



AUSTRALIANS
FOR HONEST ELECTIONS INC. (AFHE)
www.afhe.org.au

To the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters Inquiry into the 2016 federal election

7 October 2016

Dear Committee Secretary

We commend the Special Minister of State, Scott Ryan, and the Chairman of JSCEM, Senator Linda Reynolds, on calling this Inquiry with wide-ranging terms of reference.

BACKGROUND

The AFHE began in 2007 as a subset of the H.S.Chapman Society to focus, as its name implies, on honesty in elections, i.e. for the elimination of Vote Frauds under the rules as they are.

However, of course our members do also have substantial expertise in what the rules could or should be.

AFHE members have had wide experiences in the way that the electoral systems have operated, or should operate in order to improve our democracy.

AFHE is non-party-political, and most of the members of the Committee are not members of any political party.

Our interests are in the betterment of democracy in this country.

OVERVIEW OF THIS SUBMISSION

This Submission mainly focuses on the Integrity of the Electoral Roll with particular reference to the six excellent reports done by the Australian National Audit Office during the period 2002 to 2015.

These reports and our observations and evidence over the years lead to well-founded concerns that Electoral Rolls could contain thousands of false enrolments, sufficient to pervert the outcome of election results in marginal seats, and with possibly million-dollar effect on the electoral funding dispersed to those not entitled.

The most recent (4/11/15) report by the Australian National Audit Office raises severe concerns about the AEC and its mismanagement of the Electoral Roll.

This Submission also briefly raises concerns about GetUp!

Yours faithfully

Mr Lex Stewart, President, Australians for Honest Elections Inc.

stewart.lex@gmail.com | www.afhe.org.au

ITEM 1 - in regards to Terms of Reference 1.c) and 2

“regulation of” and “donations to” “entities undertaking campaign activities.”

GetUp! is certainly an entity undertaking campaign activities. In order to avoid our Submission being too long, we do not in this Submission detail our observations and concerns about GetUp!’s campaigning activities, which we regard as misconducts.

However in this Submission in keeping with our primary focus being the lack of integrity of the Electoral Roll, we do raise concerns below about the potential for GetUp! to engage in false enrolments onto the Electoral Roll. Here are some quotes from Dr Amy McGrath OAM’s book **“Wolves in Australia”** (see the few pages attached in Appendix 1) :

- Page 450:- *“Australia’s electoral system has been under attack since 2005 from the infamous Hungarian financier, George Soros ...”*
- Page 451:- *“In 2005 Soros founded GetUp in Australia ...”*
- Page 452:- *“Its foundation directors included Bill Shorten, national secretary of the Australian Workers’ Union ... the secretary of the Fabian Society, Evan Thornley ...*
- *... [GetUp’s] power, which encourages contempt for our organised system of representative parliamentary government, and harvests large sums of money ... without accountability ... is a dangerous abnegation of democracy ...”*
- Page 453:- *“Why should we entertain serious doubts about Planning Alerts? ... its key work force is GetUp!, whose electioneering knows no bounds of democratic practice ... candidates can use addresses of ... buildings undergoing change ... names can be added [to the Electoral Roll]”*
- Page 454:- *Planning Alerts is one of three organisations created by George Soros’ organisation, the Open Australia Foundation ... Its purpose was to build tools like Planning Alerts ... Its purpose was to list addresses of any applications to local councils for buildings being built, knocked down ...”*
- Page 455:- *“Planning Alerts is not as innocent as it sounds ... GetUp!’s building lists provide possibilities for false enrolments faster than in the past ... such stacking of a [Electoral] roll may be difficult to detect in that names roll-stacked are often taken off shortly after the election. One case, verified by the AEC, occurred after the 1987 federal election when ...”(for further details see appendix 1)*

ITEM 2 – in regards to Term of Reference 1

The matter that we raise related to the 2016 Federal election is the lack of **Integrity of the Electoral Roll**.

2.1 Background – the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO) has produced Audit Reports on the AEC dated:

- 1) 18 April 2002
- 2) 6 April 2004
- 3) 21 April 2010
- 4) 8 May 2014
- 5) 5 November 2014
- 6) 4 November 2015

It is important to define various terms in relation to the Electoral Roll, and the ANAO did this well in its report number 42 dated 18 April 2002 with title **“Integrity of the Electoral Roll”** (http://www.anao.gov.au/uploads/documents/2001-02_Audit_Report_42.pdf). This report defined ‘Integrity of the Roll’ as having four elements:-

- **Accuracy** – the Roll should contain correct information relating to individuals
- **Completeness** – it should include all individuals who are eligible to enrol
- **Validity** – it should include no-one ineligible to enrol, i.e. it excludes false enrolments
- **Security** – the Roll is protected from unauthorised access

2.2 An Overall Summary of all this work by the Audit Office.

The ANAO came to some alarming conclusions in its most recent report, dated 4 November 2015 (https://www.anao.gov.au/sites/g/files/net1661/f/ANAO_Report_2015-2016_06.pdf), which report seems to have been overlooked by Ministers, MPs, the media and by the JSCEM.

Page 7 of this 48-page Audit Report :- (words in **red** are emphasis added)

“Summary and recommendations

Audit approach

3. The objective of this audit was to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the AEC’s implementation of those recommendations relating to improving the accuracy and completeness of the electoral roll and other matters

Overall conclusion

5. The actions taken by the AEC prior to the 2013 election in response to previously-agreed ANAO recommendations **have not adequately and effectively addressed** the matters that led to recommendations being made. The findings of this audit are consistent with the findings of the first two follow-up audits and are **in contrast to the advice provided by the AEC** to the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters’ inquiry in 2014 that all recommendations in Audit Report No.28 2009–10 had been completed by May 2013. ”

COMMENTS BY Australians for Honest Elections (AFHE)

Normally, bureaucracies, such as the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO), write using euphemisms. However, the above **Overall conclusion** uses unusually harsh language. The first sentence states that the AEC has not taken heed to the ANAO’s recommendations, while the second sentence in effect states that the AEC told lies to the JSCEM.

As the years have progressed since 2002, the AEC and ANAO have somehow unfortunately focussed on the first two items (completeness and accuracy), and have thus almost totally ignore the third aspect, ‘validity’. For years, the AFHE has raised concerns about validity, because we have evidence that thousands of false enrolments have been put onto the Electoral Roll. Strangely, the AEC has refused to act when we have raised such concerns, and the JSCEM has similarly not taken an interest in the issue of validity of the Electoral Roll.

2.3 The first ANAO report, 18 April 2002

The objectives of this ANAO report were to examine the effectiveness of the AEC’s managing of the Rolls, and to provide an opinion on the integrity of the Roll.

As part of this work, the ANAO did cross-matching between the 12.6 million people on the Roll and the 18.4 million Medicare records.

AFHE considers that the results of this Audit were alarming in many aspects, of which we mention now only three, and we point out that there is little evidence that the deficiencies identified in years 2002 and 2004 have been corrected:-

Accuracy – The ANAO found *“the AEC does not set a target for accuracy”* [!]

ANAO checking *“indicated that over 96% of the entries on the Roll were accurate”*

Completeness – The ANAO found *“the Roll for the 2001 election was likely to be 95% complete”*

Validity – The ANAO found *“the AEC does not set performance targets”* [!] and that *“95.6% of the Roll matched Medicare [data] ... 1 % of matched records require further investigation for validation”*.

But AFHE states, *“But what about the 4.4% of UNmatched records?! That is where the ‘cemetery vote’ and false enrolments would be hiding! The ANAO did not assess how many enrolments had NO validity! And the AEC had no concern about that either! That was back in year 2002. AFHE considers, based on various pieces of evidence, that things have got worse, not better, on the Roll since then”*.

2.4 The followup report on 6 April 2004 to this alarming 2002 report was titled **“Integrity of the Electoral Roll, followup audit”**. It may be found at

https://www.anao.gov.au/sites/g/files/net616/f/anao_report_2003-2004_39.pdf

It reveals inadequate actions by the AEC to remedy deficiencies found in the 2002 report.

2.5 The 21 April 2010 report of the ANAO on the AEC

This 2010 report was primarily concerned about the AEC’s conduct of the 2007 election, and did not deal with the validity of the Electoral Roll. The fact that they did not look at validity, i.e. the issue of false enrolments, does not mean that false enrolments were not occurring – it is just that neither the AEC nor the ANAO looked at that aspect.

Here are extracts of the 2010 report:

Page 15 *“The most significant long-term issue for the AEC remains the state of the electoral Roll”*. (underlining emphasis added)

AFHE paraphrases this as:- ‘Despite our recommendations to AEC six and eight years ago in ANAO audits [2002 & 2004] the electoral Roll remains in a deficient state’.

Page 75 *“.. estimates were being developed [by AEC] in response to recommendations made in ANAO Report of 2001-02 ... that the AEC develop measures ... the integrity of the electoral rolls.”*

Page 78 *“At this time the AEC was in the process of responding to Audit Report 2003-04, and aimed to ... However costs ... had risen by 9% annually and ... success rates .. declined”*

AFHE makes comments:- 8 years later, the AEC’s response to the recommendations of 2002 were still BEING developed! (i.e. not done yet!) And 6 years later, the AEC was IN THE PROCESS OF responding to the 2004 report, but with declining success!

Page 82 *“The AEC’s review of its CRU program identified the need to ... do better ... However the AEC has not yet undertaken the program of ... analysis that would be necessary to ...[figure it out]”*.

AFHE explains:- The AEC did its last ‘Habitation Reviews’ in 1998 (at a cost of \$13.85million, per 3 years) and it alleged circa 1999 that CRU (costing \$14.7million each year, page 78) would be better. But here in 2010 the AEC does not even know if CRU is better or not, but the AEC does know that it does cost more!

CRU is an abbreviation for “Continuous Roll Update”, a process done by AEC officials sitting in airconditioned offices in Canberra doing comparisons of electronic databases (e.g. driving licences, births/deaths/marriages, school enrolments/exam results etc), but avoiding any practical external fieldwork to check the realities.

AFHE points out that CRU may well be good at including persons onto the Electoral Roll, but cannot address the issue of ‘validity’, excluding deliberately false enrolments stacked onto the Roll by using the provisions of section 98AA(2)(c) of the Commonwealth Electoral Act. This third option for identity appears in section 6 “Evidence of your Identity” of the AEC Form “**Enrol to Vote or Update your Details**” and is wide open to rorting, because once you have one false or dead person on the Roll, then unscrupulous persons can do false enrolments by forging that signature, and the AEC does not enquire into signatures, in fact has no capacity to verify the signatures anyway – this Form is shown in Appendix 2.

AFHE notes that the ANAO did express uneasiness about the CRU process being unreliable by recommendation number 3 that the “AEC ... *expand and enhance ... undertaking habitation visits as part of its Roll management activities, so as to obtain more reliable enrolment ...*” (underlining emphasis added)

To the knowledge of AFHE the AEC has done only a few habitation visits using what it terms “SAF” Sample Audit Fieldwork, and these are described in item 2.8 below.

2.6 The 8 May 2014 report of the ANAO was primarily concerned about Storage and Transport of Completed Ballot Papers at the September 2013 election. The report is at http://www.anao.gov.au/~media/Files/Audit%20Reports/2013%202014/Audit%20Report%2031/AuditReport_2013-2014_31.PDF

AFHE makes comments:-

- This 8/5/14 report presents a damning overall picture of AEC’s ‘slow’ ‘inadequate’ responses to ANAO recommendations, and in effect regarding the missing WA Senate ballot papers it says, ‘*we told you so, but you wouldn’t listen*’. The AFHE alleges that ballot papers have been going missing for years. For example, you may refer to our previous Submissions to JSCEM e.g. in regards to our doorknocking in the Parramatta electorate in 2004, and the Statutory Declarations proving that ballot papers vanished from Epping West polling booth in the 2007 election. Our website www.afhe.org.au describes ‘irregularities’ as far back as 1987. AFHE alleges that the 1370 missing in the WA Senate election were but the tip of a very large iceberg that has been going on for years.
- It is a pity that the ANAO offers no comment in its 2014 report whether the AEC did or did not expand habitation visits to obtain a more reliable Electoral Roll as was suggested by the ANAO in 2010. But the ANAO does raise substantial concerns about the state of the Electoral Roll, because page 11 of the 2014 report stated that: “*the state of the Roll was the most significant long-term issue ... and that the AEC’s approaches [re the Roll] ... had become less effective, as well as ... more costly*”. [!] (underlining emphasis added)
- AFHE’s information is that the Electoral Roll is in crisis in several ways, including that it could contain around 200,000 false enrolments, which would enable vote frauds to occur to swing a number of marginal seats, as well as procuring electoral funding to which those doing the false enrolments are not entitled.

2.7 The ANAO’s report of 5 November 2014 had as its objective “*to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the AEC’s implementation of those recommendations made in Report No. 28 2009-10 relating to ... workforce planning ... accessibility of polling booths ... and the transport and storage of completed ballot papers*”.

Issues of the validity of the Electoral Roll were unfortunately not addressed.

2.8 The ANAO's report of 4 November 2015 is addressed briefly in item 2.2 above.

Some further comments are necessary:-

In response to the ANAO's recommendation in year 2010, the AEC has done only a few habitation visits using what it terms "SAF" Sample Audit Fieldwork.

The ANAO expresses many severe concerns about the lack of reliability of the SAF work done by the AEC, and we can here quote only a few:

Page 37, section 3.19: *"In the advice provided to the AEC, the ABS identified that an increase in the reliability of the results ... would require the AEC to visit at least one million more electors than were visited in 2007 (83,176 electors were visited by the AEC in 2007. ... the AEC decided not to expand the sample due to the additional costs."*

In section 3.21 the ANAO concludes: *"The funding currently allocated to SAF (\$347,445 was spent in 2015) is not at a level that supports a sample size large enough to obtain reliable assurance that the Electoral Roll is accurate and complete, SAF's fundamental purpose" !!*

In section 3.22: *"the ABS advice provided to the AEC was premised on a 100 per cent response rate. Of the 60,569 addresses sampled in the 2013 SAF, residents at 12,690 addresses (18 per cent) could not be contacted or refused to provide information, resulting in an 82 per cent response rate"*.

In section 3.24: *"Other characteristics of the sample in 2015: the majority of electors sampled were in Vic, NT, WA and ACT which is inconsistent with the four States that have the lowest enrolment rates (NT, WA, QLD and NSW); fewer electors were sampled in NSW compared to the ACT, even though NSW has the largest number of electors, and the second highest rate of divergent records in 2015"*

2.9 Conclusions drawn by AFHE from all these ANAO Audit Reports

- The AEC has 'stonewalled' the efforts of the ANAO in its reports for years, and as a consequence the Integrity of the Electoral Roll is severely lacking.
- The AEC less than half-heartedly did "sample audit fieldwork". Whereas the ABS recommended a sample size of a million, the AEC in the 2013 SAF sampled only 60,569! And they did the sampling in the wrong States, and were biased because they avoided problematic electorates! The AEC did not seriously attempt to address the deficiencies identified by the ANAO, and the SAF was a meaningless farce.
- The result is that we now have an Electoral Roll in a crisis state - the AEC presides over an Electoral Roll riddled with an estimated 200,000 false enrolments that could allow massive vote frauds to pervert the result of the next election.

ITEM 3 – in regards to Term of Reference 1

The matter that we now raise related to the 2016 Federal election is the lack of capability of review of the Electoral Roll, granted that AFHE has identified many hundreds of false enrolments over many years and the admission by AEC Commissioner Tom Rogers in his testimony before the JSCEM in November 2014 of what can only be described as huge divergences and anomalies between Commonwealth Electoral Rolls and those of the States.

There is inherent unfairness in that the High Court, in the event of an appeal to it as the Court of Disputed Returns, is, despite what seem to be wide powers in section 360 of the

Commonwealth Electoral Act, effectively excluded from inquiring into the Electoral Roll due to a severe deficiency in section 361 of the Act, which states (underlining emphasis added) :-

“COMMONWEALTH ELECTORAL ACT 1918 - SECT 361

Inquiries by Court

(1) The Court shall inquire whether or not the petition is duly signed, and so far as Rolls and voting are concerned may inquire into the identity of persons, and whether their votes were improperly admitted or rejected, assuming the Roll to be correct, but the Court shall not inquire into the correctness of any Roll.”

If the highest Court in the land cannot inquire into the correctness of the Electoral Roll, then who can?

The answer is nobody! - - This is crazy, undemocratic and unfair.

In the rush of enrolments before an election, the AEC does not adequately check the applications to be included onto the Electoral Roll. AFHE has received that advice from several retired DROs (Divisional Returning Officers).

There is opportunity for thousands of false enrolments at real addresses to be included on the Electoral Roll, and having been included, then the election occurs, and these false names can vote and put ballot papers in ballot boxes. Then afterwards, even if a candidate finds out reliable information about the falsity of enrolments (as for example Alasdair Webster did in his case before the Court in 1993) then that issue cannot, by law by the action of section 361, be raised as a concern in an appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns.

This is a loophole rort that must be addressed if we are to have confidence in the integrity and reliability of the Electoral Roll.

Yours faithfully

Mr Lex Stewart, President, Australians for Honest Elections Inc.

stewart.lex@gmail.com

www.afhe.org.au

Appendix 1 – comprises scans of pages 450 to 455 of the book “Wolves in Australia”, published by Towerhouse Publications, 2013.

This book is available from its author Dr Amy McGrath OAM or from Lex Stewart for free in pdf format.

Helsinki, Vienna, and since 1977 Geneva to pay for continuous far-flung travel by WPC officials to publish and distribute around the world monthly periodicals in English, French, German and Spanish; to finance international assemblies, for which hundreds or thousands of delegates are provided with free transportation, and lodging. Yet the WPC has no visible means of support. Virtually all its income comes clandestinely from the Soviet Bloc.

OPEN SOCIETY FOUNDATIONS

Australia's electoral system has been under attack since 2005 from the infamous Hungarian financier, George Soros, through the medium of his Open Society Foundations. They are the international network of his flagship, the **Open Society Institutes** based in New York with branches in Baltimore, Brussels, Budapest, London, Paris and Washington DC. They are active as **Open Society Foundations** in more than 70 countries around the world claiming to build vibrant democracies founded on the principle of creating an 'open society' in each of which is **"a government accountable to their citizens."**

The presumption, that can be read into this definition, is an inherent attack on democracy that a particular government has not been accountable to its citizens and will become more democratic with the activity of an Open Society Foundation in its midst. One of them has existed in Australia for some time and has proved the opposite: that it is a dangerous threat to our democracy.

What defines an 'open society'? It is a doctrine of the philosopher Karl Popper, in his 1945 book *Open Society and its Enemies*. It was embraced by George Soros while Popper's student and subsequently a devoted friend until his death in 1994. He argued that progress occurred by random chaos rather than human intention in logical evolution.

As it proved George Soros, acting through his Open Society Foundations, deliberately caused chaos everywhere rather than wait upon chaos to open up the path for his actions. In the case of the U.S.A., Soros created 70 different organisations as his army to destroy its capitalist democracy beyond repair in favour of one world government (*Discoverynetworks.org*).

450

of which is 'This will be the final and decisive battle. With the Internationale, **mankind will get up.**'

GetUp! was launched, by two Australian Harvard graduates from its US patron *Move On*, created by Soros for Clinton's election on August 1, 2005 with \$112 million capital as a 'non-partisan' group to let people, disaffected with the parliamentary system, have a say. They expected to "energize the world's grass roots" to create the largest political organisation in Australia.

Its 'foundation directors' included Bill Shorten, national secretary of the Australian Workers Union, Amanda Tattersall research director for Unions NSW, Cate Faehrmann, Director of NSW Nature Conservation Council, and the secretary of the Fabian Society, Evan Thornley (a University friend of Julia Gillard). John Hewson, a member of the Trilateral Commission, was also briefly a member. They expected funds from unions, corporations and small donations from members recruited through internet advertising and discussion groups.

From the outset, *GetUp!* had no policy of recruiting members in any formal structure, merely adding their names to its total 'membership' if they ticked a box 'yes' on a single issue reminiscent of Ripley's famous *Believe it or Not*. They also did so by massive policy advertising (financed from where?) single issue-based campaigns like 'save the forests' during elections. In its first federal campaign in 2007 many of its 'members' marched, door knocked, campaigned in shopping centres, and manned polling booths in marginal seats wearing purple T-shirts.

Such 'people power, which encourages contempt for our organised system of representative parliamentary government, and harvests large sums of money from unions and private donors without accountability to campaign against it, is a dangerous abnegation of democracy which will take time to unravel. Even more so when Obama Camp came to Australia in its reincarnation as Camp *GetUp!* for training persuasive campaigners in powerful strategies and skills.

The contempt by *GetUp!* for any legality in its electioneering in 2007 raises the question whether it was responsible for the application by two 18 year olds to the High Court to enrol them on the electoral roll, although it was legally closed (one had had no original intention) and

452

Examples of these are:

- (1) "to disparage capitalism while promoting a dramatic expansion of social welfare programs funded by ever-escalating taxes
- (2) to advance leftist agendas by infiltrating churches and religious congregations and think tanks that promote leftist policies eg. health care, energy policy, environmentalism and global governance (4 orgs eg *Alliance* which is also already operative in Australia)
- (3) to favour global government which would bring America's foreign policy under the control of the United Nations or other international government (2 orgs)
- (4) pressure mortgage lenders to make loans to undercapitalised borrowers, a practice that helped spark the sub-prime mortgage crisis and housing market collapse of 2008 (2 orgs).

The career of George Soros, as a revolutionary magnate, began when he first broke the Bank of England in 1992, then moved on to wreck conservative regimes in eastern Europe, Central Asia, Malaysia and Thailand where he was denounced as a Dracula. At home in America he funds the promotion of agitation as a valid weapon.

The curiously named Albert Einstein Institute recommends 200 methods, some of which barely fall short of violence (3 Australians are listed as supporters). An Australian ex-hippie in Vancouver dreamed up the *Occupy Wall Street* movement. Via his journal *Adbuster*, *Newsweek* writer, John Aldridge, declares that the internet site, WND "has repeatedly documented the billionaire's many ties to it, including how the staffing of its reported nerve centre by professional agitators are linked to organisations such as Ruckus, funded by George Soros.

As to US 2004 elections, Soros spent millions to secure the passage of legislation through the US Congress to limit the amount of campaign funds raised by candidates, while exempting any 'charities' from such limitation to raising campaign funds. When he succeeded he invested vast sums of money to create a powerful 'shadow democratic party' of instant 'charities' to elect Clinton as President.

In 2005 Soros founded *GetUp!* in Australia to create 'progressive democracy', declaring 'GetUp! while the music is still playing.' And what was that music? The Communist Internationale, the chorus

451

they were already **subject** to a fine for failing to do. The decision of 3 judges in their favour led to the enrolment of a further 100,000 18 year olds and arguably the election of the Labor Coalition **Gillard** government. Who would have paid the costs of those two applicants if their case had failed? Soros?

Given the intensity of far-left *GetUp!* campaigning in 3 past elections, what should we expect in a late 2013 election? Obviously a new bag of tricks from Soros: no less than an arm of his central OpenAustralia Foundation called *PlanningAlerts*, copied from the UK *mySociety* and USA's *Sunlight Foundation* by the two people who saw its operations in the UK - Matthew Landauer and Katherine Szumanska and latterly Henri Dega - that do 90-95% of the work. An early prototype of *PlanningAlerts* was funded by the gov 2 project.

The Taskforce government 2.0 fund for *PlanningAlerts* appears to have been granted initially to the OpenAustralia Foundation, which was registered as a charitable organisation at an obscure address in 232 Bathurst Road, Katoomba, which now runs a website *OpenAustralia.org*.

What does *PlanningAlerts* do? It defines itself as "an open data, open government civic hacking charity" which describes itself as "facilitated by OpenAustralia, hosted/sponsored by Google attended by the technical community and growing a volunteer community of people creating tools and 'mashups' of information from government and public bodies to the public good. It is licensed as Creative Commons attribution share."

Why should we entertain serious doubts about *PlanningAlerts*? For several reasons.

- Its host, OpenAustralia Foundation, is registered as a charity. *PlanningAlerts* is not.
- Its key work force is *GetUp!* whose electioneering knows no bounds of democratic practice.
- Its founder, Matthew Lauder, like the two founders of *GetUp!*, comes from Harvard and was inspired by an e-democracy event web 2.0 in the UK to start a taskforce 2.0 in Australia
- It has boasted it has collected 5 million sites.

453

- Finally candidates can use addresses of housing and public buildings undergoing change or their owners are moving out or selling, or where 2 names can be added in 4 bedroom homes.

Do examples exist? Many. For example we received an extra two application forms for postal votes in invented names.

ALERT ABOUT 'PLANNING ALERTS'

Beware Anarcho-Communist organisations.

By Dr. Amy McGrath OAM

Planning Alerts is one of three organisations created by a George Soros organisation, the **Open Australia Foundation**, in recent years. It proclaims it is 'non-partisan and non-political.' This is dubious given the record of his organisations world-wide. Its application, for federal funding from Gov. Taskforce 2.0, was approved only the day before PM Gillard called an election in July 2010.

Taskforce 2.0 was a world-wide project according to its boast on the website *Shareable: the World Top Ten Gov.2 Initiatives*. It says: "**The Taskforce Gov. 2.0 movement** continues to gain momentum around the world with a number of inspiring people, projects and ideas rising to prominence the last year or so. The Australian Government has been a leader in the development of an **open government policy framework** through initiatives like the **Government 2.0 Taskforce** and the **Declaration of Open Government**." The latter is "**e-democracy**."

The **Open Australia Foundation** defined itself as **Australia's open data, open government and civic hacking charity** to transform democracy in Australia. Its purpose was to build tools like **PlanningAlerts** to simplify the discovery and use of public data and to share them for free. A federal grant to found **PlaningAlerts and Election Leaflets** was authorised just a day before PM Gillard called an election in July 2010.

This grant for **PlanningAlerts** was paid to a new organisation called **OpenAustralia.org.au** registered as a charity at an obscure private house, 232 Bathurst St. Katoomba. Its purpose was to list addresses of any applications to local councils for buildings being built, knocked

down, or changing hands so any residents could protest if they wished. Its activity began through **GetUp!**, founded in 2005 with \$1.5 million seed capital from George Soros to the Fabian Society, union leaders and 'green organisations' in Melbourne.

OpenAustralia.org.au recruits **GetUp!**'s computer-nerds to build **PlannerAlerts** from ongoing council records onto **Australia-wide Google Maps** with marker tabs. Its founders, Matthew Landauer and Katherin Szuminska, manage this project from Katoomba. After a lull in activities 2011-2012 they recruited 12 volunteers to a **little OpenAustralia.Hackfest** in **Google premises** in Sydney. They were using an online tool called **ScraperWiki** to identify new planning authorities quickly and write **Scrapers** for 19 planning authorities including **Hobart and Townsville City Councils** and others in two states not covered previously – WA and Tasmania.

All very innocent you might say, unless you had been following **GetUp!**. Its founders had founded MoveOn in 2004 then GetUp! then the world-wide Avaaz. **PlanningAlerts** is not as innocent as it sounds, you might say as I, an expert on the ways and means of electoral fraud might have done except for fact that the OpenAustralia.org.au recently boasted that "an **additional 1,823,124 Australians** can now find out what is happening in their local community using **PlanningAlerts** faster than before " **GetUp!**'s building lists provide possibilities for false enrolments faster than in the past through those Google Maps.

Editors Note: Google maps have other possibilities – clear close-ups of 2 story residences like ours. Where only two residents are identified on the rolls, other names can be added as in our case. Two postal vote application forms in false names arrived at our house in the past year – one for the last federal election and one for the state election.

Such stacking of a roll may be difficult in that names roll-stacked are often taken off shortly after the election. One case, verified by the Australian Electoral Commission occurred after the 1987 federal election when 100,000 names were taken off the roll – 60,000 in NSW and 40,000 in Victoria.

454

455

**

Appendix 2 comprises the AEC's Form that people can use to get both real or false enrolments included onto the Electoral Roll

