



Voter Suppression vs. Voter Fraud



November 21, 2013

Hamilton County's Republican and Democratic Party chairmen switched sides tonight to discuss controversial voting issues. This outline contains background, context, information, and commentary on some of the issues they discussed.

I. VALUES/BELIEFS

Jonathan Haidt, a social psychologist at the University of Virginia and author of The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion, says, if you want to persuade others you have to appeal to their sentiments. Haidt seeks to enrich political discourse with a deeper understanding of human nature. The answer to why your political opponent won't listen to reason is that "we were never designed to listen to reason." In studies, people draw immediate conclusions on issues of "right" and "wrong" and only then engage their reasoning brain to justify what they already know. Therefore, Haidt's conclusion: if you want to change people's minds, don't appeal to their reason. Appeal to reason's boss: the underlying moral intuitions whose conclusions reason defends.

Source: William Saletan, *Why Won't They Listen*, THE NEW YORK TIMES, March 23, 2012 (attached).

March 23, 2012

Why Won't They Listen?

By WILLIAM SALETAN

THE RIGHTEOUS MIND: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion

By Jonathan Haidt

You're smart. You're liberal. You're well informed. You think conservatives are narrow-minded. You can't understand why working-class Americans vote Republican. You figure they're being duped. You're wrong.

This isn't an accusation from the right. It's a friendly warning from Jonathan Haidt, a social psychologist at the University of Virginia who, until 2009, considered himself a partisan liberal. In "The Righteous Mind," Haidt seeks to enrich liberalism, and political discourse generally, with a deeper awareness of human nature. Like other psychologists who have ventured into political coaching, such as George Lakoff and Drew Westen, Haidt argues that people are fundamentally intuitive, not rational. If you want to persuade others, you have to appeal to their sentiments. But Haidt is looking for more than victory. He's looking for wisdom. That's what makes "The Righteous Mind" well worth reading. Politics isn't just about manipulating people who disagree with you. It's about learning from them.

Haidt seems to delight in mischief. Drawing on ethnography, evolutionary theory and experimental psychology, he sets out to trash the modern faith in reason. In Haidt's retelling, all the fools, foils and villains of intellectual history are recast as heroes. David Hume, the Scottish philosopher who notoriously said reason was fit only to be "the slave of the passions," was largely correct. E. O. Wilson, the ecologist who was branded a fascist for stressing the biological origins of human behavior, has been vindicated by the study of moral emotions. Even Glaucon, the cynic in Plato's "Republic" who told Socrates that people would behave ethically only if they thought they were being watched, was "the guy who got it right."

To the question many people ask about politics — Why doesn't the other side listen to reason? — Haidt replies: We were never designed to listen to reason. When you ask people moral questions, time their responses and scan their brains, their answers and brain activation patterns indicate that they reach conclusions quickly and produce reasons later only to justify what they've decided. The funniest and most painful illustrations are Haidt's transcripts of interviews about bizarre scenarios. Is it wrong to have sex with a dead chicken? How about with your sister? Is it O.K. to defecate in a urinal? If your dog dies, why not eat it? Under interrogation, most subjects in psychology experiments agree these things are wrong. But none can explain why.

The problem isn't that people don't reason. They do reason. But their arguments aim to support their conclusions, not yours. Reason doesn't work like a judge or teacher, impartially weighing evidence or guiding us to wisdom. It works more like a lawyer or press secretary, justifying our acts and judgments to others. Haidt shows, for example, how subjects relentlessly marshal arguments for the incest taboo, no matter how thoroughly an interrogator demolishes these arguments.

To explain this persistence, Haidt invokes an evolutionary hypothesis: We compete for social status, and the key advantage in this struggle is the ability to influence others. Reason, in this view, evolved to help us spin, not to help us learn. So if you want to change people's minds, Haidt concludes, don't appeal to their reason. Appeal to reason's boss: the underlying moral intuitions whose conclusions reason defends.

Haidt's account of reason is a bit too simple — his whole book, after all, is a deployment of reason to advance learning — and his advice sounds cynical. But set aside those objections for now, and go with him. If you follow Haidt through

the tunnel of cynicism, you'll find that what he's really after is enlightenment. He wants to open your mind to the moral intuitions of other people.

In the West, we think morality is all about harm, rights, fairness and consent. Does the guy own the chicken? Is the dog already dead? Is the sister of legal age? But step outside your neighborhood or your country, and you'll discover that your perspective is highly anomalous. Haidt has read ethnographies, traveled the world and surveyed tens of thousands of people online. He and his colleagues have compiled a catalog of six fundamental ideas that commonly undergird moral systems: care, fairness, liberty, loyalty, authority and sanctity. Alongside these principles, he has found related themes that carry moral weight: divinity, community, hierarchy, tradition, sin and degradation.

The worldviews Haidt discusses may differ from yours. They don't start with the individual. They start with the group or the cosmic order. They exalt families, armies and communities. They assume that people should be treated differently according to social role or status — elders should be honored, subordinates should be protected. They suppress forms of self-expression that might weaken the social fabric. They assume interdependence, not autonomy. They prize order, not equality.

These moral systems aren't ignorant or backward. Haidt argues that they're common in history and across the globe because they fit human nature. He compares them to cuisines. We acquire morality the same way we acquire food preferences: we start with what we're given. If it tastes good, we stick with it. If it doesn't, we reject it. People accept God, authority and karma because these ideas suit their moral taste buds. Haidt points to research showing that people punish cheaters, accept many hierarchies and don't support equal distribution of benefits when contributions are unequal.

You don't have to go abroad to see these ideas. You can find them in the Republican Party. Social conservatives see welfare and feminism as threats to responsibility and family stability. The [Tea Party](#) hates redistribution because it interferes with letting people reap what they earn. Faith, patriotism, valor, chastity, law and order — these Republican themes touch all six moral foundations, whereas Democrats, in Haidt's analysis, focus almost entirely on care and fighting oppression. This is Haidt's startling message to the left: When it comes to morality, conservatives are more broad-minded than liberals. They serve a more varied diet.

This is where Haidt diverges from other psychologists who have analyzed the left's electoral failures. The usual argument of these psycho-pundits is that conservative politicians manipulate voters' neural roots — playing on our craving for authority, for example — to trick people into voting against their interests. But Haidt treats electoral success as a kind of evolutionary fitness test. He figures that if voters like Republican messages, there's something in Republican messages worth liking. He chides psychologists who try to "explain away" conservatism, treating it as a pathology. Conservatism thrives because it fits how people think, and that's what validates it. Workers who vote Republican aren't fools. In Haidt's words, they're "voting for their *moral* interests."

One of these interests is moral capital — norms, practices and institutions, like religion and family values, that facilitate cooperation by constraining individualism. Toward this end, Haidt applauds the left for regulating corporate greed. But he worries that in other ways, liberals dissolve moral capital too recklessly. Welfare programs that substitute public aid for spousal and parental support undermine the ecology of the family. Education policies that let students sue teachers erode classroom authority. Multicultural education weakens the cultural glue of assimilation. Haidt agrees that old ways must sometimes be re-examined and changed. He just wants liberals to proceed with caution and protect the social pillars sustained by tradition.

Another aspect of human nature that conservatives understand better than liberals, according to Haidt, is parochial altruism, the inclination to care more about members of your group — particularly those who have made sacrifices for it — than about outsiders. Saving Darfur, submitting to the United Nations and paying taxes to educate children in another state may be noble, but they aren't natural. What's natural is giving to your church, helping your P.T.A. and rallying together as Americans against a foreign threat.

How far should liberals go toward incorporating these principles? Haidt says the shift has to be more than symbolic, but he doesn't lay out a specific policy agenda. Instead, he highlights broad areas of culture and politics — family and

assimilation, for example — on which liberals should consider compromise. He urges conservatives to entertain liberal ideas in the same way. The purpose of such compromises isn't just to win elections. It's to make society and government fit human nature.

The hardest part, Haidt finds, is getting liberals to open their minds. Anecdotally, he reports that when he talks about authority, loyalty and sanctity, many people in the audience spurn these ideas as the seeds of racism, sexism and homophobia. And in a survey of 2,000 Americans, Haidt found that self-described liberals, especially those who called themselves "very liberal," were worse at predicting the moral judgments of moderates and conservatives than moderates and conservatives were at predicting the moral judgments of liberals. Liberals don't understand conservative values. And they can't recognize this failing, because they're so convinced of their rationality, open-mindedness and enlightenment.

Haidt isn't just scolding liberals, however. He sees the left and right as yin and yang, each contributing insights to which the other should listen. In his view, for instance, liberals can teach conservatives to recognize and constrain predation by entrenched interests. Haidt believes in the power of reason, but the reasoning has to be interactive. It has to be other people's reason engaging yours. We're lousy at challenging our own beliefs, but we're good at challenging each other's. Haidt compares us to neurons in a giant brain, capable of "producing good reasoning as an emergent property of the social system."

Our task, then, is to organize society so that reason and intuition interact in healthy ways. Haidt's research suggests several broad guidelines. First, we need to help citizens develop sympathetic relationships so that they seek to understand one another instead of using reason to parry opposing views. Second, we need to create time for contemplation. Research shows that two minutes of reflection on a good argument can change a person's mind. Third, we need to break up our ideological segregation. From 1976 to 2008, the proportion of Americans living in highly partisan counties increased from 27 percent to 48 percent. The Internet exacerbates this problem by helping each user find evidence that supports his views.

How can we achieve these goals? Haidt offers a Web site, civilpolitics.org, on which he and his colleagues have listed steps that might help. One is holding open primaries so that people outside each party's base can vote to nominate moderate candidates. Another is instant runoffs, so that candidates will benefit from broadening their appeal. A third idea is to alter redistricting so that parties are less able to gerrymander partisan congressional districts. Haidt also wants members of Congress to go back to the old practice of moving their families to Washington, so that they socialize with one another and build a friendly basis on which to cooperate.

Many of Haidt's proposals are vague, insufficient or hard to implement. And that's O.K. He just wants to start a conversation about integrating a better understanding of human nature — our sentiments, sociality and morality — into the ways we debate and govern ourselves. At this, he succeeds. It's a landmark contribution to humanity's understanding of itself.

But to whom is Haidt directing his advice? If intuitions are unreflective, and if reason is self-serving, then what part of us does he expect to regulate and orchestrate these faculties? This is the unspoken tension in Haidt's book. As a scientist, he takes a passive, empirical view of human nature. He describes us as we have been, expecting no more. Based on evolution, he argues, universal love is implausible: "Parochial love . . . amplified by similarity" and a "sense of shared fate . . . may be the most we can accomplish." But as an author and advocate, Haidt speaks to us rationally and universally, as though we're capable of something greater. He seems unable to help himself, as though it's in his nature to call on our capacity for reason and our sense of common humanity — and in our nature to understand it.

You don't have to believe in God to see this higher capacity as part of our nature. You just have to believe in evolution. Evolution itself has evolved: as humans became increasingly social, the struggle for survival, mating and progeny depended less on physical abilities and more on social abilities. In this way, a faculty produced by evolution — sociality — became the new engine of evolution. Why can't reason do the same thing? Why can't it emerge from its evolutionary origins as a spin doctor to become the new medium in which humans compete, cooperate and advance the fitness of their communities? Isn't that what we see all around us? Look at the global spread of media, debate and democracy.

Haidt is part of this process. He thinks he's just articulating evolution. But in effect, he's also trying to fix it. Traits we evolved in a dispersed world, like tribalism and righteousness, have become dangerously maladaptive in an era of rapid globalization. A pure scientist would let us purge these traits from the gene pool by fighting and killing one another. But Haidt wants to spare us this fate. He seeks a world in which "fewer people believe that righteous ends justify violent means." To achieve this goal, he asks us to understand and overcome our instincts. He appeals to a power capable of circumspection, reflection and reform.

If we can harness that power — wisdom — our substantive project will be to reconcile our national and international differences. Is income inequality immoral? Should government favor religion? Can we tolerate cultures of female subjugation? And how far should we trust our instincts? Should people who find homosexuality repugnant overcome that reaction?

Haidt's faith in moral taste receptors may not survive this scrutiny. Our taste for sanctity or authority, like our taste for sugar, could turn out to be a dangerous relic. But Haidt is right that we must learn what we have been, even if our nature is to transcend it.

II. VOTING LAWS

Depending upon your viewpoint, numerous laws governing voting are being proposed for the purpose of preventing fraud or discouraging participation in elections. In 2011, GOP-backed HB 194 passed the Ohio General Assembly. It included provisions to shorten the time period for early in-person and mail-in votes, reduce voting hours on Election Day, and eliminate the requirement that poll workers inform voters when they are at the wrong precinct.

Democrats opposed to these measures fought a referendum campaign to put this omnibus election law on the ballot. Before the election, Republicans withdrew HB 194. Republicans have since introduced piecemeal bills and more are expected to regulate the voting process.

The Brennan Center for Justice, a non-partisan public policy and law institute, monitors and comments on voting changes. In its November 4, 2013 comprehensive round-up, it grouped Ohio among states with pending, active, or passed new or modified voting laws including:

- **Photo ID laws.** At least 24 states have introduced legislation either requiring voters to show photo ID at the polls or making existing photo ID laws more restrictive.
- **Modernizing Voter Registration.** At least 26 states have introduced bills that would modernize the voter registration system, in whole or in part, and make it easier for eligible citizens to register.
- **Reducing early voting opportunities.** At least eight states have introduced bills that limit existing opportunities to vote early in person.
- **Online registration.** At least 13 states have introduced bills that would establish or enhance the use of online registration systems.
- **Making it harder for students to vote.** At least two states have proposed legislation that would make it harder for students to register and vote.
- **Pre-registering students to vote.** At least 13 states have introduced bills that would allow students under the age of 18 to pre-register, so that upon turning 18 they are registered to vote.

Source: <http://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/election-2013-voting-laws-roundup>.

III. PROSECUTION OF VOTER FRAUD

Moving now from the issue of which laws should govern voting, we will focus on how voting laws should be enforced. In particular, the law requires voters to register where they live and to vote only once. Ohio law address, but leaves room for interpretation as to what should happen when a voter sends an absentee ballot and also shows up to the polls to vote:

RC 3509.09(B)(2) If a registered elector appears to vote in that precinct and that elector has requested an absent voter's ballot for that election and the director has received a sealed identification envelope purporting to contain that elector's voted absent voter's ballots for that election, the elector shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot under section 3505.181 of the Revised Code in that precinct on the day of that election. (Emphasis added.)

RC 3599.12 (A)(2) No person shall do any of the following: . . . Vote or attempt to vote more than once at the same election by any means, including voting or attempting to vote both by absent voter's ballots . . . and by regular ballot at the polls at the same election . . . (Emphasis added.)

After the 2012 election, the Hamilton County Board of Elections investigated 80 suspicious cases involving alleged voter fraud. They determined that most involved simple misunderstandings. By February 2013, they continued investigating only 19 of these cases and eventually sent 6 cases to Joe Deters, Hamilton County Prosecutor. Deters issued a legal opinion in March 2013 instructing the Board of Elections to enforce the Illegal Voting law by referring every instance and all evidence supporting an attempt to vote more than once to the prosecuting attorney for further review and action. Of the 6 cases referred to the prosecutor, two pleaded guilty of submitting absentee ballots on behalf of someone recently deceased. Three involved people who registered and voted in Hamilton County although they were not resident there. One, Melowese Richardson, 58, a long-time poll worker, was sentenced to five years in prison. Richardson pleaded no contest to four counts of illegal voting in 2009, 2011 and 2012. One count charged her with voting for her sister, who is in a coma. Richardson also voted twice in 2012, once by absentee and once at the precinct, and both votes were counted.

Sources: <http://www.wcpo.com/news/local-news/hamilton-county-board-of-elections-investigating-possible-voter-fraud>; <http://wvxu.org/post/widespread-vote-fraud-real-or-imagined>; <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/19/cincinnati-poll-worker-sentenced-to-5-years-for-voter-fraud-in-presidential/>



**Chairman Triantafilou
to appear LIVE on Fox News
to discuss the
Voter Fraud Investigation**

Hamilton County GOP Chairman Alex Triantafilou is scheduled to appear LIVE on a national Fox News broadcast on *Sunday, February 17, 2013 at 11:30 a.m.* (tomorrow) to discuss the ongoing voter fraud investigation being conducted by the Hamilton County Board of Elections.

On Friday, February 15, the Board of Elections conducted a hearing at which the Board heard testimony from a small number of witnesses who attempted to explain their decision to vote twice in the fall 2012 election. A majority of those persons subpoenaed to the Board hearing failed to appear. The investigation continues into this week with the next public hearing set for Friday, February 22 at 2:00 p.m. All hearings occur at the Hamilton County Board of Elections located at 824 Broadway, 3rd floor, in downtown Cincinnati.

Many local media outlets have [reported](#) on the serious fraud allegations being investigated and now, the national media is starting to take notice of what occurred in Hamilton County, Ohio last November.

Statement of Chairman Alex M. Triantafilou

"During the fall 2012 campaign season, the left in America went to great lengths to falsely accuse Republicans of "voter suppression." Those completely nonsensical arguments were designed to politically motivate the Democratic base and to stir voters' fears. The real problem with our voting process is voter fraud.

"The Republican Party's reasonable statewide attempts to clarify the rules, provide substantive reforms, and create uniformity across our state have been met with staunch opposition at every turn. The result is the type of voter fraud that we are investigating in this pivotal swing county in this critical battleground state of Ohio. For instance, the "golden week" of Ohio voting, during which a person can register and vote on the same day, has caused several instances of potential voter fraud that we are investigating. Democrats across this state should ask themselves: Why didn't we allow the reasonable reforms proposed by Republicans to go into affect so we could maintain integrity in our voting process?

"We intend to continue this fight to protect the integrity of the vote in Ohio. It is important to every citizen that legal votes be counted and that those attempting to cheat and sway an election be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

"Finally, I'm gratified that Fox News has decided to cover this story on a national scale so that the American people can see that voting reform is necessary. I look forward to the conversation on Fox News tomorrow."

Paid for by the Hamilton County Republican Party, Alex M. Triantafilou,
Chairman, 700 Walnut Street, Ste 309, Cincinnati, OH 45202

by German Lopez 06.10.2013

Posted In: [Voting, News, Government](#) at 10:27 AM | [Permalink](#) | [Comments](#) (1)



County to Investigate 39 Voter Fraud Cases Critics warn of potential chilling effect

As county and state officials move to investigate and potentially prosecute voter fraud cases, local groups are pushing back, warning that the investigations could cause a chilling effect among voters. Vice Mayor Roxanne Qualls became the latest to speak out in a letter to Hamilton County Prosecutor Joe Deters and Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted. "The current legal investigations perpetuate the idea that voter fraud is widespread, when it's not true," she wrote. "We need to work together to give citizens the confidence that the election process is fair and accessible to those who have followed the law and pre-determined process. When citizens are confused about the process of voting they are intimidated from exercising their full rights to vote, which erodes confidence in and the integrity of our democracy." The American Civil Liberties Union of Ohio (ACLU) and League of Women Voters of Ohio sent similar letters to Husted in the past few weeks, echoing fears that the investigations will intimidate voters into staying out of future elections. The controversy surrounds 39 "double voter" cases recently sent to the county prosecutor by the Hamilton County Board of Elections. In most of the cases, the voters in question sent in an absentee ballot prior to Election Day then voted on Election Day through a provisional ballot, which are given to voters when there's questions about eligibility. Even though the voters technically voted twice, their votes were only counted once. The letters from Qualls and the League of Women Voters claim the cases were sent to the county prosecutor based on a narrow interpretation of state law and other sections of election law back the voters' actions. The letters reference Ohio Revised Code Section 3509.09(B)(2), which says, "If a registered elector appears to vote in that precinct and that elector has requested an absent voter's ballot for that election and the director has received a sealed identification envelope purporting to contain that elector's voted absent voter's ballots for that election, the elector shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot under section 3505.181 of the Revised Code in that precinct on the day of that election." The law goes on to clarify only one of the votes should be counted. Husted broke a tie vote in the Hamilton County Board of Elections on May 31, siding with the Republicans on the board who wanted to send the case to the county prosecutor. Alex Triantafilou, an elections board member and chairman of the Hamilton County Republican Party, says Republicans just want an investigation. "I think anytime a person casts two ballots we ought to ask why," Triantafilou says. "This is not to prejudice any of these cases as criminal charges. That's not been our intention. What we want is a qualified investigator to ask the question and then answer it." Tim Burke, chairman of the local elections board and the Hamilton County Democratic Party, disagrees: "This is a damn shame. What's happening to those voters is absolutely wrong." Burke claims the law was followed and no further investigation is necessary. He alleges Republicans are trying to suppress voters. "I fear that what's going on is that elements of the Republican Party want to create the impression that there is massive voter fraud going on, and they want to scare the hell out of people to intimidate them and discourage them from voting in the future," Burke says. "I think part of what's going on here is an effort to identify voter fraud in order to justify more restrictions on voting rights." Triantafilou argues Democrats, including Burke, are playing politics: "It's a continuation of the kind of fear that Democrats try to instill in the electorate, and it's a political weapon. We're not trying to do that. They alleged voter suppression in the last election cycle. That was nonsensical. The problem really is fraud."

IV. REDISTRICTING

In Ohio, every 10 years, after a census, the party in power redraws Ohio's electoral map into voting districts. According to Ohio's Secretary of State and the non-partisan League of Women Voters, there are 4 quantifiable measures of success for redistricting:

1. *Communities of Interest – keep counties and municipalities together.*
2. *Compactness – avoid bizarrely-shaped districts.*
3. *Competitiveness - maximize the number of legislative districts that could be won by either party.*
4. *Representational Fairness - make any partisan balance of legislative districts match the real world voting history of Ohioans.*

Ohio's Republican-drawn 2011 map gives the GOP 12 of Ohio's 16 districts and scores much lower on these 4 goals than dozens of redistricting plans submitted by Ohio's citizens in response to a state-wide competition.

As evidence of the impact of redistricting, in 2012, President Barack Obama won Ohio by 3 percentage points, while Republicans won huge majorities in the legislature and the congressional delegation.

In 2012, Ohio voters considered, and then roundly rejected, a constitutional amendment — Issue 2 — that would have replaced Ohio's current redistricting process with a 12-person citizen commission to draw legislative and congressional district maps. Issue 2 was defeated by over 26 points.

Democrats criticize Ohio's current map, but chose not to expend any significant effort supporting Issue 2.

Republicans have defended the map as fair, however, just last week, Republican Secretary of State Jon Husted, an architect of Ohio's map, blamed the map for "increasing levels of government partisanship and dysfunction." Husted called for another ballot issue in 2014 to include his three recommendations for redistricting:

1. The apportionment board should be expanded from five to seven, so that at least two members of the minority party are included.
2. Its actions should require approval from a supermajority that includes support from both Republicans and Democrats.
3. The districts it creates should be drawn with compactness and competitiveness in mind.

The Columbus Dispatch

Redistricting changes are crucial, Jon Husted says

By Jim Siegel

The Columbus Dispatch Friday November 15, 2013 8:10 AM

Calling it potentially “the most important reform to the Constitution in generations,” Secretary of State Jon Husted urged the Ohio Constitutional Modernization Commission to change the state’s hyper-partisan process for drawing legislative and congressional districts.

Partisan drawing of legislative and congressional districts, which leaves the vast majority of state and federal lawmakers in safe seats and all but ensures GOP control, is a primary cause for the increasing levels of government partisanship and dysfunction, Husted told the commission.

Republicans properly followed the mapping process in 2010, Husted said. However, he noted that while President Barack Obama won Ohio by 3 percentage points, Republicans won huge majorities in the legislature and the congressional delegation.

When general elections are not a concern, Husted said, lawmakers speak to the flanks of their parties that vote in primaries, rather than mainstream Ohioans. When those candidates are sent to Columbus and Washington to solve complex problems with the other party, it doesn’t work, he said.

“Good people can’t function well in a bad system,” Husted said. “The system creates the wrong incentives in our democracy ... and does not force people to work together.”

The Modernization Commission is tasked with recommending changes to the Ohio Constitution. The legislature can decide to place issues on the statewide ballot.

Speaker William G. Batchelder, R-Medina, the commission co-chairman, said redistricting is crying out for public attention and “is an issue we want to deal with sooner rather than later.”

His fellow co-chairman, Rep. Vernon Sykes, D-Akron, wants to see a recommendation ready in time for the November 2014 ballot. “We’re pretty close on many of the issues.”

Husted recommended a plan he introduced while in the legislature, consisting of a seven-member board that would require at least one minority party vote to approve a map. Maps, he said, should create districts that balance compactness and competitiveness.

He estimates that of Ohio’s 16 congressional districts, six to eight could be made competitive.

Husted’s testimony contrasted with what a subcommittee of the commission heard earlier in the day from Tom Brunell, a political-science professor from the University of Texas at Dallas, who said Ohio should reject any provision that encourages competitive districts.

Those districts, Brunell argued, have the highest percentage of people voting for losing candidates, and those voters are less likely to trust the government.

Fred Mills, who is heading the subcommittee dealing with redistricting, said of the roughly 10 issues that must be decided to create a plan, the panel has agreed on two — a map should get approval from a minority party member, and the new board should draw both congressional and legislative maps.

Source: <http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2013/11/15/redistricting-changes-are-crucial-husted-says.html>