about 25 years). I would welcome the opportunity of working with you.
A week or so ago, in haste, I sent an email to aapornet without a message! Please look at our new website researchsurveyservice.com.

I am a longtime member (about 25 years). I would welcome the opportunity of working with you.

Jan Kiley
Research Survey Service, Inc.
307 W. University
Champaign, Illinois 61820
217-239-7880
If we are going to have baseball analogies, let us keep in mind another quotation (real): Fred Mosteller, in Social Relations statistics course c. 1946:
"The World's Series has an n = 7, so the results are usually not statistically significant."

Neither was the result of the recent presidential election. However since someone has to become president, I would prefer that all the votes were counted. The Supreme Court's version of "Compassionate Conservatism" seems to be that if there is a really close race, it is nicer to give the prize to the kid who comes in second.

    Enough already?     Allen Barton

----- Original Message ----- 
From: <Thomoconr@aol.com> 
To: <aapornet@usc.edu> 
Sent: Friday, December 29, 2000 11:32 PM 
Subject: Re: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes

> The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court
> had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W.
> and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.
> Here's a little parody, not totally devoid of wisdom, that I wish to pass on.
> After all the bogus Nostradamus/Stalin quotes, VNS apologists, and
> blame-shifters, I do not feel that it is at all out of line.
> Subject: Press Release
> NEW YORK AP -- The New York Mets announced today that they are going
> to court to get an additional inning added to the end of game 5 of the
> World Series. The batting pitching and bench coaches for the Mets
> held a press conference earlier today. They were joined by members of
> the Major League Players Union
> We meant to hit those pitches from the Yankee pitchers
> said the Mets batting coach. We were confused by the
> irregularities of the pitches we received and believe we have been
> denied our right to hit. One claim specifically noted that a small
> percentage of the Mets batters had intended to swing at fast balls but
> actually swung at curve balls. It was clear that these batters never
> intended to swing at curve balls though a much higher percentage were
> not confused by the pitches
> Reporters at the press conference pointed out that the Mets had
> extensively
> reviewed film of the Yankees pitchers prior to the World Series and had in
> fact faced the Yankees in inter-league play earlier in the year. The fact
> remains that some of the pitches confused us and denied us of our right
>
> to hit said the Mets batting coach The World Series is not over yet and
> the Yankees are celebrating prematurely Major League Baseball has reviewed
> the telecast of all the World Series games and recounted the balls and
> strikes called by the umpires of each game While some of the strikes
> called against the Mets were in fact balls there were not enough of
> them to change the outcome of the World Series the commissioner said
> Another portion of the Mets legal claim stated that based on on-base
> percentage the Mets had actually won the World Series regardless of
> the final scores of the games
>
> It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees
> said a Mets spokesman The World Series crown is rightly ours.
> The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging
> in some light jogging for exercise He has stated that he believes
> we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.
>
> It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees
> said a Mets spokesman The World Series crown is rightly ours.
> The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging
> in some light jogging for exercise He has stated that he believes
> we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.
>
> It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees
> said a Mets spokesman The World Series crown is rightly ours.
> The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging
> in some light jogging for exercise He has stated that he believes
> we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.
>
> It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees
> said a Mets spokesman The World Series crown is rightly ours.
> The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging
> in some light jogging for exercise He has stated that he believes
> we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.

If the Mets were forced to use butterfly bats I would agree that something
about
the system was not working. Extending the number of innings would not be the
solution, and we have to face the fact that the Mets lost the series, but if
the
equipment used was that faulty steps should be taken to prevent it happening
in
the future.

Thomoconr@aol.com wrote:

> The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court
> had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame
> W.
> and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.
>
> Here's a little parody, not totally devoid of wisdom, that I wish to pass
> on.
> After all the bogus Nostradamus/Stalin quotes, VNS apologists, and
> blame-shifters, I do not feel that it is at all out of line.
>
> Subject: Press Release
>
> NEW YORK AP -- The New York Mets announced today that they are going
to court to get an additional inning added to the end of game 5 of the World Series. The batting pitching and bench coaches for the Mets held a press conference earlier today. They were joined by members of the Major League Players Union.

We meant to hit those pitches from the Yankee pitchers said the Mets batting coach. We were confused by the irregularities of the pitches we received and believe we have been denied our right to hit. One claim specifically noted that a small percentage of the Mets batters had intended to swing at fast balls but actually swung at curve balls. It was clear that these batters never intended to swing at curve balls though a much higher percentage were not confused by the pitches.

Reporters at the press conference pointed out that the Mets had extensively reviewed film of the Yankees pitchers prior to the World Series and had in fact faced the Yankees in inter-league play earlier in the year. The fact remains that some of the pitches confused us and denied us of our right to hit said the Mets batting coach. The World Series is not over yet and the Yankees are celebrating prematurely. Major League Baseball has reviewed the telecast of all the World Series games and recounted the balls and strikes called by the umpires of each game. While some of the strikes called against the Mets were in fact balls there were not enough of them to change the outcome of the World Series the commissioner said. Another portion of the Mets legal claim stated that based on on-base percentage the Mets had actually won the World Series regardless of the final scores of the games.

It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees said a Mets spokesman. The World Series crown is rightly ours. The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging in some light jogging for exercise. He has stated that he believes we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.

Date: Sat, 30 Dec 2000 18:33:46 -0500
From: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
To: <ande271@attglobal.net>, <aapornet@usc.edu>
Cc: "Andrew A. Beveridge" <andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
Subject: RE: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes
Message-ID: <NEBBIBIOIKDMKGPFPJBPCEJPCIAA.andy@troll.soc.qc.edu>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook IMO, Build 9.0.2416 (9.0.2911.0)
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6700
In-Reply-To: <3A4E9257.9EC59BFD@attglobal.net>

The real analogy would be to assessing the calls of referees by using a taped replay. The Florida Supreme Court wanted to the replay to take place, the US Supreme court stopped the replay, and now the GOP in Florida wants to burn the tape.
See the following for a serious attempt to figure out what happened in Florida.

(But Republicans are not going to like it!)

The Herald is reviewing about 60,000 so-called undervotes in all 67 Florida counties.
The Herald is looking into voting irregularities to help explain what went wrong on Election Day.
Read more about this series.

http://www.miamiherald.com

Link is towards the bottom!
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>
> Thomoconr@aol.com wrote:
> 
> The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W. and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits. Here's a little parody, not totally devoid of wisdom, that I wish to pass on.
> After all the bogus Nostradamus/Stalin quotes, VNS apologists, and blame-shifters, I do not feel that it is at all out of line.
> >
NEW YORK AP -- The New York Mets announced today that they are going
to court to get an additional inning added to the end of game 5 of the
World Series. The batting pitching and bench coaches for the Mets
held a press conference earlier today. They were joined by members of
the Major League Players Union.

We meant to hit those pitches from the Yankee pitchers
said the Mets batting coach. We were confused by the
irregularities of the pitches we received and believe we have been
denied our right to hit. One claim specifically noted that a small
percentage of the Mets batters had intended to swing at fast balls but
actually swung at curve balls. It was clear that these batters never
intended to swing at curve balls though a much higher percentage were
not confused by the pitches.

Reporters at the press conference pointed out that the Mets had
reviewed film of the Yankee pitchers prior to the World Series
and had in fact faced the Yankees in inter-league play earlier in the year.
The fact remains that some of the pitches confused us and denied us of our right
to hit. The Mets batting coach said the World Series is not over yet and
the Yankees are celebrating prematurely. Major League Baseball has reviewed
the telecast of all the World Series games and recounted the balls and
strikes called by the umpires of each game. While some of the strikes
called against the Mets were in fact balls there were not enough of
them to change the outcome of the World Series. The commissioner said
Another portion of the Mets legal claim stated that based on on-base
percentage the Mets had actually won the World Series regardless of
the final scores of the games.

It's clear that we were slightly on-base more often than the Yankees
said a Mets spokesman. The World Series crown is rightly ours.
The manager of the Mets has remained in relative seclusion engaging
in some light jogging for exercise. He has stated that he believes
we need to let the process run its course without a rush to judgment.
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Am I missing something. Are you really arguing that two wrongs make a right?

At 11:32 PM 12/29/00 -0500, you wrote:
> The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court
had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W.
and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.

Warren Mitofsky
******************
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX

The FSC, by a single vote -- and with a strongly worded dissent from its chief justice (which was later endorsed in part by seven members of the USSC) reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge who had conducted a trial on the matter. I don't think that anyone on the Republican side feels there were "two wrongs" -- unless you count some of the other highly questionable but very revealing actions of the Gore side -- such as appealing the Martin and Seminole county decisions to the FSC. They lost all credibility with those actions, which were only minimally discussed against the backdrop of bigger news breaking at the same time.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Saturday, December 30, 2000 6:37 PM
Subject: Re: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes

Am I missing something. Are you really arguing that two wrongs make a right?
>
>At 11:32 PM 12/29/00 -0500, you wrote:
>>The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court
>>had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W.
>>and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.
>
>Warren Mitofsky
>********************
>Mitofsky International
>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
>New York, NY 10022
>
>212 980-3031
>212 980-3107 FAX
>
>
=========================================================================  
Date: Sat, 30 Dec 2000 23:07:11 -0500  
To: aapornet@usc.edu  
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Two Wrongs  
In-Reply-To: <003001c072bc$9465ede0$16e4c3d1@default>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"; format=flowed  

Are you kidding us. The U.S. Supreme Court decision that was decisive was 5 to 4. Furthermore the Martin and Seminole county cases were not brought by Gore nor were they supported by him. I still say the USSC made a wrong, albeit political, decision as did the FSC. I repeat, are you still saying two wrongs make a right? Or do you really think either decision was apolitical? Get past the partisan thinking and recognize all of these decisions for what they were.

warren mitofsky

At 06:59 PM 12/30/00 -0500, you wrote:
> The FSC, by a single vote -- and with a strongly worded dissent from its chief justice (which was later endorsed in part by seven members of the USSC) reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge who had conducted a trial on the matter. I don't think that anyone on the Republican side feels there were "two wrongs" -- unless you count some of the other highly questionable but very revealing actions of the Gore side -- such as appealing the Martin and Seminole county decisions to the FSC. They lost all credibility with those actions, which were only minimally discussed against the backdrop of bigger news breaking at the same time.
>
>James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
>Voice (610) 408-8800
>Fax (610) 408-8802
>jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
>-----Original Message-----
>From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
>To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
>Date: Saturday, December 30, 2000 6:37 PM
>Subject: Re: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes
>
>
Am I missing something. Are you really arguing that two wrongs make a right?

At 11:32 PM 12/29/00 -0500, you wrote:
The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W.

and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX
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Subject: Re: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes
In-Reply-To: <001c01c072b1$c51c06a0$d094f7a5@default>
References: <d6.5e5343.277ebf66@aol.com>
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Very good Allen. Best definition of "Compassionate Conservatism" I've seen to date.

Dick Halpern

At 05:42 PM 12/30/00, you wrote:
If we are going to have baseball analogies, let us keep in mind another quotation (real): Fred Mosteller, in Social Relations statistics course c. 1946:
"The World's Series has an n = 7, so the results are usually not statistically significant."

Neither was the result of the recent presidential election. However since someone has to become president, I would prefer that all the votes were counted. The Supreme Court's version of "Compassionate Conservatism"
> seems to be that if there is a really close race, it is nicer to give the
> prize to the kid who comes in second.
>
> Enough already? Allen Barton

I can't tell if this message is an attempt at spin or a display of ignorance.

"...reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge..." As was reported extensively at the time, the FSSC had previously severely rebuked judge Sauls in words that came close to questioning his qualifications for the job, and there was no love lost between them. Further, judge Sauls was also known around Tallahassee as a "Good 'Ol Boy," like many of the former "Southern Democrats" that now form the bedrock of radical Republicanism in the Old South.

Further, not only did Gore not particpate in the original Martin and Seminole cases, but he refused to support their appeal, against the wishes of his chief counsel David Boies, on the grounds that all votes should be counted, whether for him or against him. Whether Gore was sincere in this or not, you cannot accuse him of being a hypocrite for supporting those appeals.

It's one thing to be partisan, it's another to have no idea what you are talking about.

Jan Werner

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

> The FSC, by a single vote -- and with a strongly worded dissent from its
> chief justice (which was later endorsed in part by seven members of the
> USSC) reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge who
> had conducted a trial on the matter. I don't think that anyone on the
> Republican side feels there were "two wrongs" -- unless you count some of
> the other highly questionable but very revealing actions of the Gore side -
> such as appealing the Martin and Seminole county decisions to the FSC. They
> lost all credibility with those actions, which were only minimally discussed
> against the backdrop of bigger news breaking at the same time.
Am I missing something. Are you really arguing that two wrongs make a right?

At 11:32 PM 12/29/00 -0500, you wrote:
>
>>The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court
>>had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame
>>W.
>>and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
>1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
>New York, NY 10022

>212 980-3031
>212 980-3107 FAX

======================================================================

The following article appeared in the Orlando Sentinel last week.

Aside from the political consequences mentioned by the authors, the findings have serious implications in questionnaire based research, particularly for self-administered questionnaires, which may not come as a total shock to some.

Jan Werner

______________________

Gore would have gained votes
David Damron, Ramsey Campbell and Roger Roy
An inspection of more than 6,000 discarded presidential ballots in Lake County on Monday revealed that Vice President Al Gore lost a net 130 votes that were clearly his even in a conservative GOP bastion that President-elect Bush dominated as a whole.

The tally of uncounted ballots by the Orlando Sentinel was the first outside review to be completed in any Florida county since the U.S. Supreme Court halted a statewide recount on Dec. 9. At that point Bush's ever-fluctuating lead over Gore was just 154 votes -- and the margin might have been shaved to a mere two dozen had the Lake ballots been counted. Similar ballots were counted elsewhere.

The review found 376 discarded ballots in Lake that were clearly intended as votes for Gore: In each case, an oval next to his name was filled in with a pencil and the voter mistakenly filled in another oval next to a spot reserved for write-in candidates, writing in Gore's name or running mate Joe Lieberman's there as well. Another 246 such ballots showing clear votes for Bush and running mate Dick Cheney were thrown out. Had all such ballots been counted, the result would have been a net gain of 130 votes for Gore.

Bush spokesman Tucker Eskew said the Sentinel was engaged in "mischief making" by treating "illegal votes" as legal votes. He argued that a 7-2 majority of the U.S. Supreme Court agreed such tallies should not count, and the Sentinel would only be irresponsibly "inflaming public passions" by playing the numbers up as certain or clear.

"To publish illegal votes as legal votes would be to mislead the readers and the public," Eskew said. "These are illegal votes, and your paper is publishing them as legal votes."

The findings in Lake are just one piece in a statewide mosaic to be assembled in coming weeks and months as outsiders look at ballots that didn't count on Nov. 7. Newspapers including the Sentinel are banding together to inspect many of the approximately 180,000 ballots cast statewide but not tallied in the presidential race either because no vote could be detected by a machine or because voters marked more than one choice for president. A review likely to be much more tedious than the one in Lake began Monday in Broward County, where a study of 6,600 punch-card ballots began.

But the Lake numbers are significant even in isolation. Republicans had argued all along that Gore's push for recounts in heavily Democratic counties like Miami-Dade, Palm Beach and Broward was selective and unfair because it would have skewed results in his favor. But the Sentinel review shows how he might have recovered votes even in a county where Bush beat him by 15 percentage points.

And ballots exactly like those rejected in Lake -- and now called "illegal" by Eskew -- were counted by canvassing boards in places such as Orange and Seminole counties and are now part of the
certified totals.

Lake reported 3,114 so-called "overvotes" in its certified presidential results, and county officials had been preparing to evaluate those ballots as part of the recount ordered by the Florida Supreme Court on Dec. 8. By the time the U.S. Supreme Court halted that effort the next afternoon, Lake officials had already sifted through 91,989 ballots cast countywide to segregate the presidential overvotes as well as about 3,000 overvoted ballots rejected by tabulation machines in other races.

It was this pool of more than 6,000 ballots examined by three Sentinel reporters under a Florida public-records law request. Reporters were not allowed to touch ballots, but the newspaper paid for three election workers to spend the day holding them up for inspection. The process was observed by representatives of both parties.

The count went quickly because voter intent was easily detectable. Lake ballots are marked with pencils and tabulated with optical-scanning devices. There are no issues of "dangling chads" or "pregnant chads" to contend with, as there are in counties that use punch-card voting systems.

If Florida's recounts had continued, the Lake County ballots examined by the Sentinel could have swung the presidential election, said Bob Poe, chairman of the state Democratic Party. When the recount was halted by the U.S. Supreme Court, "we were within 113 or 114 votes," Poe said, referring to claims that Gore was gaining more ground even that Saturday before the recount was halted. "This would have put Gore over the top."

Bush's official margin of victory was 537 votes, the number certified by Secretary of State Katherine Harris two weeks before the Florida Supreme Court's last recount order.

GOP partisans say they don't put much stock in any new numbers coming out of Florida now. Bush spokesman Eskew said GOP observers watching the Lake review on Monday dispute the accuracy of the Sentinel's inspection. They claimed that as many as 29 votes counted as write-ins for Gore by the Sentinel were actually written as "Gore and Cheney" or Gore and Green Party candidate Ralph Nader on the ballot.

But such ballots were specifically excluded in the Sentinel's methodology. The review also found -- but did not count -- hundreds more questionable ballots that machines tossed aside or local election officials deemed invalid. Many of these arguably could have been judged as intended for a single candidate.

Some of those were ballots in which the voter penciled in the oval next to the name of more than one candidate, but then tried to erase one. On some ballots, the voter nearly rubbed through the paper trying to erase a vote.

Others voted for more than one candidate, sometimes a half-dozen, then made X's through most of the names. In many cases, it wasn't
clear whether they meant to select the candidates who were X'ed out, or those who weren't. On other double-voted ballots, the voters' intention was spelled out, however awkwardly: Some made notations next to one of the votes, including "no," "wrong one," "mistake" and "not."

These hundreds of more marginal ballots -- which the Sentinel did not include in its tally -- also fell heavily in Gore's favor.

Lake also reported 245 "undervote" ballots, in which counting machines could discern no votes. Only 50 of those undervotes were separated by election officials before the federal high court stepped in. An examination of those ballots by the Sentinel found only a dozen that could be counted. Of those, Bush and Gore had six each. But those were not included in the newspaper's tally.

On some, voters had used an ink pen rather than a pencil, and the machines were apparently unable to detect their vote. Others circled the candidate's name or put an X or check mark next to a name or in one case the party designation.

But on most undervote ballots, there were simply no signs of a vote for a presidential candidate.

The Lake overvote totals put Republicans in an odd spot. It's one they may often find themselves in during the next few weeks.

But regardless of what the overvotes show, Lake's GOP Party Chairman Dan Semenza said, "they don't count."

"You newspaper people are just trying to stir things up."

Elections experts say Democrats are more likely to be undereducated, older, less affluent, or first-time voters -- all groups more prone to muddle a ballot.

So Poe said he wasn't surprised that most of the flawed ballots were from Democratic voters, even though Lake is predominantly Republican.

"My people are economically disadvantaged; some people don't read very well," Poe said. Many may be immigrants who don't read or speak perfect English, he said.

The reason these votes weren't counted Nov. 7 is somewhat confusing. On election night, Lake's canvassing board decided in a 2-1 vote not to count ballots that included an unqualified write-in candidate. Bush and Gore were not legal write-ins, they decided.

They made the same decision in the congressional races on the ballot and wanted to be consistent, canvassing-board member and County Judge Donna Miller said.

But Catherine Hanson, a Lake canvassing-board member and county commissioner, said Monday that if she could do it all again, in a race this close she would have looked at and counted clear votes that the machines skipped over.
"We were trying to do our best. It was consistent with what we had done in the past," Hanson, a Republican, said Monday. "I wouldn't say it was a mistake, but we would have done it differently if we knew what we do now."

Copyright © 2000, Orlando Sentinel
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Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of the court's decision is illustrated in an article in TIME magazine which has George W. Bush on the cover as "Person of the Year." In an article on the court's decision, it notes that even though black defendants on death row could show that their sentences were judged by a different standard than those of white defendants who had committed similar crimes, that was not a violation of the equal protection law. However, different standards for counting votes in a state somehow are a violation of the equal protection law.

It is no wonder that one sees such a gap in the perceptions of African-Americans and whites on the fairness of the election, even aside from the many irregularities and inequalities of resources that excluded higher proportions of black votes than white votes in Florida.

Warren Mitofsky wrote:

> Are you kidding us. The U.S. Supreme Court decision that was decisive was 5 to 4. Furthermore the Martin and Seminole county cases were not brought by Gore nor were they supported by him. I still say the USSC made a wrong, albeit political, decision as did the FSC. I repeat, are you still saying two wrongs make a right? Or do you really think either decision was apolitical? Get past the partisan thinking and recognize all of these decisions for what they were.
> warren mitofsky
At 06:59 PM 12/30/00 -0500, you wrote:

The FSC, by a single vote -- and with a strongly worded dissent from its chief justice (which was later endorsed in part by seven members of the USSC) reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge who had conducted a trial on the matter. I don't think that anyone on the Republican side feels there were "two wrongs" -- unless you count some of the other highly questionable but very revealing actions of the Gore side -- such as appealing the Martin and Seminole county decisions to the FSC. They lost all credibility with those actions, which were only minimally discussed against the backdrop of bigger news breaking at the same time.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com

---Original Message-----
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Date: Saturday, December 30, 2000 6:37 PM
Subject: Re: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes

> Am I missing something. Are you really arguing that two wrongs make a right?
> >
> > At 11:32 PM 12/29/00 -0500, you wrote:
> > The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W.
> >
> > and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.
> >
> > Warren Mitofsky
> > Mitofsky International
> > 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> > New York, NY 10022
> >
> > 212 980-3031
> > 212 980-3107 FAX
> >
> Warren Mitofsky
> Mitofsky International
> 1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
> New York, NY 10022
> 212 980-3031
The Martin and Seminole cases were orchestrated by Gore supporters on his behalf. He had to maintain a distance from them because they were contrary to his primary argument at the time. As the end approached, Gore was quoted as expressing interest in the results of the FSC appeals (of those cases) as his deus ex machina. The cases appeared to be without merit from the beginning but you can give the Democrats the benefit of the doubt on the possibility that serious irregularities might have been uncovered during the trials. When that did not happen, the decision to further appeal to a sympathetic FSC revealed their strategy for what it was.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Jan Werner <jwerner@jwdp.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Two Wrongs

>>I can't tell if this message is an attempt at spin or a display of ignorance.
>
>"...reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge..." As was reported extensively at the time, the FSSC had previously severely rebuked judge Sauls in words that came close to questioning his qualifications for the job, and there was no love lost between them. Further, judge Sauls was also known around Tallahassee as a "Good 'Ol Boy," like many of the former "Southern Democrats" that now form the bedrock of radical Republicanism in the Old South.
>
>Further, not only did Gore not participate in the original Martin and Seminole cases, but he refused to support their appeal, against the wishes of his chief counsel David Boies, on the grounds that all votes should be counted, whether for him or against him. Whether Gore was sincere in this or not, you cannot accuse him of being a hypocrite for supporting those appeals.
It's one thing to be partisan, it's another to have no idea what you are talking about.

Jan Werner
__________________

"James P. Murphy" wrote:

The FSC, by a single vote -- and with a strongly worded dissent from its chief justice (which was later endorsed in part by seven members of the USSC) reversed the decision of a respected Democratic lower court judge who had conducted a trial on the matter. I don't think that anyone on the Republican side feels there were "two wrongs" -- unless you count some of the other highly questionable but very revealing actions of the Gore side -- such as appealing the Martin and Seminole county decisions to the FSC. They lost all credibility with those actions, which were only minimally discussed against the backdrop of bigger news breaking at the same time.

James P. Murphy, Ph.D.
Voice (610) 408-8800
Fax (610) 408-8802
jpmurphy@jpmurphy.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Warren Mitofsky <mitofsky@mindspring.com>
To: aapornet@usc.edu <aapornet@usc.edu>
Subject: Re: Stalin & Nostradamus Quotes

Am I missing something. Are you really arguing that two wrongs make a right?

At 11:32 PM 12/29/00 -0500, you wrote:
The high court would not have had to interfere if the Florida Supreme Court had not been so nakedly partisan, itself. It's a shame that so many blame W.

and the Republicans for trying to keep the process within legal limits.

Warren Mitofsky
Mitofsky International
1 East 53rd Street - 5th Floor
New York, NY 10022
212 980-3031
212 980-3107 FAX