

Do Electronic Voting Machines Improve the Voting process?

Improvement indeed! Electronic voting machines have been improving the voting process for many years. Today, proponents have a better argument in favor of the improvement of the Electronic voting machines. Without a doubt, proponents have a better argument than their opponents because they uphold that electronic voting machines can not be modified during an election; they provide accessible voting ~~for by people person~~ with disabilities, and they increase efficiency.

Firstly, Proponents argue that electronic voting machines can not be modified during an election. For example, they claim that "To this day, no evidence exists that any electronic voting machines used in an election in the United States has been tampered with or even that any attempt has been made to perform such tampering".(pro 1) This suggests that electronic voting machines are resistant ~~from to~~ tampering and modifying during an election.

Secondly, proponents argue that electronic voting machines provide accessible voting ~~to by person people~~ with disabilities. They claim that " all voters, including the physical disabilities, vote using the same system, and also use a wheel to highlight choices, and a button to mark those choices on the electronic ballot". (pro 3) This suggests that electronic voting machines are more conveniently accessible for people with disabilities.

On the contrary, opponents believe that electronic voting machines ~~are should-not be~~ reliable. They argue that "shouldn't it be in both parties' interest to assure the truth of the electorate in this process- especially what happened in 2004".(con 7) However, proponents have a better argument. They affirm that "numerous pieces of evidence suggest that electronic voting machines outperformed all other methods used in november 2004 election".(pro 7) This implies that electronic voting machines would improve the process of voting and increase efficiency.

In conclusion, the proponents for electronic voting machines have a better argument than the opponents because they support their argument more effectively. The proponents use evidence that disproves the opponents' claims. They show the benefits of voting machines by arguing that electronic voting machines can not be modified during the election ~~since they are by making them~~ resistant ~~to from~~ tampering and modifying. They also provide accessible voting ~~to people by person~~ with disabilities, ~~by making it more convenient for them~~ ~~convenient them~~ ~~by accessible for people with disabilities~~. Additionally, they will also improve the voting process and increase efficiency. As such, it is clear that the proponents' argument about electronic voting machines is much stronger; therefore, electronic voting machines ~~do~~ improve the voting process.

Commented [1]: This textual evidence is not very supportive to your claim. Try looking for another piece of textual evidence.

Commented [2]: Find a synonym for these word e.g. altering.

Commented [3]: Find a synonym for this word e.g. efficacy. Remember, in your conclusion, you are restating your thesis, which means that your main ideas have to be stated differently than how you stated them in your introduction.