Essay 1

Total Word Count (including title): 523

AWL Count: 55

Against E-Voting

The <u>computer</u>, which is the most important advance in modern <u>communication technology</u>, is in fact a threat to our democratic elections. With <u>computer technology</u> advancing daily, many activities that used to <u>require</u> many long hours can now be accomplished in a few minutes and sometimes even seconds. For the most part, these <u>technological innovations</u> promise to save time and money and to make people's lives easier and more comfortable, but not every <u>aspect</u> of life should be taken care of by <u>computers</u>. In particular, societies should not vote with <u>computers</u> or other electronic <u>media</u> because elections are too important to trust to cyberspace.

In years past, people voted on paper ballots and marked them with ink or some <u>similar</u> means. Voters could look over their ballots to <u>ensure</u> that they did not make a mistake. Also, when there was a dispute over the results of an election, paper ballots allowed election officials to count votes by hand. This <u>process</u> was tedious, but the results could be easily verified to see if there were any <u>deviations</u> between vote tallies. Several countries still use this <u>traditional</u> system of voting, and it provides a <u>crucial foundation</u> for <u>ensuring</u> fairness.

Without this <u>traditional</u> system of voting, however, voters do not really know whether evoting systems count their votes <u>accurately</u>. It is quite possible that a <u>computer</u> programmer could develop a program so that a person could <u>select</u> one candidate on a <u>computer</u> screen, yet the vote would be counted for another candidate. Although some people might think this <u>scenario</u> sounds unlikely, serious problems with <u>computer security</u> have <u>occurred</u> throughout the world. The simple fact is that hackers can gain <u>access</u> to many <u>computer</u> systems for <u>illegal</u> purposes. By <u>illegally</u> entering an online polling <u>site</u>, they could easily change the <u>outcome</u> of an election. Citizens should also question whether electronic voting <u>enhances</u> the voting <u>process</u>. As Celeste, Thornburgh, and Lin (2006) point out, "the desirability of electronic voting systems should be judged on the basis of whether their use will <u>significantly</u> improve the <u>process</u> of election <u>administration</u>" (p. 131). As the old saying tells us, "If something isn't broken, don't fix it." If government officials decide to use electronic voting machines, they should <u>ensure</u> that all voters receive receipts for their votes that could then be collected for <u>subsequent</u> verification. These paper receipts would clearly state that the voters really voted for the candidates that they <u>selected</u>. <u>Furthermore</u>, if any candidate suspects that an election is unfair, these receipts could be counted by hand and checked against the results that the <u>computers</u> provided. At the very least, as Alvarez and Hall (2008) argue, voting should be a simple, <u>secure</u>, and <u>consistent process</u>, regardless of the voting <u>procedure</u> that is being used.

<u>Computer</u> technologies have improved the quality of our lives vastly, but these technologies are not a cure for all of society's problems. Sometimes a little more human work <u>ensures</u> a better, more <u>precise</u> result. Since voting is critically important to the effective and honest working of society, citizens should <u>rely</u> on a much older <u>technology</u>—paper and ink—rather than on <u>computers</u> for all elections.