VOTER IDENTIFICATION LAWS

Should states require voters to present government-issued identification (ID) before voting?

Issue Date: September 12, 2011

**SUPPORTERS ARGUE**

States should take every measure possible to ensure the integrity and accuracy of elections by preventing voter fraud. Requiring a photo ID is a reasonable requirement that politicians should back regardless of political affiliation, if they are interested in restoring confidence in elections and in the government. Voter ID requirements will not negatively affect voter turnout.

**OPPONENTS ARGUE**

Voter ID requirements will disproportionately affect certain groups of voters who are more likely not to have a government-issued ID, such as low-income and minority voters and students. Republicans who are backing identification measures are trying to disenfranchise core Democratic constituents. ID requirements will not affect voter confidence in elections, but will negatively impact voter turnout.

In 2006, then Georgia Governor Sonny Perdue (R) holds a sample voter identification card for his state after a voter ID measure was approved.

In May 2011, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker (R) signed into law a bill that will require the state's voters to present a photo identification (ID) before they vote, starting in 2012. The same month, South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley (R)
signed into law a similar bill, saying it would improve elections' "integrity, accountability and transparency." Texas Governor Rick Perry (R) also signed a voter identification bill into law later that month. Alabama, Kansas and Tennessee, too, joined the list of states that have passed voter ID laws in 2011.

While the federal government has some limited power over federal election procedures, the authority for most election-and voting-related regulations resides largely in the states. According to former Federal Election Commission member Hans von Spakovsky, the U.S. "has one of the most decentralized systems of election administration for its national elections of any democracy. This is in accord with the Constitution, which reserves to the states the exclusive authority for most election decisions." As a result, voter registration requirements and polling place procedure vary among states.

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 30 states require some form of ID to vote; seven of those states will take only a photo ID. Among the states that require some form of ID, identity verification requirements can vary widely. Some states merely require voters to give their names to election officials working at the polling place, while others require a signature (which some states match to a previously signed document) and other states ask for other forms of ID, which can range from a driver's license to a utility bill. In the past few months, more and more states have enacted or are considering enacting the strictest form of voter identification laws—requiring a government-issued photo ID at the polling place. Government-issued ID can include a driver's license, a non-driver government ID, a passport, a military ID and other forms. Acquiring most government-issued ID requires a trip to a government office—usually the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)—and a fee. Some voter ID laws, such as Indiana's, require that the state provide free IDs to eligible voters if they do not already have one.

Opponents of government-issued ID requirements for voters argue that such measures place too heavy a burden on people who do not currently have a government-issued ID, particularly low-income, minority and elderly voters. Supporters, however, have touted the requirement as a much-needed measure to improve election security and prevent voter fraud. The Census Bureau has estimated that 11% of eligible voters lack current government-issued IDs.

For some observers, voter ID measures raise difficult questions because they seem to pit two equally important concepts—increasing voter turnout and ensuring electoral accuracy—against each other. Stephen Ansolabehere, a political science professor at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, writes:

> At the heart of the efforts to improve elections in the United States are two important values: access and integrity.... Often these values work hand in hand, but at times they are at odds. Such is the case with the authentication of voters at the polls.

Should states adopt laws that require voters to present government-issued IDs before voting? Or will such laws disenfranchise some voters (deprive them of their right to vote)?

Supporters of voter ID laws say that voter fraud is a problem in the U.S., and instituting more stringent voter-authentication practices, such as requiring photo identification, can prevent fraud at the polling place. Such measures do not place undue burdens on voters and will not reduce voter turnout, supporters say. Furthermore, proponents contend that efforts to improve voter authentication should not be considered partisan but should rather be supported by all those interested in good governance.

Critics, on the other hand, argue that voter ID measures are clear partisan efforts to disenfranchise portions of the population, such as disabled, elderly, low-income and minority voters, who tend to vote Democratic. Voter fraud is almost nonexistent in the U.S., critics say, and the forms in which it does exist will not be remedied by requiring voters to present identification. Instead of addressing fraud, such measures will discourage people from voting, and result in even lower voter turnouts, critics say.
Accusations of Voter Fraud Fuel Electoral Reform

The 19th century saw several infamous instances of voter fraud. In one notorious case, in an 1843 New York City election, the Democratic political organization known as Tammany Hall "imported inmates from the Blackwell's Island Penitentiary to vote in Democratic wards," according to historian Tracy Campbell. Historians have also alleged that the presidential elections in 1844 and 1876 were won through voter fraud. [See Issues and Controversies in American History: Tammany Hall]

More recently, the November 2000 presidential election raised allegations of voter fraud and electoral inaccuracy. In that contest, Democratic Vice President Al Gore defeated Republican Governor George W. Bush (Texas) by more than 300,000 in the popular vote, but fell short of the electoral votes required for victory. The national election was ultimately decided by Florida, where Bush had beaten Gore by an extremely slim margin. In December, the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5–4 vote, ruled a recount requested by Gore to be unconstitutional. Gore conceded the election, and Bush was inaugurated in January 2001 amid allegations of voting irregularities and voting machine malfunctions that were alleged to have robbed minorities and the elderly of their votes in several Florida counties.

The 2000 presidential election debacle prompted numerous calls for electoral reform, including measures designed to prevent voter fraud. Many states adopted stricter voter-authentication requirements.

In 2002, the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) was passed, requiring states to create computerized lists of registered voters for federal elections and establishing the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to oversee federal election reform and procedures. The EAC, however, can only recommend, not mandate, the best practices for states to adopt. The legislation also required new voters who had registered through the mail to present some form of identification before voting. The measure marked the first national identification requirement for voting.

Furthermore, under direction of the administration of President George W. Bush (R, 2001–09), the Justice Department launched a "war on voter fraud" in 2002. By 2006, however, the operation had led to only 86 convictions for voter fraud out of approximately 196 million votes cast in federal elections during that time period. Most of those convictions involved vote-buying or registration fraud—the registration of voters who are ineligible to vote. Neither type of fraud, some observers have noted, is a crime that could be remedied by requiring identification at polling places. The Bush administration also changed Justice Department rules to allow local prosecutors to pursue voting fraud allegations at their discretion, although official Justice Department policy had previously deemed that voter fraud had "only a minimal impact on the integrity of the voting process" and was not worth systematically investigating.

Concerns about voter fraud arose during the 2008 presidential election, when the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN), a liberal advocacy group, came under investigation for filing fraudulent voter registrations. Critics accused the group of filing thousands of such forms, some of which were filled out under the names of nonexistent persons and even cartoon characters. Prosecutors in at least 14 states investigated ACORN and several filed charges against it, including Nevada and Washington. Republican presidential candidate Senator John McCain (R, Arizona,) said the group was "now on the verge of maybe perpetrating one of the greatest frauds in voter history in this country, maybe destroying the fabric of democracy."

The organization, which paid workers to register new voters, admitted that it did not have the resources to catch duplicate or fraudulent registration cards. Observers noted, however, that the occurrence of fraudulent registration does not necessarily imply the occurrence of voter fraud. According to Washington Independent journalist Daphne Eviatar, "ACORN has repeatedly explained that when its workers submitted false registrations, the fraud was against ACORN, not against voters or the elections process." Furthermore, Eviatar writes, "That some of those workers copied names out of the phone book, or listed their favorite cartoon characters, doesn't mean those people are going to show up to vote."

Those individuals who were convicted in the ACORN scandal went to jail for registration fraud, rather than voting
fraud.

Overall, election experts disagree on the extent to which voter fraud occurs; while some say it is almost nonexistent, others say it is pervasive but largely undetected. According to a 2011 report released by the Brennan Center for Justice, a public policy and law institute at New York University in New York City, only 44 one-millionths of one percent of votes are cast by people committing voter fraud. More pervasive fraud, some say, exists at different levels of the voting system. According to National Public Radio (NPR), "Voter fraud does exist, say the experts, but in more systematic ways" than in-person voter fraud—"through ballot box stuffing, voter machine manipulation, registration list manipulation and absentee balloting."

**Voter ID Laws Spark Backlash**

In 2005, the bipartisan, privately run Commission on Federal Election Reform released a report that addressed the arguments for and against requiring voters to present identification at their polling places. The commission, chaired by President Jimmy Carter (D, 1977–81) and former Secretary of State James Baker, acknowledged the objections to mandating voter IDs and recommended that states address those concerns by sending out mobile units to register voters and provide free voter ID cards to citizens who do not have them. Overall, however, the report did not find any fundamental problems with voter ID requirements, noting that "Voters in nearly 100 democracies use a photo identification card without fear of infringement on their rights."

In April 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6–3 to uphold a voter ID law in Indiana after a coalition of groups led by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Democratic Party brought suit against the state. The plaintiffs contended that Indiana's law would disenfranchise low-income, minority and elderly voters. Indiana's law resembles voter ID laws passed in 24 other states, but, according to NPR, it is the "strictest: It requires anyone voting in person to present a current government photo ID." People without identification will be allowed to vote provisionally, but their votes will not be counted unless they present an ID at a government office within 10 days of the vote. The law also requires Indiana to provide eligible voters with a free ID if they do not already have one, but such voters are required to present another proof of identity, such as a birth certificate and other documents, in order to obtain that free ID.

The majority in the case, *Crawford v. Marion County Election Board*, ruled that requiring voters to produce photo identification does not violate citizens' constitutional rights. According to Justice John Paul Stevens, who wrote the majority opinion, the law "is amply justified by the valid interest in protecting 'the integrity and reliability of the electoral process'" and does not impose "excessively burdensome requirements" on "any class of voters." A dissenting opinion written by Justice David Souter, however, asserted that the law "threatens to impose nontrivial burdens on the voting rights of tens of thousands of the state's citizens." [See Supreme Court Ruling on Indiana Voter Identification Law (Excerpt) (sidebar)]

After November 2010 midterm elections, Republicans gained control of 19 previously Democrat-controlled state legislatures. By June 2011 at least 33 states had considered strengthening voting identification requirements, according to USA Today. Those measures, however, sparked fierce criticism, particularly from Democrats. In July, 16 Democratic senators sent a letter to U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder asking him to investigate the "highly restrictive photo identification requirements" that the legislators said could "block millions of eligible American voters."

Other observers alleged that the measures were racially tinged. Hilary Shelton, the director of the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), called them a new form of "a poll tax." Representative Debbie Wasserman Schultz (D, Florida) called the laws an effort to "drag us all the way back to Jim Crow laws." ("Jim Crow" refers to laws passed in the late 19th and early 20th century to segregate blacks and disenfranchise black voters by, for example, instituting poll taxes and literacy tests, which prevented many African
Americans from voting). Republicans criticized Wasserman Schultz's statement as hyperbole, and the website PolitiFact rated the statement false.

Legislators also investigated the expected costs of such bills, particularly those that would require states to provide eligible voters with free IDs. In early 2011, the Republican-controlled Minnesota state legislature debated a bill that would mandate every voter to show a photo ID before voting. According to a report compiled by Minnesota Common Cause, a nonprofit, nonpartisan "citizen's lobby," and Citizens for Election Integrity, a transparent-election advocacy organization, the bill would cost about $19.5 million in voter outreach and education initiatives and $3.9 million to provide free IDs, in addition to other, smaller expenses. Though legislators passed the bill, Democratic Minnesota Governor Mark Dayton vetoed the measure in May, saying it lacked broad bipartisan support.

Legislators also proposed voting bills that went beyond identification requirements. New Hampshire State Representative Gregory Sorg (R), for example, proposed a bill in January 2011 that would change eligibility requirements for voting in a way that would have prevented many out-of-state students who attended school in New Hampshire from voting. Students and other advocacy groups rallied against the measure, which attracted further attention in March when New Hampshire House Speaker William O'Brien (R) referred to college students as "foolish" voters who "voted their feelings" and had "no life experience." New Hampshire Governor John Lynch (D) vetoed the bill in July. [See States Consider Changes to College Students' Voting Procedures (sidebar)]

Other states, including Florida, Ohio, Wisconsin and Oregon, have considered what Republicans term "no-match, no-vote" laws, requiring new voter registration information to match the information in other state databases exactly. In Ohio, Republicans filed a lawsuit in September 2008 against then Secretary of State Jennifer Brunner (D) demanding that matching be a condition of voting in the state. Brunner, however, argued that such a rule could prevent hundreds of thousands of Ohio residents from voting because of clerical errors or because voters have changed their names. In October, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Brunner's favor.

Moves to change voting regulations have stirred greater controversy in light of the upcoming 2012 presidential election. According to the Washington Post, "Several states where newly empowered Republicans are pushing voter legislation, such as New Hampshire, Wisconsin and North Carolina, are expected to be battlegrounds in the 2012 presidential race." Some Democrats interpreted Republican-backed voting measures as a strategy to diminish President Obama’s voting base, hurting his chances for reelection. A large African American voter turnout in North Carolina, for example, had helped Obama win the 2008 presidential election, and according to analysis by the North Carolina State Board of Elections, new laws requiring a state-issued ID to vote would negatively affect the voting turnout of that same demographic.

Electoral experts, however, disagree on the effect that voter ID requirements have on voter turnout. A 2006 study by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey, analyzed voter turnout in the 2004 election and determined that more stringent voter identification requirements reduced voter turnout. A 2007 study by the Center for Data Analysis, a subdivision of the conservative Washington, D.C.–based think tank the Heritage Foundation, however, found that "voter identification laws largely do not have the negative impact on voter turnout that the Eagleton Institute suggests." Similarly, estimates of how many U.S. citizens lack the required photo ID vary. According to a 2008 survey by the Center for Democracy and Election Management at American University in Washington, D.C., fewer than half a percent of those surveyed lacked both a photo ID and citizenship documentation. Other surveys, however, have estimated that as many as 11% of eligible U.S. voters lack current government-issued photo IDs.
IDs Needed at the Polls to Combat Voter Fraud, Supporters Say

Supporters of requiring a photo ID to vote contend that such a measure is necessary to address the problem of voter fraud in the U.S. Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach (R) writes in the Wall Street Journal, "Voter fraud is a well-documented reality in American elections." Supporters note that in 2010, Kansas City, Missouri, Democratic state representative J. J. Rizzo won an election by a margin of one vote. Rizzo's opponent in the election later alleged, however, that a Rizzo supporter had brought non-English speakers from Somalia to the polling place and coached them on how to vote. That same opponent also accused Rizzo of bringing in family members from outside his district to cast votes. That is just one example of voting fraud, supporters assert. Kobach also notes, "Because voter fraud is extremely difficult to detect and is usually not reported, the cases that we know about likely represent a small fraction of the total."

Allowing U.S. residents to vote without presenting proper identification is a clear flaw in the U.S. electoral system, supporters say. According to the Heritage Foundation:

*In order to have an election process in which we can be confident that everyone who is eligible gets to vote, the vote is counted and the vote is not diluted by fraudulent votes, we have to have security and integrity throughout the entire process.... Unfortunately, because of various problems...we cannot currently ensure that such security is in place. This is particularly true because of the general lack of verification by some*
states of the authenticity of...the identity of voters who show up at the polls.

Requiring voters to present identification can cut down on several forms of voter fraud, supporters say. Spakovsky testified in front of the Texas Senate in 2009 that requiring "voters to authenticate their identity at the polling place is part and parcel of the same kind of security necessary to protect the integrity of elections. Every illegal vote steals the vote of a legitimate voter." Spakovsky testified that voter ID measures can prevent impersonation at the polls, voting under fictitious voter registrations, voting by illegal aliens, and double voting (by individuals registered in more than one voting precinct). Furthermore, Spakovsky noted, "In states without identification requirements, election officials have no way to prevent bogus votes from being cast by unscrupulous individuals."

Though requiring voters to present IDs at the polls cannot singlehandedly end fraud in the electoral system, it is a first step toward providing some security in the voting process, supporters say. According to South Carolina news site SCNow, "Photo IDs...will make [fraud] far more unlikely by creating a significant, if not wholly insurmountable, barrier to its success. It's difficult to see how that's a bad idea."

Supporters argue that while Democrats have maligned voter ID measures as moves to disenfranchise Democratic voters, requiring voters to present identification should not be a partisan issue. Even the largely Democratic state of Rhode Island, supporters note, has passed a new voter ID law. Jon Brien, a Democratic state representative in Rhode Island, said, "I think that party leaders have tried to make this a Republican versus Democrat issue. It's not. It's simply a good government issue." Supporters also note that several polls, including a June 2011 survey by polling agency Rasmussen Reports, indicate that clear majorities of voters favor ID laws. Thus both liberals and conservatives, supporters claim, can stand behind voter ID legislation.

If the government does not take steps to address voter fraud, public confidence in elections and thus government will continue to decline, supporters say. Kobach writes, "Fear that elections are being stolen erodes the legitimacy of our government."

Supporters argue that Democrats have inflated estimates of how many people do not have government-issued photo IDs. Disputing the estimate that 11% of eligible voters do not have a photo ID, Kobach writes:

\[
\text{[W]e don't have to rely on implausible estimates when the actual numbers are readily available. In Kansas, my office obtained the statistics, and they tell a very different story.... [T]here are more photo IDs in circulation than there are eligible voters. The notion that there are hundreds of thousands of voters in Kansas (or any other state) without photo IDs is a myth.}
\]

Many everyday activities require a photo ID, supporters note, and voting should not be any different. Wall Street Journal columnist James Taranto writes, "[Y]ou will be asked for identification when you check into a hotel. You need ID to board an airplane or to drive a car.... If black people have trouble producing identification, how come nobody ever claims that these requirements are discriminatory?"

Supporters dispute the charge that voter ID measures reduce voter turnout. Spakovsky testified that 2008 election results in Georgia and Indiana—states with voter ID requirements—"confirm that the suppositions that voter ID will hurt minority turnout are incorrect. Turnout in both states went up dramatically in both the presidential preference primary and the general election."

Supporters contend that bringing a government-issued ID to the polls should simply be considered a part of the voting process and is not by any means an undue burden. Former Indiana Secretary of State Todd Rokita told NPR, "There are burdens to register to vote; there are burdens in gas or shoe leather in going to the polls. That doesn't mean [voters are] disenfranchised."
ID Requirements Will Disenfranchise Poor, Minority Voters, Critics Say

Critics contend that Republicans are pushing restrictive voter ID measures because those most affected by such measures—the elderly, college students, minorities and the disabled—are also more likely to vote Democratic. Charles Lichtman, the lead counsel for the Florida Democratic Party in the 2008 election, told the *Washington Independent* that Republicans are "trying to do what they can to poison the well on the eve of the election because they're not winning on the issues. They know there are more Democrats registered than Republicans so they're calling out fraud where it didn't occur."

Indeed, voter fraud is not the endemic problem Republicans portray it to be, critics say. Critics note that a study by the Brennan Center for Justice found that any given voter is more likely to be struck by lightning than attempt to impersonate another person at the polls. *Washington Post* columnist E. J. Dionne Jr. writes, "[S]tudy after study has shown that fraud by voters is not a major problem—and is less of a problem than how hard many states make it for people to vote in the first place."

Instead of clamping down on voter fraud, critics assert, voter ID measures are more likely to prevent eligible citizens from voting. Indianapolis resident Kim Tillman, for example, told NPR that she could not afford the fees it would have cost to get a copy of her birth certificate from out of state, which she would have needed to do in order to get Indiana’s free voter ID card. Tillman said, "I believe that I should be able to have a voice...to say who I would like governing the state that I live in. But unfortunately because of state laws I'm unable to do that."
Furthermore, critics argue, the laws will disproportionately affect the poor and minorities. Dionne contends, "These statutes are not neutral. Their greatest impact will be to reduce turnout among African Americans, Latinos and the young. It is no accident that these groups were key to Barack Obama’s victory in 2008—or that the laws in question are being enacted in states where Republicans control state governments."

Critics also say that voter ID measures are enforced unfairly among voting demographics. A study by political science professor Ansolabehere found that, while 53% of white voters were asked to show a photo ID during the 2008 presidential election, "a staggering 73% of African Americans" were asked. Ansolabehere writes, "The data further show that poll workers do not administer this procedure fairly or without regard to race, which raises the important possibility that in practice voter-identification procedures violate the Voting Rights Act," a 1965 law prohibiting discriminatory voting procedures. [See Issues and Controversies in American History: Voting Rights Act of 1965]

U.S. history provides countless examples of politicians using the specter of voter fraud to disenfranchise minorities, critics say. Daniel Tokaji, a law professor at Ohio State University in Columbus, said, "We've seen it throughout American history. In the 19th century, claims of fraud were made to exclude immigrants, ethnic minorities and laborers. And throughout most of the 20th century, the disenfranchisement of African-Americans in the South was done through voter-registration requirements that local officials claimed were to prevent voter fraud."

In fact, critics say, such statutes will turn back the recent progress the U.S. has made toward universal voting. Stephen Shapiro, the legal director of the ACLU, said, "We should be seeking ways to encourage more people to vote, not inventing excuses to deny citizens their constitutional voting rights."

If fighting voter fraud were truly a priority, critics say, legislators would look in other areas of the voting process where most fraud occurs. A study written by Gabriel Sanchez, a political science professor at the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque, Stephen Nuno, an assistant political science professor at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff, and Matt Barreto, a political science professor at the University of Washington in Seattle, notes, "[T]he occurrence of voter fraud whereby people ineligible to vote...fake their way into voting is extremely rare. Instead, we argue that more attention should be given to those areas where election fraud is more likely to exist, such as the point of contact between the ballot and officials counting the vote, absentee voting and registration fraud."

Critics deny that instituting voter identification measures will increase confidence in the electoral process. Ansolabehere said that his study disproved the assertion that stricter identification measures increased public confidence in elections. He writes, "Those voters living in states with stricter identification laws did not report higher levels of confidence or higher rates of voting than those living in states with relatively weak identification rules.... ID laws will have little or no effect on the confidence in the electoral system or the belief in the incidence of fraud."

Critics also contend that state legislatures should be focusing on much more pressing issues than searching for ways to combat imaginary voter fraud. Tova Andrea Wang, an election reform expert and fellow at the New York City–based public policy research organization Demos, writes in the American Prospect, "Instead of spending money on a nonexistent problem, states could save crucial programs in health care, job creation and education. They could even use this money to increase voter participation by improving poll-worker recruitment and training, stepping up outreach efforts to Americans whose primary language is not English, and educating citizens about the registration and voting process."

Do More Court Challenges Await Voting Measures?

Many observers predict that voter ID legislation will continue to be challenged in court. The Supreme Court's upholding
of Indiana's ID measure in 2008, some say, is no guarantee that courts will uphold similar laws in the future. According to a 2011 report from the Brennan Center for Justice, the Supreme Court's decision "left the door open to challenges to other photo ID laws that burden voters more than Indiana's." While Indiana's law had several safeguards against unduly burdening voters, such as the mandate that the state provide free IDs to eligible voters, others do not. According to the report, "It is likely that any law that lacks these features would fare differently in court."

Other observers wonder what effect such measures will have on the voter turnout in November 2012, the next presidential election. Dionne writes, "Whether or not these laws can be rolled back, their existence should unleash a great civic campaign akin to the voter-registration drives of the civil rights years. The poor, the young and people of color should get their IDs, flock to the polls and insist on their right to vote in 2012." Political pundits and electoral experts will be likely to track the effects the passage of voter ID measures might have on the 2012 election and beyond.

Discussion Questions

1) Do you think the comparison between voting and boarding an airplane, driving a car or checking into a hotel is valid? Devise your own analogy between voting and another activity, and explain your choice.

2) Do you think stricter voter authentication measures will reduce voter turnout? Why or why not?

3) How do you think the voting-related measures passed over the past year will affect the presidential election of 2012?

4) What measures do you think states should undertake to improve the voting system in the U.S.?
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