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The brouhaha over the U.S. 2000 presidential election’s military/overseas absentee ballots questioned the voting rights’ sanctity, but more importantly, it revealed partisan bias within the military. The complex and disparate voting rules of states and territories coupled with an ineffectual DoD voting assistance apparatus fueled a media and political frenzy over military absentee votes and indirectly alluded to a military “vote-block” that linked military personnel with the Republican Party. To avoid the disastrous consequences associated with a perceived or actual partisan military, DoD must deliberately work to avoid this recurrence. To eliminate excessive publicity about military voting preferences, military absentee voting problems must be resolved. Additionally, military affiliate advocacy groups should deliberately focus on candidates’ issues and avoid party-focused rhetoric. In short, impediments to military/overseas absentee voting should be unblocked and DoD should eschew establishment or perceptions of special interest military vote-blocks.
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Unblock the Votes: Military/Overseas Absentee Voting

Democracy’s ceremonial, its feast, its great function, is the election.

—H.G. Wells

More than merely a ceremonial, a feast or a great function, the 2000 United States (U.S.) federal election and its aftermath evolved into a media brouhaha. During the ballot counting debacle, the previously not-so-perceptible politicization of the U.S. military became unmistakably evident to the public. Rather than appearing as an apolitical sector of the citizenry or even as a generally bipartisan reflection of the current American population, the U.S. military surfaced as strongly supportive of the Republican Party, adding credence to previous academic accusations of military politicization.¹ Negative ramifications of a partisan military include perceptions that the military can and will leverage “vote-blocks” in response to specific issues. With U.S. public support split close to 50-50 between the two major parties, vote-blocks can carry profound influence in national as well as local elections to significantly impact national policies. However, this prospect of targeted military vote-blocks may backfire, fulfilling Samuel Huntington’s observation that power revealed is power reduced.² Military vote-blocks may also jeopardize the existing imperative that professional soldiers remain “above politics” by not overtly displaying partisanship.³

More than other election issues, military personnel have deep-seated interests in voting for candidates whose policies will best support national security concerns. Each military serviceperson takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution and obey the orders of designated leaders. Though not often required to give their lives in support of their commitments, servicepersons must be prepared to make that ultimate sacrifice. During close elections, vote-blocks can be decisive. Yet, the perception of military vote-blocks erodes the very principle of military separation from political activity.⁴ Apolitical military service is critical for the Department of Defense (DoD) to credibly promote military interests and provide objective national security policy advice while expending large portions of the federal budget pursuing nonpartisan national interests.⁵ Political participation undermines both military professionalism and its perceived objectivity.⁶

Candidates’ stands on national security issues may profoundly affect military operational readiness, contingency operations and engagement activities.⁷ With this in mind, the Military Coalition (TMC) and other military-affiliate groups should promote
policies that best posture the U.S. for success in future operational and strategic environments. Representing 31 organizations comprising over 5.5 million uniformed services’ members—active, reserve, retired, survivors, veterans—and their families, TMC and other military-affiliate groups demand attention. When differences exist in candidates’ outlooks affecting important national security issues, these organizations could extol the merits of the opposite views. Through their actions and influences, these groups generate de facto military vote-blocks.

Because of the nature of their service, military members give up many rights which other U.S. citizens enjoy. Among these relinquished rights, military members are precluded by law from soliciting votes for any particular party. However, military-affiliate interest/support groups can surface priority issues for politicians to address while keeping voters informed of the comparative benefits of each candidate’s platform, thereby enabling DoD to avoid partisanship while ensuring military issues have a prominent place in campaign debates. Nevertheless, military vote-blocks perceptively politicize the military, shedding skepticism on the notion of U.S. civilian supremacy limits to the proffering of military advise or expression of dissent concerning national defense policies. Even when informed about the full spectrum of election issues from national security to non-defense domestic matters, individual servicepersons’ collective votes can still impact election results and create images of powerful vote-blocks. The partisan flavor of these military vote-blocks jeopardizes objective treatment by the U.S. government’s politicized legislative and executive branches.

A watershed event, the 2000 election campaign brought the military vote-block to national prominence. Using military ballots as political footballs, both political parties extolled military servicepersons’ rights to vote. Due to Republican bias of the military vote, many politicians on that side of the aisle attempted permissive interpretations or tried to relax state absentee voting standards. At the same time, Democrats deliberately promoted strict application of military/overseas absentee voting requirements while simultaneously pushing liberal interpretations of questionable non-absentee ballots from predominantly Democratic voting districts. Each side’s political rhetoric played on patriotic military sentiments while advancing their own political agendas:

- Senator Bob Graham: “...military votes should not be discounted simply because they lacked a postmark. Election officials should ‘bend over backward’ to have military votes count...The federal law provides that a postmark is not required for overseas stationed military personnel.”
• Representative Steve Buyer: “The men and women of our military, who literally put their lives on the line every day in defense of our right to vote, had their votes thrown out...I will continue to determine whether this was a blatant violation of [federal law] that protects against abuses of this kind.”

• Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) William S. Cohen: “The last thing we want to do is make it harder for those wearing our uniform and serving overseas to be able to cast a ballot.”

• General Colin S. Powell: “We shouldn’t disenfranchise our GIs if there’s anything we can do to avoid it. All those GIs in Broward County, Florida, are going to learn that 75 percent of their absentee ballots were thrown aside...”

• Montana Governor Marc Racicot: “I am very sorry to say that the Vice President’s lawyers have gone to war in my judgment against the men and women who serve in our armed forces.”

• Marine General Charles Krulak: “If you have people serving in a combat zone or an area with some exclusion [on mail service] and that mail doesn’t have a postmark, that [ballot rejection] is a disgrace...Then you have people in harm’s way who aren’t being counted...There is something wrong with a situation where those people who are out serving their country are disenfranchised.”

• Representative Neil Abercrombie: “If a federal absentee ballot is otherwise properly executed, it should be counted, even if the postmark is in question.”

• Senator John Warner, Co-chair, Senate Armed Services Committee: “Fundamental principles of equity, long established in our jurisprudence, should be invoked to ensure that the ballots of our overseas military personnel are counted despite the absence of a postmark, or some other technicality. It is a fact, regrettably, that a number of absentee ballots from overseas U.S. military personnel do not bear postmarks, although those ballots were received in the voter’s state by the deadline set by state law.”

• General H. Norman Schwarzkopf: “It’s a very sad day for our country when the men and women of the armed forces are serving abroad and facing danger on a daily basis...yet because of some technicality out of their control they are denied the right to vote for the president of the United States who will be their
commander in chief...For the sake of fairness alone these armed forces ballots should be allowed to be tallied.”

- Bob Ingram, Medal of Honor Winner: “If they’re going to count a dimple, then they need to count a vet’s vote.”

- Florida State Attorney General Robert A. Butterworth, Co-chair, Vice President Al Gore’s Florida Campaign: “…no man or woman in military service to this nation should have his or her vote rejected solely due to the absence of a postmark.”

- Representative Joe Scarborough: “I’m calling on the 67 counties of this great state...to count the ballots of servicemen and women. “Men and women in the military have every right to vote on who their next Commander-in-Chief will be; if something was done to inhibit their ability to vote, the public has a right to know.”

- Senator Zell Miller: “Any ballot from a man or woman in the military who is serving this country should be counted—period.” “I don’t care when it’s dated, whether it’s witnessed or anything else. If it is from someone serving this country and they made the effort to vote, count it and salute them when you do it.”

- former Senator Bob Dole: “And they have a right to vote, they have a right (sic) to defend us, but their vote’s not counted...” “But the point is, let’s count their votes, let’s count their votes, let’s count their votes.”

- Senator Joseph I. Lieberman: “...if I was there, I would give the benefit of the doubt to ballots [coming in from military personnel], generally...And if they have the capacity, I’d urge them to go back and take another look. Because, again, Al Gore and I don’t want to ever be part of anything that would put an extra burden on the military personnel abroad who want to vote...” “Let me just say that the vice president and I would never authorize, and would not tolerate, a campaign that was aimed specifically at invalidating absentee ballots from members of our armed services...We ought to do everything we can to count the votes of our military personnel overseas...”

- Jim Post, Duval County Republican Party lawyer: “This was a systematic, heavy-handed effort by the Democrats to eliminate military absentee ballots.”

- Representative Bob Barr: “We’re asking for these people to be allowed to vote now.”

- Representative Gene Taylor: “I am greatly disturbed by the perception the Democratic Party is trying to keep the military from voting.”
• former Representative Sonny Montgomery, Co-chair, Republican Veteran Outreach Committee: “Governor Bush’s campaign put much emphasis on getting the overseas military vote...They made a special effort to get the military vote.”

Eventual consequences of the election’s military absentee voting controversy and the inference of a “Republican Armed Forces” have yet to be realized. Clearly, some possible short-term negative ramifications were avoided by the election of a Republican President. Nevertheless, should military “fortunes” become tied to specific political parties or candidates, the actual politicization of the military cannot be far behind with obvious dire consequences stemming from the military’s growing political influence and stake in political outcomes. Resolution of military/overseas absentee voting problems should help ensure each military vote counts regardless of political issues. DoD should emphasize that U.S. soldiers are citizens first, with interests for which they have the right to promote with their votes. Similarly, military voters must understand the issues and how candidates will champion their concerns irrespective of party affiliation and divorced from special interest-group influence. Elimination of election controversy and public awareness of military political tendencies/biases support our military and national interests. To avoid controversy, DoD should play a central role in ensuring military personnel meet state absentee voting requirements rather than seeking relaxed standards. Moreover, DoD should deliberately avoid the image of affiliating with any political party.

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

The right of election is the very essence of the Constitution.

——Junius 11

Valuing democratic practices, Americans exercise their voting rights as specified in Article II as well as in certain amendments to the U.S. Constitution. Although the post-election ballot recounting process seemed a crisis of democracy, SECDEF William S. Cohen told international leaders that the U.S. “is not dealing with a constitutional crisis but with a constitutional process.” Military/overseas voting right concerns are not new. About 250,000 men and women in the Armed Forces are of voting age at the present time. Many of those in uniform are serving overseas, or in parts of the country distant from
their homes. They are unable to return to their States either to register or to vote. Yet these men and women, who are serving their country and in many cases risking their lives, deserve above all others to exercise the right to vote in this election year. At a time when these young people are defending our country and its free institutions, the least we at home can do is to make sure that they are able to enjoy the rights they are being asked to fight to preserve.

—President Truman’s 1952 Letter to Congress

With the U.S. in the midst of the Korean War, President Truman, reflecting longstanding sentiments about military/overseas absentee voting, beseeched Congress to ensure military servicepersons retained their voting rights. Since then, the number of people eligible to vote military/overseas’ absentee has mushroomed to over six million, including American servicepersons and their families stationed away from their homes of record as well as other U.S. citizens living abroad. Federal and state voting rights’ legislation has also evolved since 1952.

To supplement the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Relief Act and other voting rights’ legislation, in the early 1980s the federal government asked some states to allow overseas voters more time. Florida eventually agreed to distribute ballots 45 days before elections and give 10-day extensions for returning overseas ballots. Enacted in 1986, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA) covers military servicepersons as well as merchant marines and their families serving away from their homes of record in the continental U.S. (CONUS) or overseas, and other U.S. citizens residing outside the U.S.

DoD administers UOCAVA through the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP). Providing voting rights information to U.S. citizens worldwide, FVAP fosters voting participation and protects/enhances federal, state and local electoral processes. In short, FVAP encourages and simplifies military/overseas voting. FVAP also provides ombudsman services to further enhance accessibility and resolve difficulties.

For feedback on how to improve military/overseas absentee voting processes, Gallup conducts FVAP post-election surveys for 20,000 servicepersons worldwide, 10,000 overseas non-federal government employees, 2000 overseas federal government employees, 2400 military Voting Assistance Officers (VAOs), 200 embassy/consulate VAOs, and 500 local election officials. 1996 survey results indicate the total military voting participation rate was 64% (including in-person, absentee, and attempted-vote voters) compared to 49% of the general public. FVAP does not track
complaints from voters who did not receive their ballots in time and the survey's executive summary fails to note problems concerning rejected ballots.46

The 2000 surveys were distributed in November; reminders to complete them were published; and survey results will be available in late 2001.47 The local election officials' survey contains questions about ballot requests and ballots received too late to be counted.48 Though the surveys conclude with open-ended requests for comments on any questionnaire topic and/or how to improve the FVAP, there are no direct requests for other possible ballot rejection causes and no plans to distribute supplemental surveys.49

Increased potential for voter fraud and other absentee voting problems prompt many states to count absentee ballots last.50 Military absentee voting raises residency and legitimacy concerns.51 In 1996, military absentee voter problems occurred in Texas' Val Verde County, where pilot training had been conducted at Laughlin Air Force Base.52 There, two candidates won seats during the local election, but were overturned when 800 absentee ballots, mostly from military officers, were counted.53 A law suit was filed and the U.S. House of Representatives conducted a hearing to address challenged residency requirements and corresponding military voting rights.54 Though the consensus was that military servicepersons must retain voting rights, misgivings concerning military voter residency lingered.55 Absentee voter problems extend beyond the military. In 1998, Miami-Dade County faced non-military absentee voter fraud while, that same year, non-fraud absentee voting problems plagued Nevada.56

Like Val Verde County's military absentee voters, many servicepersons claim residency and vote in states where they do not reside and have not for some time, attracting certain allegations of tax evasion and/or voter fraud and increasing general public apprehensions.57 Often, servicepersons retain their home of record in the state from which they first entered military service or change to the state of a subsequent duty assignment, as long as they continue to meet state-established residency requirements.58 Many servicepersons establish residency in states with numerous military installations and no state income tax, such as Florida or Texas. Over 12% (140,000-180,000) of today's 1.4 million servicepersons claim Florida residency, more than any other state.59 Voter fraud or residency ambiguity predicaments are particularly ironic while prominent Americans assist other nations in certifying their democratic elections as free and fair.60 Encouragingly, FVAP is leading probes into possibilities and implications of electronic voting and other innovations which may alleviate some high-profile absentee voting disparities.61
To reduce fraud and other problems, some state voting laws are more exacting than federal requirements, specifying that absentee ballots cannot be counted unless they are postmarked, or signed and dated.62 Ballots are not typically postmarked since they must be mailed postage-free and there are no federal postage-free postmarking requirements.63 States that allow signing and dating in lieu of postmarking do not always provide adequate areas or instructions.64 Although DoD requires postmarking of all mail, not all Army Post Office/Fleet Post Office (APO/FPO) facilities have postmarking capabilities.65 Even at locations that can postmark, it is not always done.66 Additionally, overseas un-postmarked military mail is sometimes postmarked at CONUS ports of entry.67 The lack of (overseas) mail postmarking is not news to DoD.68 Consequently, for the last election, FVAP reminded voters to have their ballots hand-stamped; yet, APO/FPO workers received no special instructions to meet this requirement.69

Since the 55 individual states/territories control voting, each has specific and, in some cases, disparate procedures.70 With 30 various ballot-return requirements and procedures, voting law differences create extra challenges for military servicepersons.71 Four states required voted-ballot return prior to the election with the strictest stipulating return four days before election day, necessitating overseas mailing many days prior.72 Most (33) states/territories required voted-ballot receipt by election day, still compelling overseas posting well before the election, while ten states/territories allowed mailing by election day and receipt up to 15 days after the election.73 Eight states/territories, to include Florida, had mixed CONUS' and overseas' mailing requirements.74 Dissimilarities in absentee voting policies can be particularly puzzling for military servicepersons who are often first-time state voters.75 Voting requirements and procedures, published by state voting offices, can be found in FVAP's Voting Assistance Guide and the October issue of Voting Information News.76

Although there is evidence that early voting has little effect on election outcomes, military/overseas voters who must vote days prior to the election may be deprived of the benefits of responding with their vote to late-season information disclosures.77 Compensating for this disadvantage, 44 U.S. states/territories allow voters to register, request/receive ballots, and return ballots by fax.78 Overseas absentee voters who have requested but not received state ballots may cast federal write-in ballots (FWIBs) for federal offices, while some states allow FWIBs to also be used for state/local elections.79
CURRENT ISSUES

It's not the voting that's democracy, it's the counting.
—Tom Stoppard

Even before the most recent vote-counting dilemma, some overseas servicepersons experienced trouble receiving and mailing ballots. Consequently, the day following the election, Representative Joe Scarborough requested a Congressional inquiry. Initially, the Navy, unaware of widespread or organized complaints, disputed internet (discussion groups, online news services) accounts concerning thousands of military absentee ballots languishing aboard ships in Aden, saying reports were exaggerated because only about a dozen ballots were delayed. One veterans' affairs attorney claimed he was inundated with e-mail messages from overseas servicepersons who complained that they did not receive requested absentee ballots. Republicans Abroad International received some complaints while Democrats Abroad noted no significant problems. Subsequently, the Navy, though still avoiding allegations about troops not receiving ballots, confirmed delayed voted-ballots from about 3000 sailors and Marines aboard three ships would hence be expedited for on-time delivery.

Florida election officials said many problems were nothing new since similar ballot rejections occurred or would have occurred in previous elections. Miami-Dade County threw out 209 of 312 ballots while the Brevard County Supervisor of Elections stated, "In the past, we have not counted ballots that didn't have a postmark...this is the first year anybody has told us something different." Perhaps unaware of all extant problems, FVAP cautioned voters to watch for:

- inadequate or no legal voting residence address;
- inadequate or illegible current mailing address;
- illegible writing;
- application to wrong jurisdiction;
- failure to indicate party preference;
- no signature;
- received too late; and
- form in general not completed.

While absentee voting is often replete with problems, this election's troubles seemed disproportionate. The 1996 absentee ballot rejection rate was over 20%.
With historical 2% rejection rates in presidential races, Florida's 3% rejection rate in the 2000 election was only slightly higher. Nevertheless, approximately 41% (1527 of 3726-3733) of Florida's absentee ballots were disqualified ranging from 29%-60% rejections in various counties. In the 2000 election, a large number of military absentee ballots were rejected for myriad reasons:

- no/late postmark;
- lateness;
- voter not a county resident;
- improper voter registration;
- failure to request ballot within required 30 days;
- used FWIB, but no record of requesting Florida ballot;
- unmatched signatures;
- lacking signature in correct place;
- lacking voter signature;
- ballot improperly witnessed;
- inadequate witness' address (not as detailed as desired);
- lack of proper signatures;
- voter sent in more than one absentee ballot; or
- improper mailing from within CONUS.

Though some problems may not have been new, since absentee ballots are often counted after elections, previous national elections were not impacted. Consequently, state/local election officials had possibly not closely examined absentee ballots nor reported consistently recurring or potential problems to FVAP. Yet, in the close 2000 election, these same election officials expressed frustration at seemingly conflicting laws and inconsistent guidance on how and what to count or reject.

Overall, the nation in general and military personnel specifically were surprised about the voting problems and concerned that many military/overseas absentee votes possibly never count. The name of one USS O’Kane sailor, an Escambia County homeowner and absentee voter, was included on a list of challenged ballots. Unaware of any prior voting problems, this sailor thought his ballot instructions were easy-to-follow. Bewildered over snafus about his and other military/absentee ballots, he felt disappointed that his ballot was not counted and hoped it would not be used in "some kind of political role..." Ultimately, Escambia County election officials reconsidered
some absentee ballots, accepting 160 and rejecting 112, with many military/overseas absentee voters unsure whether their vote eventually counted.96

Many military/overseas ballot challenges seemed partisan. Some Republicans objected to technicalities listed on a five-page memo synopsizing election law written for, but later disclaimed by, Democratic Party ballot-counting observers.97 Though Florida’s Attorney General requested that counties reconsider rejected military absentee ballots, pervasive partisan animosity still correlated military voters with the Republican Party accusing the Democratic Party of systematically seeking to discredit military absentee ballots.98 Military-affiliate support groups joined prominent Republicans in criticizing Democratic Party legal challenges, requesting that Florida election officials rescind military/overseas ballot rejections.99 Republican attorneys urged one U.S. District Judge to declare military absentee ballots valid even if they were undated, lacked postmarks, were postmarked in the U.S., or were not requested on time or at all.100 The Republican Party established a special advisory committee of retired admirals/generals, while the media quoted many of these four-stars as well as Congressional Medal of Honor winners, showcasing military leader support.101 Unfortunately, these events helped cement the image of military alignment with the Republican Party. This consequence could have been avoided if DoD had ensured mail handling and postal procedures met all state mandates and conducted focused campaigns to ensure servicepersons met state voting requirements.

IMPACT

Your voice, your choice: Vote/Make your mark: Vote102

The 2000 national election exposed multiple issues:

- military/overseas votes were largely rejected for various reasons, possibly disenfranchising many military servicepersons;
- state and federal voting legislation differs and sometimes conflicts;
- military members are sometimes perceived as tax evaders or fraudulent voters who claim residency in states with no state income taxes; and
- unlike other citizenry, military members seem to overwhelmingly identify themselves as Republican, possibly furthering civil/military alienation.
The closeness of the 2000 presidential election revealed that voting Americans are nearly evenly split among the two major parties, yet the military leans heavily toward the Republican Party. One Naval Reserve officer, who was also the military voting rights coordinator for the American Veterans and Defense Alliance, reported:

"The media and the Internet are crackling with anger about the Democrats’ concerted challenge to military voting rights in Florida. This is not the first time that the Democrats have sought to overturn an election result by disenfranchising the brave young men and women who are away from home and prepared to lay down their lives in defense of our country...our national government clearly has the authority and the responsibility to ensure that its military personnel are not disenfranchised by the circumstances of their service...Recent results in Florida and elsewhere reaffirm that military personnel are among the most reliable supporters of the Republican Party."  

This officer further purports [italics mine] "We simply cannot afford to allow ill-considered philosophical compunctions to stand in the way of enfranchising our party’s most reliable voters." Some claim the military vote delivered Florida and the presidency since Florida’s military/overseas ballots were last to be counted. Such conclusions stoke fears of military servicepersons being used as “pawns in a partisan battle” which Representative Neil Abercrombie suspects “risks politicizing the military in a manner antithetical to democracy.” During December in a seemingly unrelated matter, Senate Democrats were criticized for holding-up a bill to allow polling places on remote domestic military bases. While Democrats denied the accusations, Republicans continued to elicit angry anti-Democrat objections from servicepersons accusing the Democratic Party of seeking revenge against the military. It is in our country’s vital interest to overcome these military partisan paradigms. By refining the systems to meet state-mandated absentee voting requirements, DoD can at least avoid the media hype and negative political consequence associated with high-profile voting controversies.

RESPONSE(S): WHAT HAS BEEN DONE/SAID THUS FAR?

Leadership responses to military/overseas absentee voting problems vary. A Congressional investigation was solicited to explore military members not receiving requested ballots. A group of retired officers chastised the SECDEF for not taking up his troops’ cause. The SECDEF responded by directing an Inspector General (IG)
investigation to ensure DoD has a system that makes every vote count and to recommend changes that DoD should implement to secure military voting rights.\textsuperscript{112} The IG will analyze absentee voting processes to suggest feasible changes to improve efficiency, fairness, inclusiveness, and simplicity.\textsuperscript{113} Although the SECDEF may have procrastinated in initiating the IG investigation, many consider it a positive step in developing needed reforms.\textsuperscript{114} Similarly, the American Legion National Commander wanted Legionnaires to work with Congress and local/state legislators to introduce/enact appropriate legislation to avoid the “partisan politics we've seen in play this election with regard to military absentee ballots” so that “military absentee ballots are handled uniformly and accurately across the nation.”\textsuperscript{115} One presidential historian opined “We've got to have a uniform ballot. There should be the same ballot, the same machinery in every state...”\textsuperscript{116} Fortunately, FVAP has promoted pilot programs to improve absentee voting through increased fax services and potential internet procedures.\textsuperscript{117}

Democrats defended their ballot challenges saying that they were seeking only to enforce pre-existing rules, that local election boards made the final decisions, and that “you have to follow the rules to cast a valid vote...both sides have been challenging the validity...it's not aimed at military or overseas civilians...It's aimed at valid voting.”\textsuperscript{118} Meanwhile, the Deputy Director of the nonprofit Center for Defense Information thought that even though Republicans hyped the absentee ballot issue for their own benefit, the election fracas showed hypocrisy and cynicism on both sides, with Democratic insistence on strict adherence to absentee ballot rules mirroring Republican insistence on strict adherence to voter recount rules and deadlines.\textsuperscript{119} Immediate Congressional hearings were called to address military/overseas absentee voting and balloting processes to guide future legislation.\textsuperscript{120}

\textbf{WHAT NEXT?}

Every absentee voter is entitled to the same treatment...

\textit{——Representative Neil Abercrombie\textsuperscript{121}}

SECDEF/FVAP should:
- continue work on new initiatives;
- encourage states to share best practices that are no more restrictive than federal specifications;
resurvey local elections officials to better garner lessons learned;
initiate internal DoD changes to help servicepersons comply with state requirements;
conduct/publicize military/overseas voter training; and
discourage military vote-blocks.

Military-affiliate groups should:

- edify candidates and voters about relevant national security issues;
- emphasize the importance of private non-partisan issues-oriented voting;
- educate servicepersons concerning how to become informed about pertinent issues; and
- encourage military servicepersons to exercise their right to vote.

In the final analysis to ensure their votes count, servicepersons need education about voting mechanics and technicalities. As good citizens/voters, they also need to understand election issues, especially those that are important to national security, and exercise their rights to vote. DoD should ameliorate obstructions to military/overseas absentee voting by working with states/territories to simplify diverse legislation. Military-affiliate organizations can assist with legislative reforms and focus efforts at informing candidates and voters about critical national security issues. However, military voters must contemplate the entire plethora of election issues, from national security to non-defense domestic policies, when considering how to cast their votes. Otherwise public perceptions that the military will leverage partisan, or even nonaligned issues-oriented, vote-blocks may foster distrust in the military. Moreover, a military whose “fortunes” become tied to any political party necessarily portends increased military involvement in that party. This growing politicization of the military is anathema to both our military profession and constitutional processes. DoD should avoid appearances of interest-group partisan/nonpartisan vote-blocks to preserve military professionalism and credibility. Hopefully, with clear military voting rights solidified, we can live up to Senator Robert Kerry’s hope that “In the military, we accept responsibility for our mistakes. We don’t blame it on somebody else...Personally, I think the military should not be treated any differently than any other citizen.” In short, we need to un-block obstacles to military/overseas absentee voting and avoid special treatments or formations of military vote-blocks.

word count: 4930
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