

AUSTRALIA SENATE APPROVED
– MARTIN BRYANT VICTIM no.36 –
PORT ARTHUR KILLING CONTINUES

FREE!
INNOCENT
MARTIN BRYANT

NO LAWYER ■ NO TRIAL ■ NO PAROLE
NOW BEING KILLED OFFICIALLY
TASMANIA ■ AUSTRALIA

■ **THIS BOOK*** is an indelible file of findings from over 20 authors who have questioned, researched, and documented the 1996 official-terror massacre (35 killed, 23 wounded) at Port Arthur in Tasmania, Australia.

■ **THIS BOOK** is permanently accessible with free pdf copies available via the internet – but given the State does not want you to know the facts of its official terror, police records are sealed for 75 years (1996 to 2071).

■ **THIS BOOK** details the mindless blind hatred and death designs that officials and complicit media continue to incite toward Martin Bryant – the State has failed to address and stop this incitement for over two decades.

■ **THIS BOOK** records the corrupt Tasmanian legal system failed its duties – it falsely convicted then wrongly jailed a mentally-handicapped (66 IQ) *boy-man* who was denied his prescribed guardian and an ethical lawyer.

■ **THIS BOOK** reveals embalmer Stephen Parry (now with Administrative Appeals Tribunal) took part in the official-terror incident. Chilling facts about him were sent (2016) to the Senate but none of the 76 members replied – it was/is concluded that, the Senate of Australia condoned/s the killing.

In her letter (26JAN2019) addressed to the Tasmania attorney-general, Dr. Christine Klugman OAM, Civil Liberties Australia president, qualifies major legal failings in Tasmania: "The Sue Neill-Fraser case is taking on the dimension of the Lindy Chamberlain case nationally. But Chamberlain was in jail three years only: Neill-Fraser is in her 10th year already. Like Chamberlain, only a public inquiry will finally resolve all issues."

What about INNOCENT Martin Bryant wrongly incarcerated for 23 years? (since 1996) His persistent plea of NOT guilty was illegally rejected. He had NO trial, there was NO thorough coronial inquest, there was NO thorough public inquiry, etc. Mentally-handicapped Martin Bryant must be freed immediately on humane, legal, medical, and moral grounds from Risdon Prison where he is because of wilfully false decisions made by his official killers – Avery, Bugg, Cox. The State must reveal the truth about this official-terror incident in Tasmania. Everyone in the nation – especially families, relatives, and friends of all 58 victims officially shot by some highly skilled shooter(s), NOT Martin Bryant as *Ted Serong* a late brigadier of the Australian Defence Force declared publicly – has a right to the truth, NOT more State lies. ■

KEITH ALLAN NOBLE

***OFFICIAL TERROR in TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA; 2019; 768pp**
INCLUDES UPDATED MASS MURDER 2ND EDITION; 2014
internet booksellers; free pdfs bigwormbooks@gmx.net

RE: SOUTHERN JUSTICE (2019) COLIN McLAREN
BE PREPARED TO BE SHOCKED!
THE GUILTY ARE STILL OUT THERE!
AND: OFFICIAL TERROR IN TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

TASMANIAN DEVILS

ON THE PRECEDING PAGE, a number of evil facts related to the Port Arthur case are mentioned. Specifically, these facts are: **i** The sealing of police records for 75 years with access being controlled (read denied) by the commissioner of police in Tasmania (currently Darren Hine), and, **ii**. The wrongful gaoling in Tasmania of Sue Neill Fraser. The following words appear on a website in which similar facts are raised by Andrew L. Urban; see, Sue Neill-Fraser Appeal To Go Ahead, Amidst Tough Questions; wrongfulconvictionsreport.org; 21 March 2019:

The 'original sin', the factor that justifies the claim that this was an obviously unsafe conviction, was police first ignoring then fumbling the powerful evidence of a large, strong DNA sample at the crime scene – which did not match Sue Neill-Fraser's DNA. This failure set off a chain reaction that embroiled the DPP (both Tim Ellis SC and successor Darryl Coates SC) when it came to court, where over the past eight years it was downplayed, dismissed and denigrated at every step from trial to appeal, to High Court, to this most recent seeking leave to appeal. The system sought to protect the conviction, in favour of seeking the truth.... The absence of any sense of urgency by the legal establishment has been unconscionable. A convicted person, in this case Neill-Fraser, is deprived of liberty and restricted in her ability to agitate the system for a review, both by those restrictions and by the legal framework. If there is an obviously unsafe conviction, the proper response is to fast-track the process to a judicial review, not hinder it as has been the case. In no other area of potential human suffering would this absence of compassion be tolerated – not in failures in medicine, not in safety or security. Reform is urgently needed.

In response, reader MM posted the following comment (22 March 2019; 09:21):

Too right the police and government officials lie AND cover their tracks! I have just finished researching and writing a report on the board of inquiry into the horrific abuses to mental health patients* at Tasmania's Lachlan Park and Millbrook Rise Hospitals, which later merged into the Royal Derwent Hospital and Willow Court facility. Tasmania has a rampant culture of coverup that, even after numerous PUBLIC inquiries, still persists today. The 2003 Ombudsman Inquiry into the 'Tasmanian Review of Claims of Abuse from Adults in State Care as Children' involved as many as 2500 cases which have still not been made public. Even the Royal Commission into child sexual abuse has only fingered church abuse – the government institutions involved have been kept secret. We keep paying for public inquiries and get NOTHING! We have no idea whether they are behaving constitutionally or not and THAT's the way they like it. They've stunk of corruption for at least 50+ years! You're an uneducated fool if you believe a word the Tasmanian authorities say. They're not the least bit interested in protecting anyone but themselves! (original capitals)
* read Kevin Moylan's book ONE FLEW OVER THE KOOKABURRA'S NEST (2016)

Tasmania is toxic – bedevilled by official corruption, incompetence, and secrecy. ■

OFFICIAL COVER-UP PROOF
PUBLIC DENIED POLICE RECORDS FOR 75 YEARS!
POLICE COMMISSIONER SOLE ACCESS ARBITER!
OFFICIAL MASSACRE PORT ARTHUR 1996

REQUEST DENIED
HINE DID NOT REPLY TO THREE QUERIES

17FEB2019

Darren HINE
Tasmania Police
Hobart TAS 7000
AUSTRALIA



Commissioner HINE,

Thank you for your attention to the following non-copyrighted letter.

An archivist in Tasmania (Nicki.Ottavi@education.tas.gov.au) presented an egregious paper at the national conference of the Australian Society of Archivists conducted in Perth, Western Australia, on 25-28SEP2018. Details related to Ottavi's presentation plus an image of her appear on p.xviii of the book OFFICIAL TERROR.... (768pp). [amended 05MAR2019]

What follows are some of Ottavi's words from an electronic youtube transcript. No copies of her paper were made available to the public by Ottavi, or by the Australian Society of Archivists, or by Tasmania Police. WHY?:

I...registered it into our system it became known as transfer to nine zero zero....; ...Tasmania Police records of the Port Arthur massacre will be open to the public in 2071....; ...they are an e75 access restriction which means they're closed for 75 years and the e means that only one person or position can grant access in this case only the Commissioner of Police.

Given Tasmania Police is a public agency funded 100 percent by taxpayers to serve not deny the public, Ottavi's words are shocking. They have **generated more concern in Australia re the official terror at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania (28-29APR1996)**, a massacre in which international and national victims were killed (35) and wounded (23).

Thus in relation to the boldface italicized words of Ottavi as appear above, you are herewith requested to address the three queries following:

- 1.** Are Ottavi's words an accurate description of the official policy re the availability of Port Arthur massacre records held by Tasmania Police?;
- 2.** Under what legislation are the Port Arthur massacre records held by Tasmania Police being secreted away from the public for 75 years?;
- 3.** Under what legislation has the police commissioner been appointed sole arbiter of access re Port Arthur massacre records now held by Tasmania Police and now secreted away from the public for 75 years?

ADDRESSEE DARREN HINE; TASMANIA POLICE; 17FEB2019

A copy of this letter appears in OFFICIAL TERROR.... [amended 05MAR2019]
Space for your replies to the three queries will be reserved in said book until 28FEB2019. If you do not reply, then your unacceptable failing will be highlighted in said book, and elsewhere **in and out of Australia**.

Also note that if you fail to reply, it is understandable people will conclude **there is no legislation in Tasmania that permits the withholding of public documents and/or permits a public servant (you) to be sole arbiter of access to public documents**. If such legislation exists, it identifies Tasmania as a police state (*a government that exercises power arbitrarily through the power of the police force* – wikipedia).

And finally, some points of concern for you – and our other readers:

- a)** You are a senior member of Australia & New Zealand SEBP (Society of Evidence Based Policing Inc.) On one hand it seems you value "Evidence Based Policing." But on the other you are willing to ignore **exculpatory evidence confirming Martin Bryant is INNOCENT** – this *boy-man* (66 IQ) is the patsy. Not only ignore it, but as a gate-keeper you are now participating in the **withholding of exculpatory evidence from the public for 75 years**. Surely you understand the immorality of Bryant being denied an ethical lawyer, of him having his persistent **NOT guilty** plea rejected, of him being falsely convicted with **NO trial**, of him being incarcerated in Risdon Prison **since 1996**, etc.
- b)** Let us not forget James Boyce's LOSING STREAK: How Tasmania Was Gamed by the Gaming Industry. That officials covered up crimes is revealed in his 2017 book: "...at some point the file was accidentally misplaced or **deliberately destroyed**, and it cannot be located." Corrupt officials do this with files containing truths dangerous to them. Dr. Boyce goes on: "The current police commissioner [you] has refused to give permission for the release of further *supplementary* material." So it seems you have withheld evidence in this gambling case. If true, the long-deceived people of Australia, **especially families, relatives, and friends of all 58 victims officially shot at Port Arthur**, can expect nothing from you re the records secreted by Tasmania Police.

Sincerely,

Dr. **Keith Allan NOBLE**; author
Unit 72 B, Am Heumarkt 7
1030 Vienna, AUSTRIA
murder.research@gmail.com
t. 43-1-9712401 ■

HINE's office confirmed receipt of this request letter. But then Hine did NOT reply. His refusal to qualify significant facts related to the secreting of police records, all paid for by taxpayers, confirms the April 1996 terror in Tasmania was officially planned and perpetrated. ■

AUSTRALIA SENATE APPROVED
- PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE -
35 KILLED ■ 23 WOUNDED

- 2ND EDITION -

OFFICIAL TERROR

- IN -

TASMANIA ■ AUSTRALIA

KEITH ALLAN NOBLE

- IN MEMORIAM -

WENDY ESME SCURR †2018
nurse, tour guide, ambulance officer
FIRST RESPONDER
Port Arthur Historic Site Massacre
Tasmania ■ Australia
28 APRIL 1996

»A hell of a cover-up.«

- RIP -



**BIG
WORM
BOOKS**

2020

– **EUREKA STOCKADE SERIES** –

■ **OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia**
(includes MASS MURDER)
2020, 2019; 768pp.

■ **THE WORST OF BRITISH JUSTICE**
Readings Related to Injustice in Australia c.1825-2015
2015; 796pp.

■ **MASS MURDER (no longer available)**
Official Killing in Tasmania, Australia
2014, 2013; 720pp.

■ **FIND! FALCONIO – Dead of Alive**
Concealing Crimes in Northern Territory, Australia
2012, 2011; 504pp.

■ **CORRUPT TO THE C·O·R·E**
Concealing Crimes in Queensland, Australia
2009; 626pp.

**A shorter version of this book having the title
MASS MURDER was published in 2013 & 2014.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia Documents research findings, and reflections on those findings, related to the officially alleged killing of 35 and wounding of 23 at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, Australia, in April 1996. Truth and Justice were foundational philosophies and they are also the desired outcomes of this book. Question everything official – do not doubt your common sense, experiences, and knowledge. Published by – ENGLISH PRESS INTERNATIONAL (EPIUS@t-online.de), Eureka Stockade Series imprint – BIG WORM BOOKS (BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net); ISBN 978-3-9503136-6-6; images 100, inserts 182, maps 4, notes 1031, pages 768; except where indicated, all notes are by the editor (KAN) and may not necessarily be beliefs of the authors; ANSI archival acid-free paper; efforts were made to ensure citation accuracy, but users should confirm words quoted herein with original sources; official reactions – including names of people and their associations – will subsequently be exposed on the internet.

NO COPYRIGHT To enlighten any person/group about official corruption, cover-ups, incompetence, *etc.* all or any part of this book can be translated, reproduced, and/or transmitted by electronic, mechanical, photographic, *etc.*, means without prior approval. With all reproductions and transmissions please acknowledge the following; editor (Keith Allan Noble – MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com); publisher (BIG WORM BOOKS, BIGWORMBOOKS@gmail.com); and, year (2019).

COVERS Selected phrases used on the front and back covers are attributable to: Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche (1844-1900) – **All truths kept silent become poisonous**; and, Joseph Raz (1939-) – **There can be no justice without truth.**

EUREKA STOCKADE SERIES Describes the increasing number of articles, blogs, books, websites. *etc.* revealing the corruption and incompetence of officials in Australia. The Eureka Stockade Rebellion* (1854; Ballarat VIC) was the first in that nation. Today, more and more Australians are standing up and resisting. (* Later, juries stood up to the oppressive State by repeatedly declaring that the miners who had been charged were not guilty of any offences. Juries nullified points of law – it was their legal right then, and it is still your legal right today. Read about jury equity/nullification, do not accept what self-serving judges say.)

KEITH ALLAN NOBLE From Australia, he studied (BSc MEd PhD) at universities in Canada. A Socratic equalitarian, he has written 20 books (English, German; available through abebooks, amazon, bookfinder, vialibri, *etc.*). He writes in Europe and his most recent work is *OMEGA Human Killing* (2018; 514pp). ■

OFFICIAL TERROR
 - in -
TASMANIA ■ AUSTRALIA
FREE!
 INNOCENT MARTIN BRYANT

CONTENTS	PAGE
SENATE APPROVED	<i>a</i>
TASMANIAN DEVILS	<i>b</i>
REQUEST DENIED	<i>c,d</i>
TITLE & SPECS	<i>i,ii</i>
HIDDEN TRUTHS	<i>iv-vi</i>
GRAVE DECEPTIONS	<i>vi</i>
1 FRONT MATTER	<i>vii-lxvi</i>
2 TRUTH	<i>1</i>
3 STATE KILLING	<i>41</i>
4 THE INCIDENT	<i>133</i>
5 THE PATSY	<i>199</i>
6 THE EVIDENCE	<i>295</i>
7 THE WITNESSES	<i>377</i>
8 STATE CORRUPTION	<i>499</i>
9 JUSTICE	<i>583</i>
10 BACK MATTER	<i>645</i>
DRAWING....	<i>696</i>
HUMAN RIGHTS	<i>697</i>
UNETHICAL LAWYERS	<i>697</i>
RESISTING CHANGE	<i>698</i>
TELLING PASSPORT	<i>698</i>
36th VICTIM	<i>698 ■</i>

- SUBSEQUENT RELATED WORKS -

■ **WORDS OF WOMEN**
Official Terror Shooting Tasmania
 2019; 162pp.

■ **WORDS OF MEN**
Official Terror Shooting Tasmania
 2019; 162pp.

HIDDEN TRUTHS

10MAR2019

ALL Families, Relatives, Friends
of Port Arthur Victims (58)
ALL Moral People Who Live in
Australia & New Zealand
ALL Moral People Everywhere
Opposed to State Injustice

**A PRESENTATION ON THE
PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT:**

**PRELUDE TO A
ROYAL COMMISSION**

NOEL McDONALD

– 2001 –

Dear READERS,

Thank you for your attention to the following non-copyrighted letter.

Based on words of those who knew him, Noel McDonald was a decent man. Now deceased, he was born in 1944 at Geelong and in mid-life his interest in politics (local & federal) began to develop. He exhibited a true-blue concern for his country and his fellow citizens. To learn the truth about his subjects of interest, he undertook thorough research then took on those whose actions would despoil the *land down under*. He prepared national reports and submissions, and he also wrote the 280-page book **A PRESENTATION ON THE PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT: Prelude to a Royal Commission** (2001). McDonald's summary reads:

An in-depth analysis of evidential statements, official reports, publications and television footage, challenging the Crown hypothesis of a lone gunman. The Port Arthur Incident was [/is] a black cloud of tragedy affecting every decent Australian. This book commences to lift the bigger cloud of concealment that has ignored and buried the true facts of what actually occurred, before during and after the 28th April 1996. (cover)

McDonald challenges the very deceitful Crown hypothesis – so deceitful as so many good investigators have proved with hard evidence – he also reveals the Port Arthur incident was a professionally planned and perpetrated terror incident with the desired outcome of convincing the public to accept restrictive gun laws. And it did convince people in Australia – those easily deceived people who do not question. After a dubious shooting at Christchurch in March 2019, restrictive gun laws were also thrust onto New Zealanders. McDonald believed a royal commission was essential given the heinous nature and impact of the Port Arthur massacre in April 1996. But tellingly, the State ensured there was NO royal commission for Port Arthur. In New Zealand however, one was announced by the prime minister there 10 days after the Christchurch shooting. Regardless, do NOT accept what any State says about mass/multiple shootings – question every assertion, every alleged finding.

In chapter 43 of his detailed work, McDonald lists the salient points to be considered by a royal commission. There are 96 of them, each one serious and shocking. His words confirm that McDonald did NOT blindly accept any of the many deceptive allegations made by the State. And in the same chapter, McDonald declares (see italicized words below) that Martin Bryant being blamed for everything about the Port Arthur incident is absolute nonsense, which those who are honest and who reflect on all the exculpatory facts can only concur. Tragically, many people sense the official narrative is not right but they do not speak out, just as the current police commissioner in Tasmania and his gutless predecessors all the way back to 1996 have not spoken out. Hine accepts the State lie. He will let INNOCENT Martin Bryant be killed in Risdon Prison. And as for the victims (58) who were shot at and near Port Arthur, Hine does NOT give a damn about them. Maintaining the State lie is what matters to Hine:

The Tasmanian Government has vigorously avoided public scrutiny over what has transpired at Port Arthur. Despite pleas from victims and survivors, to date a coronial inquest has still not been held, despite the deaths of 35 people. Equally important has been the omission of a trial for Martin Bryant. It simply was not good enough that his basic right of, being innocent until proved guilty beyond all reasonable doubt, was totally ignored. But it would appear that a concerted effort took place to thwart his day in Court. Looking at the myriad of anomalies, oversights, injustices, and distortions that have permeated the Port Arthur Incident from day one, and realising that the authorities' efforts only worked towards Bryant's conviction whilst avoiding inquiries and hearings that might have given the larger picture, it is time to instigate a Royal Commission to investigate all aspects of what has now been partly uncovered and exposed. (p.273)

There is indisputable evidence that the Port Arthur terror incident has been blamed falsely on patsy Martin Bryant. On compassionate grounds (humane, legal, medical, moral), he should be released immediately from prison. He was denied a trial, his guardian, plus an ethical lawyer; and, all Australians are still being denied a coronial inquest plus an in-depth public enquiry. Noel McDonald would NOT have accepted police files being sealed with one cop being the arbitrary gatekeeper. That records have been hidden away confirms that all the killing (35) and wounding (23) in Tasmania, Australia, were officially planned and perpetrated crimes. What follows are three grave deceptions that malinfluence the thinking of people when it comes to their understanding of the Port Arthur incident. Related details appear in Noel McDonald's highly recommended book:

i. a painful process Officials do not want the official narrative, or any part of the terror incident (officially) perpetrated at and near Port Arthur to be examined. They allege public pain, even trauma will arise from any form of questioning: *it's too painful, it's too traumatic, let's not go there.** This is how officials have discouraged people from focusing on the official narrative of the case and asking the standard investigative questions. Officials in Tasmania were encouraged NOT to conduct a coronial inquest by that mongrel of a prime minister John Howard who said it would be *too painful*. So there was NO inquest. There was also NO trial. Note that a trial could have been brief, just focusing on one death. It did NOT require protracted, blood-soaked expositions of 35 individual cases of killing, then 23 individual wounding cases. (* In March 2019 after a dubious shooting at Christchurch NZ, the same claim was made there by officials as they scrambled to stop people seeing a related video on the internet. So we must therefore ask the question – **Is there evidence incriminating the State re that video?**)

ii. he pleaded guilty When the NO trial fact is raised, a frequent rebuttal is the clown-comment *he pleaded guilty*. Helpless Martin Bryant pleaded NOT guilty for over six months. Imagine the set-up position Martin was in. Handicapped mentally and on his own against officials who desperately wanted him guilty. In his weak childlike voice, he kept telling officials – directly and indirectly – he didn't do it. But officials illegally refused to accept Martin's plea of NOT guilty. Related to this point, here are some words of the barrister Chester Porter (**THE CONVICTION OF THE INNOCENT**; 2007): "If a person has an IQ of seventy [70], it is not difficult for experienced detectives to persuade him or her to confess to almost anything." (p.19) Martin had/has? an IQ of 66. And Avery admitted he would NOT defend his *client*. So Avery's guilty plea was forced down Martin's throat for regurgitation at the sham of a hearing (which was NOT a trial).

iii. they saw him Before an investigation could begin, and even before he staggered out of blazing Seascope bewildered with 3rd-degree burns, Martin Bryant was said to be the gunman. Tasmania's Mercury newspaper illegally published (30APR1996) this together with a large image on p.A1: "THIS IS THE MAN". Unethical media used images with manipulated eyes making him look maniacal. False beliefs about him were created with negative never-proved claims. Blinded by anger, the unthinking public accepted then promoted official assertions which were soon swirling around the nation. But only one witness there personally knew Martin. This respected local businessman James Laycock confirmed in writing that the gunman who he saw at Port Arthur **was NOT Martin Bryant**. Other eyewitnesses also declared in writing that it **was NOT Martin Bryant**.

We now await the last breath of INNOCENT Martin Bryant in Tasmania, Australia. (an *ADVANCE OBITUARY* follows) Regardless of how officials say he died, his three killers Avery, Bugg, and Cox have his death on their public/family records. Please pray for Martin, his dear mother and dear sister. ***Dominus vobiscum.***

Keith Allan NOBLE ■

FRONT MATTER

1



CONCERN

Because the public has never been encouraged to examine the incident at and near Port Arthur in April 1996, the public understanding of the crime is not based on an objective analysis of the whole set-up.

CONTENTS

PAGE


■ PATSY	ix
■ MAJOR AUTHORS	x
■ THANK YOU	xi
■ PLEASE NOTE	xii
■ OFFICIAL APPROVAL	xiv
■ OFFICIAL NARRATIVE	xv
■ OFFICIAL KILLERS	xvi
■ OFFICIAL MONGRELS	xvii
■ OFFICIAL COVER-UP	xviii
■ PROLOGUE	xix
■ ADVANCE OBITUARY	xxiii
■ SUBMISSION TO APC	xlv

COUNTS

Images 37, Inserts 35, Pages 66

PATSY

MARTIN BRYANT



NO mental capacity **NO** hard evidence proving guilt **NO** proven motive **NO** fingerprints **NO** forensic findings **NO** credible identification **NO** credible timeline **NO** re-enactments at 7 crime scenes **NO** legal defence **NO** legal process integrity **NO** ownership/transfer of any firearm proven **NO** DNA evidence **NO** un-coerced admission of guilt **NO** witness testimony in court **NO** jury **NO** complete list of evidence **NO** coronial inquest **NO** thorough public inquiry **NO** royal commission **NO** police records given to public **NO** trial, a hearing is not a trial ■

NO LAWYER IN TASMANIA EVER DEFENDED MARTIN BRYANT
all are intelligent and all know of the injustice; but all are unethical and too gutless to stand up for Truth and Justice

*THIS mentally-handicapped boy-man (IQ 66) innocent of all charges was set up, **refused a trial, then caged forever** in Risdon Prison, where he is being tortured to death by anguish and prescribed drugs. Though there is no hard evidence proving his guilt, he has been incarcerated since 1996. On www.tasfamilylawpathways.com.au/services.php?code=360 it says Tasmanian lawyer Jennifer White is: a board member, Prisoners Legal Service Association Inc; the sub-committee chairperson, Prisoners' Advisory Legal Service; a member of Australian Lawyers for Human Rights; and a member of A Fairer World. Yet after repeated requests (personal & written) for White to act, it seems this hypocritical mongrel barrister has done nothing to assist poor innocent Martin Bryant. Please do not visit Tasmania, or buy Tasmanian products until the whole truth is revealed and justice is served to all victims of the official massacre at and near Port Arthur. - ed.*

MAJOR AUTHORS

Raul BASSI
Daniel BAXTER
Stewart K. BEATTIE
Carleen BRYANT
Hamish CHITTS
Ross COULTHART
FREESTATEVOICE.com.au
Gerry GEORGATOS
Alastair Neil HOPE
JASHER TEAM
John KEANE
Andrew S. MacGREGOR
Damian MARRETT
Noel McDONALD
Michael McKENNA
Kevin MORGAN
Mark MORRI
Patricia MORTON-THOMAS
Keith Allan NOBLE
Tony PITT
Terry SCHULZE
Wendy SCURR
Paul TAPP
Paul TOOHEY
ULTIMATE-RESEARCH-ASSISTANT.com
Carl WERNERHOFF
WIKIPEDIA
John G. WOLLASTON ■

AUTHORS listed here are the major contributors. See indices in Part 10 for a complete list of all contributing authors as well as their articles and shorter pieces used as inserts throughout this book. - ed.

THANK YOU

AUTHORS, INVESTIGATORS, SURVIVORS AND ALL CONCERNED MORAL PEOPLE

special thanks to the following
for their musical contributions

Cherri BONNEY

Wish I Knew How To Be Free
single; Cherri Bonney Music; 2016
www.youtube.com

***...what's Risdon doing to me
You know I spoke the truth way back then
Again and again and again and again
Why'm I in prison, what's my crime? ■***

GREELEY

Question of Guilt
(includes Wendy Scurr speaking)
album; Apple Isle Child – LMR Entertainment; 2014
www.youtube.com

***...and it was an hour away from the station to drive
But it took at least three hours for police to arrive
You would expect an inquest with all the people that died
To this day many people still believe it's a lie... ■***

Below refers to a case in England which involved the serial (8) killer
Reg Christie, and the set up and hanged (1950) innocent Tim Evans.

Ewan MacCOLL

The Ballad of Tim Evans
album; Bad Lads and Hard Cases – Riverside; 1957
www.youtube.com
(see *Rillington Place* series; BBC One; 2016)

***They sent Tim Evans to the drop
for a crime he did not do;
It was Christy was the murderer
and the judge and jury too. ■***

THANKS to all who, knowingly and unknowingly, provided verbal and/or
written material, not all of which appears within this compilation. Enqui-
ries continue, mine plus those of good investigators in Australia. – ed.

PLEASE NOTE

- This is a reference book. Unlike a novel, it was **not** written to be read linearly from the beginning to the end – from Part 1 to Part 10. This format means some facts are repeated in the book. It is recommended that the parts of the book be read in order of reader interest.
- This book examines the corrupt official narrative associated with the killing and wounding of people at a shooting incident in Tasmania – but it is **not** a definitive exposé. There are facts related to the incident which are **not** included because they are **not** known publicly. Any fact included herein does **not** mean it reflects the moral truth.
- Keith Allan Noble (hereafter editor or ed.) does **not** propose a definitive explanation of the incident. Explanations are described herein but, like the official narrative, they too must be rigorously examined.
- For layout reasons, liberties have been taken with ampersands, spacing, word divisions, etc. To enhance your comprehension, it is suggested you **overview** the *DEFINITIONS* prior reading any text.
- You are encouraged: **not** to doubt your ability to think through aspects of the incident; **not** to be intimidated by the State with its disregard for universal justice; above all, **not** to blindly accept the **nonsense** which has, since 1996, been promoted as the truth.

In 1996, this editor lived in Germany. The official narrative flooded the international media and, like most people, he accepted what he saw and read about what happened. It was, and still is, a terrible incident. Firearms were subsequently controlled in Australia, and life went on. It was not until a decade had passed that this editor, then involved with another corrupt case in Australia, started seeing literature which told another story about the incident at Port Arthur.

This literature was not just retrospective words about the case, and writing of the time-healing-wounds type. It was literature based on detailed examinations of the official narrative. On closer inspection, this narrative does not stand up. Getting to the point, the literature exposes the official narrative as being a concocted story which covers up very serious crimes. Not crimes the State said happened, but crimes committed by the State itself. Putting an ever sharper tip to this point, and the literature details this clearly, the incident at and near Port Arthur in Tasmania was MASS MURDER – deliberate killing. More specifically, **a premeditated, planned, and professional psycho-political terror attack**. It was used as the prelude to the passing of legislation to take control over the private possession of certain types of firearms throughout Australia: to disarm the people.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

This is a very serious statement to make. But be assured those who have examined, researched, and questioned the official narrative have attended to their work in an extremely thorough manner. They have documented and broadcast their findings. Articles and books written by them are not ideas and theories scribbled down. These investigators have freely given their time, money, and energies, to studying the Port Arthur incident. Their findings are truly troubling.

This editor is not related to any person whose name or writing is included in this book. Along with millions of others living in Australia, and elsewhere around the world, this editor is rightly critical of police – in general as an organization, and in particular when individual cops behave in unethical and criminal ways. Too many cops are blunt instruments with levels of intelligence far too low for all the duties they are expected to fulfill. No recruit who is morally minded, which is what the public wants, could possibly last in the environment of corruption, incompetence, and thuggery which is what police forces (not services) in Australia seem unwilling and unable to rise up from. (Google *police violence Australia* for details on this national disgrace.)

Though it is, this book was not compiled just to be critical of officials and governmental systems. Nor was it compiled to make money or to promote firearm ownership. (The editor does not own a firearm, nor is he a member of any firearm group. But given the criminal governments that exist, he understands why citizens should keep weapons.) It was compiled: to have questions asked; to have the truth, the whole truth told; to have justice served for all victims of the official incident; and, to have all those who are directly and indirectly responsible for the official incident at and near Port Arthur apprehended, charged, tried, and imprisoned for their heinous crime of **MASS MURDER**.

Question all case-related acts, assertions, conclusions, *etc.* Don't accept the facts of the case as officials have described them, as many official descriptions are deliberately inaccurate. Once you see through the official cover-up, you will be staggered, and yes even angered, by the evil things perpetrated. No person with an IQ of 66 whose understanding is that of an 11-year-old could have done what the State keeps insisting Martin Bryant did – insisting with not a shred of legal proof. To see your way through the State's many lies, put the beliefs of family and friends behind you. Grasp the objective truth for yourself without being influenced by what others unthinkingly believe. ■

If you have information related to any part of the case, contact me: BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net; MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com; MURDER.RESEARCH@gmail.com; EPIUS@t-online.de. Thank you. – ed.

OFFICIAL MASS MURDER

– TASMANIA ■ AUSTRALIA ■ APR 1996 –
35 SHOT DEAD ■ 23 INJURED

AUSTRALIA SENATE APPROVED

MASSACRE

WITH

STEPHEN SHANE PARRY

EMBALMER, EX-COP, EX-SENATOR (LIB-TAS)



AFTER illegally sitting in the Senate of Australia, his political mates put this embalmer Parry on the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. This Liberal Party hack has inside information on the official Port Arthur terror-massacre (1996) which he has refused to reveal to all those who pay him – the people of Australia. ■
eyes not manipulated

AUTHOR

PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE:

**AFDA [Australian Funeral Directors Association]
National Embalming Team – Detailed Report**

in *PORT ARTHUR SEMINAR PAPERS: A Record of the Proceedings of the Port Arthur Seminar*, 11-12 MAR 1997: p.104-119
Melbourne VIC, Australia. (ISBN 0642271364)

“Nelson Brothers [Funeral Services, Melbourne VIC] had organised for an embalming machine box and a special large equipment case to be **manufactured ready for the incident.**

These two containers were the envy of all embalmers and worked extremely well.” (p. 112)

BACKGROUND: A *Show Cause* notice was directed to Parry on 24 FEB 2016. He did not reply. A four-page related letter was directed to 76 federal senators on 9 MAR 2016. None replied. see youtube.com – **PORT ARTHUR CRACKS**; Lindsay Johnson ■

SCORES of pages of a Martin Bryant interview transcript were redacted, and exculpatory witness statements were never heard by the public during a trial.

OFFICIAL NARRATIVE

THE 28 April 1996 began like any other quiet Sunday at Port Arthur. At 1300 [sic] hours, the peaceful serenity was shattered when a gunman* used a military-style weapon to kill 20 people who had been enjoying company and refreshments in the Broad Arrow Cafe. He continued his shooting rampage outside, leaving behind more dead and injured. [* Identified in the publication referenced below as Martin Bryant.]

He then left the Port Arthur Historic Site in a commandeered motor vehicle and drove a short distance to the Port Arthur Store. There he took a hostage and secured him in the boot of the commandeered vehicle before returning to shoot dead the female companion of the hostage.

The offender then drove to a nearby guest house where he took refuge. Even during the journey to the guest house he took time to fire upon a large number of people who had attempted to take refuge in the Fox and Hounds Hotel. He also flagged down a four-wheel drive vehicle and shot both occupants.

Having secured himself in the guest house, he kept police at bay until the early hours of the following morning before setting fire to the building. After a period, he emerged from the building and was taken into police custody. He had suffered burns to his back. The fire destroyed the building and an examination of the site revealed three more bodies.

In all, 35 people were dead and 22 [sic] suffered various forms of injury. Tasmania, indeed Australia, was shaken to the very core by this tragic and shocking event.... ■

Richard McCREADIE

Commissioner of Police, Tasmania &
Chairman Tasmania State Disaster Committee
28 April 1997 [sic]

*THE above Foreword appears in Port Arthur Seminar Papers (p. iii), a record of proceedings of the Port Arthur Seminar – organised by the Tasmania State Disaster Committee, sponsored by Emergency Management Australia – Melbourne, Victoria, on 11-12 March 1997. This statement above contains **factual errors, serious omissions, never proved assertions**, etc. A year after the incident and this McCreadie still did not get it right. Regardless, statements like his became the essence of the corrupt official narrative for the case, the narrative which to this day is promoted by the complicit media. – ed.*

THEY *KILLED* HIM then they praised themselves for what they had done – an innocent gaoled with no parole, slow tortured death body and soul.

OFFICIAL KILLERS

■ **John AVERY**

killer lawyer (now ex-lawyer & criminal)

perverted course of justice

refused Martin Bryant's NOT guilty plea;
coerced his client to accept Avery's guilty plea;
did NOT defend or present exculpatory evidence;
declared publicly that he would NOT defend Martin
and called his client a "monster"; later convicted
for stealing from his legal colleagues and clients



■ **Damian BUGG**

killer prosecutor (Tasmania)

perverted course of justice

ignored extensive exculpatory evidence;
presented never-proved assertions as truths;
refused to accept Martin Bryant's NOT guilty plea;
Wikipedia states Bugg "successfully prosecuted"
a mentally-incompetent, coerced, State victim –
that's our Buggsy, a real bobby-dazzler barrister




■ **William COX**

killer judge (Tasmania)

perverted course of justice

ignored extensive exculpatory evidence; held
a hearing which is NOT a trial; convicted then
imprisoned mentally-incompetent and innocent
Martin Bryant never to be released; his payback –
appointed *Right Royal Arse Licker* to the Windsors
(aka Governor of Tasmania, 2004-08)



In the *Law Reports King's Bench Division* vol. 1; 1924: p. 259, these very wise words of Gordon Hewart (1870-1943) appear: "A long line of cases shows that it is not merely of some importance that justice should not only be done but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done." In the Port Arthur case, the exact opposite occurred – JUSTICE WAS NOT DONE AND JUSTICE IS STILL BEING SEEN NOT TO BE DONE. ■

THESE three – with NO hesitation, NO investigation, and NO trial – accepted a coerced guilty plea, then falsely convicted an innocent mentally-handicapped boy-man (66 IQ), then wrongfully gaoled him in Risdon Prison in Tasmania never to be released. There, he is being, since 1996, slowly tortured to death. You are to accept this as Justice. It is the most diabolical injustice in the legal history of Australia. – ed.


OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

**THESE mongrels, all law learned,
remained silent as they watched
Justitia gang-raped raw: her cry,
INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY!**

OFFICIAL MONGRELS

■ **John HOWARD**

former prime minister; lawyer; USA sycophant
abetted the crime
encouraged Tasmanian officials NOT to
conduct legislatively required investigative
procedures, eg. coronial inquest; completely
ignored all legal requirements and milked the
tragic situation for his own personal political gain



■ **David WEISBROT**

former chair, Australian Press Council
failed to stop false image usage
failed to stop the media from broadcasting
an image of Martin Bryant photoshopped giving
him a demonic appearance; said deceptive images
are available and are used throughout Australia
(example right deliberately incomplete)



■ **Jennifer WHITE**

barrister; officer of the court
unethical inhuman neglect
holds offices to protect rights of prisoners;
but after being requested (verbal and written)
to assist just continued to ignore Martin Bryant's
unfulfilled legal and human rights whilst in prison;
all smiles but full of shit, a callous legal hypocrite



Additional information related to these three mongrels and to many other people implicated with the official killing at Port Arthur in Tasmania – mongrels like Vanessa Goodwin, Brawler Gunson, Rick Sarre, etc, – appears in the 21-page ADVANCE OBITUARY MARTIN BRYANT (30 JUN 2016) and the 21-page SUBMISSION TO AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL (27 SEP 2015) amended copies of which follow the PROLOGUE. ■

*THESE three are seriously implicated with the Port Arthur incident. That they have NOT publicly denied or defended their behaviour, and have NOT taken action to address negative facts surrounding their behaviour confirms corruption. If you have info related to these three mongrels and/or to others implicated with the incident please forward it to: MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com **Thank you.** – ed.*

THE STATE cannot prove Martin Bryant fired a weapon at/near Port Arthur. It is one reason why there was NO trial, and one reason why police records are sealed 75 YEARS.

OFFICIAL COVER-UP

1996 Poor innocent Martin Bryant was wrongly sentenced to prison forever. There was: **NO** trial*; **NO** coronial inquest, **NO** public enquiry, **NO** Royal Commission, *etc.* (* a hearing is not a trial)


1996 After April, people are denied access to Martin Bryant and the State accepts the national media exposing him with terms and images which **incite hate, violence, and the killing of him.**

2009 After 13 no-public-access years and with no notice to the public, police records* of the official killing at Port Arthur were transferred to the archives and preservation unit of Libraries Tasmania.

2018 The **secret** transfer (2009) of the **secret** records only became public knowledge after an archivist gave a related paper at the Australian Society of Archivists (ASA) conference in far off Perth.

What follows are verbatim words from an unofficial transcript. It seems that a public transcript was NOT made available by the ASA:

"I...registered it into our system it became known as transfer to nine zero zero....; ...Tasmanian Police records of the Port Arthur massacre will be open to the public in 2071....; ...they are an e75 access restriction which means they're closed for 75 years and the e means that only one person or position can grant access in this case only the Commissioner of Police." ■



Nicki Ottavi (image left)
Nicki.Ottavi@education.tas.gov.au
*Tasmanian police records
of the Port Arthur massacre*
National Conference
Australian Society of Archivists
25-28 SEP 2018; Perth WA
[youtube.com/watch?v=zdxGQK0Dow8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zdxGQK0Dow8)

In her abstract of this paper, Ottavi expresses concern over making "the records accountable as evidence." What a sham. Ottavi did NOT mention all the written statements in which eyewitnesses who were at and near Port Arthur have confirmed in writing that the shooter there **was NOT Martin Bryant** – repeat, **was NOT Martin Bryant.** There is no guarantee the records transferred include every record (before, during, after) related to the **official killing at Port Arthur.** And it is also reasonable to believe that all facts/documents/tapes/transcripts/*etc.*, or parts thereof, which incriminate the State will be permanently erased/lost/misplaced/removed/reworded/*etc.* should there ever be a transfer. Officials (past and present) now have the perfect cover-up for the official killing and intended subsequent terror. **By 2071 you and I will be dead – so too will Martin Bryant. – ed.**

PROLOGUE

SCHOOLS FAIL US in every sense of the word fail. No doubt there might be some exceptions and no doubt some people will disagree. But here, this statement is not made superficially. The subject is too serious for that. Having spent a few decades in several countries as a pupil, student, lecturer, researcher, and an observer of educational systems, my conclusion is not based on merely a few observations. And nowhere is this failure any more evident than in the educating (conditioning) of people not to question. From the first year in whatever educational system we were involved with – where you and I were numbered and counted, stamped and dated – we were taught not to question authority. From early in life, children are conditioned (they are conned) to accept official narratives and to ridicule those who do not. People are taught to obey officials even after they learn officials can be immoral, liars, even inhuman mongrels. All systems in society, not just educational systems, reward conformists who unquestioningly accept then espouse official policies, positions, procedures, etc.

Officially, servile behaviour is promoted as the right and respectful way of living. But thankfully, there are tough moral people who stand up and resist for us. Award-winning journalist (wikileaks) **Julian Assange** was arrested in London after his embassy asylum there was revoked by Ecuador in April 2019. Pursued by the United States, he now faces possible extradition. The United States also pursued **Edward Snowden** who is now compelled to reside in Russia. And it also prosecuted then incarcerated **Bradley Manning*** for 35 years.** These three cases of persecution confirm the evil United States does not want the public to learn of its war crimes around the world. Never forget the words of that ancient Greek, Bias of Priene in Ionia: *Truth breeds Hatred*. (* now **Chelsea Elizabeth Manning**; ** commuted in 2017 after serving six years, but she was reimprisoned in March 2019)

That mighty person of human understanding **Martin Luther King** (1929-1968) confirmed a disturbing truth about the United States: *The greatest purveyor of violence on earth is my own government*. Given the political reality in that morally and financially bankrupt nation, have no doubt Assange will have retributive violence inflicted on him in one of its houses of horror if he is extradited with the assistance of lickspittle little Britain.

But Britain is the home of the best legal traditions in the world you might think. Well, in her **excellent insight-filled book NO SMOKE!** The Shocking Truth About British Justice, this is how the author-researcher **Sandra Lean** describes how corrupt the adversarial legal system is in that disunited kingdom:

"Until two years ago, I had no idea anything was broken. I believed in the justice system.... What I found left me shocked and sickened. The information was there, easily accessible, for me, or anyone else to see. Because it had simply never occurred to me to ask the questions (perhaps because I believed there were no questions to be asked), I had never been exposed to the answers. The more I delved, the more apparent it became that something is terribly wrong with our system, but hardly anyone seems to know, or care. As my investigations progressed, I found another curious phenomenon. Not only were people reluctant to discuss the issue of miscarriage of justice, and the suggestion that there may be some serious flaws at the heart of our justice system, they would vigorously (and sometimes with hostility) defend their position that I was mistaken – even with pages of documented evidence before them.... [W]e ignore the evidence of our own senses, for fear of looking stupid, or being judged by others." (p.xiii)

This editor praises Lean's work as well as books by other good authors which detail, amongst many other significant things, negative reactions of people with minds conditioned not to think and who thus fail to question State officials and their deceptive narratives, which take on characteristics similar to those of myths. They are pervasive, unthinkingly repeated, and absence of hard evidence is dismissed as insignificant. The underlying premise – **the LIE** – is that because the myth is a State story, an official narrative, it is correct. Officially, not only is questioning a narrative deemed wrong, the questioning of it is considered unnecessary and often said to be proof that someone wants to promote some conspiracy theory – which is to be immediately guffawed at and roundly ridiculed. What happens is exactly what Lean has revealed to us: People ignore the evidence of their own senses for fear of looking stupid, or being judged by others.

Addressing that often erroneously used phrase conspiracy theory, this expression is favoured by those who have not thought in depth about a subject. They use the phrase to ridicule anyone who does not accept or who questions some official narrative. When you read from the extensive literature related to the Port Arthur incident, you will see that people who hold beliefs different from those within the official narrative are not driven to identify an official conspiracy. We are driven to seek the truth, the whole truth, which is frequently sparse or corrupted within official narratives. But the reality is official narratives are often conspiracies pushed by the State. Evidence of this is abundant, easily obtained, and well documented. If your information source is mainstream media (MSM), then you are doing a disservice to yourself and to all those you communicate with. Tune in to alternate media. The quality and quantity of highly credible and confirmable information there is astounding.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

People are conditioned to accept what they are told, and they are favoured when they repeat what was told to them. Along the curricula conveyor-belt in schools, and later in their daily lives, people are rewarded for accepting State beliefs and officials who propound those beliefs. Anyone who questions a narrative draws forth condemnation from those whose brains have been dumbed down. For such conditioned (conned) people, it is always safer to accept official narratives than it is to question then assuredly face negative feedback.

Finally – for yourself, your family and friends, as well as for the betterment of the world in which all of us must live – you are urged to fulfill your ever-abiding civic duty as declared by that scientist-statesman Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790) who wisely advised us: *It is the first responsibility of every citizen to question authority.* After reading the many moral truths within this book, thinking people, those not afraid of looking stupid or being judged by others, will realize the official Port Arthur incident narrative is nonsense not supported by hard evidence. Please take a stand and speak out against it.

POSTSCRIPT (2014) After the 1st edition of this book was released, I received emails from many people. Most wrote supportive words, a few suggested additions, corrections, and/or improvements. But some expressed opinions that Martin Bryant is guilty, that he is in prison where he should be. No evidence was given on which their beliefs are based other than the claim that he was the gunman seen at Port Arthur. (All had conveniently forgotten there was **NO trial.**) Whether these people read this book, and whether they studied some or any of the references is not known by me. It is doubted. Some have become so fixated on the official narrative that it is difficult, with some it is impossible, to get them to consider anything else. For some, dissonance in their minds is too much. Others fear ridicule.

Compounding this is MSM which to this day persists in promoting the official narrative even though its associated dishonesty and deception has been detailed for many years. Proof of this is evident in shocking facts: **i.** MSM never discuss the 22-body refrigerated truck built ready for the killing; **ii.** MSM never discuss the embalming equipment prepared in advance for the funeral directors **Nelson Brothers**, which embalmed c.25 of the officially killed victims; **iii.** MSM never discuss the identity of the naked black-haired woman who several cops wrote they saw running and screaming at Seascapes late Sunday afternoon (c.6:00pm), long after officials insisted the grey-haired owner (**Sally Martin**) was shot dead (before midday) at that coastal cottage; **iv.** MSM never discuss the written statements of eyewitnesses who described the Port Arthur shooter(s) as NOT being Martin Bryant; *etc.*

Also contributing to the public's misunderstanding of this official mass murder is the refusal of people to accept States get involved in evil pursuits and cover-ups. This cannot be comprehended by those who believe officials wouldn't do that. Such false claims have been expressed to this editor, but documentation confirms officials do get involved. Schools create compliant citizens whose understanding of the world is limited to what is doled out to them. The incident of psycho-political terror at Port Arthur in Tasmania confirms that schools fail us. Even when given hard evidence proving the State approved and facilitated all the killing and wounding there, people conform to the norm and refuse to acknowledge the **absence of Truth and thus Justice.** ■

POSTSCRIPT (2019) Over the years, a number of people told me there did not have to be a trial. As soon as Martin Bryant admitted his guilt, the need for a trial was waived – they said. A trial would have been traumatic for families and friends of victims – they said. This is what the State wants you to believe. But these facts are incomplete and thus deceptive. All officials had to do was prove one person was killed and that he or she was shot by a gunman whose identity was unquestionably accurate. It was not necessary to prove guilt for every victim. And it was not necessary to drag every person through those painful scenes within or near the Broad Arrow Café, or along the historic site access road, or at the tollbooth/gate.

But the State has not identified Martin Bryant as the gunman beyond a reasonable doubt. And the State has not proved guilt with hard evidence in relation to a single death at or near Port Arthur. Though it is alleged 35 people were killed and 23 wounded, officials ensured there was **NO** serious *investigations*. There was **NO** trial, **NO** full coronial inquest, **NO** complete documented enquiry, **NO** royal commission, *etc.* These inactions **incriminate the State.**

The public has been blatantly lied to about the case. Martin Bryant was made the patsy. His assets were plundered to prevent him from hiring a competent lawyer. For months, he was locked away from his family. His images were manipulated to make him appear maniacal then published nationally. Hate toward him was incited by the media and condoned by officials. Every the defence (*sic*) lawyer rejected Martin's persistent plea of **NOT** guilty. Then Bugg and Cox sentenced their innocent victim to die slowly – drugged and in despair inside Risdon Prison. Then the State sealed police files until 2071. These actions **confirm the worst injustice in modern-day Australia.** ■

ADVANCE OBITUARY

THE FOLLOWING 21 pages are a document (30JUN2016) distributed after innocent Martin Bryant was moved from a secure section into the dangerous main section of Risdon Prison in Tasmania. The intention – some other prisoner(s) will *burn him alive, kill him, knock him, etc.* Then callous Aussies will rejoice in harmony – Advance Australia Fair. (*Advance Obituary* free pdf copies BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net)

Not only are gutless officials in Tasmania content to see INNOCENT Martin Bryant killed in prison, the entire legal profession (so-called) in Australia will not give a hoot when he breathes his last – cold and alone, confused and crushed by crimes of the evil State. When that "social misfit," as judge *Killer Cox* called him, soars free from that prison cage, Australia's unethical lawyers will deny their unfulfilled responsibilities and their shameful guilt. Then, all mealy-mouthed, they'll repeat the corrupt official narrative. Forgive them – if you can.

As for the words that follow by esteemed barrister Chester Porter (**THE CONVICTION OF THE INNOCENT**; 2007), this writer says he believes not one lawyer in the nation will want to be reminded, or will care, or will stand up and declare that he or she is ashamed:

THE FUNDAMENTAL BASIS of liberty in the common law of England and Australia is the presumption of innocence. Thus any person accused of a crime is presumed to be innocent until his or her guilt is proved beyond reasonable doubt in a court of law. If the prosecution fails to prove guilt to the requisite standard of proof, the presumption of innocence is not displaced and the accused person is deemed to be innocent. Most civilized systems of law have a similar presumption of innocence, although it may well be that sometimes only lip-service is paid to it. In common law countries, such as England, the USA, Australia, and New Zealand, the legal profession is dedicated to upholding the fundamental presumption of innocence and making it a reality. (p.1)

Dedicated my arse. Indirectly, his contemporaries have told Porter they don't give a rat's for the fundamental basis of liberty in the common law of Australia. For them, it's all about money – cases that pay. Not a case about some simpleton who they and other callous unthinking people believe should be fed to *great whites* at Roaring Beach. And ex-senator for Tasmania Jacqui Lambie has another method: "**That Martin Bryant, he should have had a round in his head.**" *Just like they did to the boongs down there, shoot the bastard...* ■

INTERNATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

THE
WORST INJUSTICE
- of -
MODERN-DAY AUSTRALIA

ADVANCE OBITUARY

- MARTIN BRYANT -

INNOCENT!
KILLED IN CUSTODY
TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



- RIP -

FALSELY CONVICTED, WRONGLY IMPRISONED, KILLED IN CUSTODY

1967–20**
– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



THE INJUSTICE

"THERE ARE INJUSTICES SO WRONG ON THIS VAST CONTINENT [Australia] that they burn deep, they continue, they become more, they divide humanity, fracture humanity. The belief that we have to compromise, reduce what needs be said so as to carry people to common ground never achieves universality, never carries all sides, all the people, to for instance equality, justice, to the good end. The carrying of people arrives on the back of the truth. Truth does not seek to victimise and accuse, it does not seek to make hostages of all those who are wrong. Truth seeks the freeing of everyone. In this tenet we must be solid-in-our-thinking. We must not fear that the truth will offend the perpetrators or the institutions they represent or are protected by. We must fear only our own silence. We must not fear any level of persecution, we must not fear what those who do wrong or what those others who insist on silence about wrongs will do to us. We must be fearless." ■

GERRY GEORGATOS

Not All Are Deaths in Custody – Murders in Custody
thestringer.com.au
9 JUL 2015

Dr. GERRY GEORGATOS is a long-time researcher of racism, deaths in custody, and unnatural deaths. He is also an advocate of prison reform and restorative justice. His words quoted above relate to injustice which has been inflicted on Black/Indigenous people for centuries by racist Whites in Australia. But the official psycho-political incident of State terrorism in Tasmania in 1996 has led to the worst injustice of modern-day Australia. That 35 people were fatally shot and 23 wounded, and that NO judicial process was initiated to determine the whole truth, and that the innocent person blamed then incarcerated for life for the entire incident has been killed in custody, and that the families, relatives, and friends of all the victims have been denied truth and justice makes the massacre at and near Port Arthur and what has ensued the worst injustice of modern times. Note there have been larger massacres in Terra Australis since the British invasion in 1788. Historians record possibly up to a thousand Black/Indigenous people were slaughtered in 1840 during a mass killing in Victoria. Hunting parties were organized in 19th-century Tasmania to rid the island of its original inhabitants. Etc. What was officially perpetrated in Tasmania in 1996 has a blood-soaked trail leading from it back to Botany Bay in New South Wales. Every massacre in Australia has been undertaken to annihilate/dominate/eradicate/exterminate/subjugate people there. Facts confirm the purpose of the official killing and wounding at and near Port Arthur was to bring about political support for de-arming (dominating) the populace. (* see Insert "Massacres in Australia" pp. 95,96 in THE WORST OF BRITISH JUSTICE: Readings Related to Injustice in Australia c.1825-2015; 2nd edition, 2015: 794 pp. free pdf file bigwormbooks@gmx.net) ■*

KEITH ALLAN NOBLE

Unit 72 B, Am Heumarkt 7, 1030 Vienna, Austria
murder.research@gmail.com
30 JUN 2016
(statement amended 27 JAN 2019)

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

MARTIN BRYANT WAS INNOCENT

DURING a phone conversation
with Keith Allan Noble on
27 MAY 2016

Graham Derek Collyer
reconfirmed the innocence of
Martin Bryant:

"He was not the man who shot me."

This eyewitness and victim of the
shooting inside the Broad Arrow Café
at the Port Arthur Historic Site
first confirmed this innocence in his

Witness Statement

given to Tasmania Police on
7&8 MAY 1996

**"[The gunman] seemed about 20.
He had long blonde bedraggled hair about
3-4 inches below the shoulder.**

**He looked like he might have had a lot
of acne. A pitted face.... I think I probably
would identify him if I saw him again."**

Martin Bryant was almost 30 at the
time of the massacre. He did NOT have
hair below the shoulder, and he did
NOT have a pitted face –
confirmed by his mother and by
original images; see page 1 and
Tasmania Police interview video.

(For statements by other eyewitnesses – for example,
"the picture I saw in the newspapers was not the same
person" – confirming Martin Bryant was innocent,
read MASS MURDER: Official Killing in Tasmania,
Australia; 2nd edition, 2014. see RESOURCES)

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



THE HISTORY

FOR OVER TWO DECADES, mongrels* have been lying and deceiving the people of Australia. Officials in many places have corrupted the national political process, perverted the legal system in Tasmania, denied glaring documented truths, and/or prevented justice from being served. (* vernacular Australian word meaning despicable person/party)

In Tasmania in April 1996, it is alleged that 35 people were killed and 23 were wounded at and near the Port Arthur Historic Site. **It was an official crime** – a crime so horrific it sent shockwaves the length and breadth of the *land down under*. Hate and vengeance came to the fore rapidly, force-fed by mainstream media broadcasting unproved accusations and manipulated images to implicate and demonise Martin Bryant who was blamed for the entire incident. But it was impossible for this mentally-handicapped patsy to have undertaken all the planning, the provision of all the equipment*, and the perpetration of all the crimes at **seven locations**. False statements based on supposed facts were made repeatedly by officials before a thorough investigation was completed. In fact, NO such investigation was undertaken – then or since. (* Includes: a 22-body refrigerated mortuary truck; special embalming equipment “manufactured ready for the incident” – officially confirmed in writing by Stephen Parry who became a Liberal Party (TAS) senator; allegedly dozens of weapons and thousands of rounds of ammunition none of which was ever proved to be acquired or transported to Port Arthur by the patsy.)

Instead of putting every official resource into determining exactly how the incident occurred, the State went out of its way to ensure there was NO assessment and public release of all associated facts. It also ensured Martin Bryant had NO competent and committed legal representative. There was NO trial, NO coronial inquest, NO public enquiry, NO royal commission, *etc*. Legally required processes were NOT permitted. Opinions and suppositions were allowed to suppress searches for evidence. **An unthinking shocked public was deceived by biased media** and the Tasmanian legal system was upended. Mongrel members – includes every barrister there, all of whom are officers of the court – ignored the setting up and sacrifice of an innocent patsy. After being kept in isolation for over six months, Martin Bryant was declared guilty without a shred of evidence being presented and proved in a trial, with a jury, **as was required by law**.

One difficult thing to do in life is to unlearn what has been learnt. People become attached to what they believe is correct. Challenges to their beliefs are quickly ridiculed even when there is evidence their beliefs are patently wrong. How the killing and wounding at and near Port Arthur in April 1996 were perpetrated are good examples of such beliefs. Unthinking people (includes witnesses) have been gulled into fixed mind-sets. The result is they do NOT reflect on all the hard evidence which reveals the official narrative is corrupt. People with such fixed beliefs refuse to question and simply accept inaccurate and incomplete evidence be it physical or testimonial.

The only thing that can help **ease the pain and address the injustice** arising from the official massacre in Tasmania is the bright light of truth. Innocent Martin Bryant should never have been convicted then incarcerated – but he was. And though the State knew the likelihood was great that Martin Bryant would be killed in any place of detention, he was wrongly incarcerated in 1996 at Risdon Prison near Hobart – never to be released. **Now Martin has been killed.** ■

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



THE *BOY-MAN*

MARTIN BRYANT* was the first child (born 7 MAY 1967) of Carleen and the late Maurice Bryant, his two loving parents. Lindy his sister arrived on 24 JUL 1972. As best he could, Martin grew up in the Australian state of Tasmania. His early life and upbringing have been detailed by his mother in a candid work of family history called MY STORY. (* no middle name)

In her book, Carleen Bryant states, amongst many other things, the following about her son:

"I know my son and it is difficult to imagine him being able to plan these events [massacre of 35 killed and 23 wounded at **seven crime scenes** at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, in April 1996]. Psychologists determined that Martin's IQ was that of an **11-year-old**. He could not even plan his overseas trips. He would fly to one country and then decide on the spur of the moment where to visit next. **He struggled with simple things** such as how to remove a wheel from a bicycle, how to construct something from a Meccano set or build a simple airplane such as young boys enjoy making. Martin **could drive an automatic car** but he could never sit for a driver's licence." (pp. 133-134; added emphasis)

"I wondered why it was that Martin was initially questioned without having a lawyer present. These were, after all, horrendous charges and at no time should he have been questioned without legal assistance, especially **given his intellectual impairment** which would have been quite obvious from the start." (p. 134; added emphasis)

Mrs. Bryant holds nothing back. She describes, as only a mother of a mentally-handicapped child can, the difficulties her son Martin had to contend with growing up – and later as a young man. **Martin's IQ was determined to be 66** by Australian psychologist Ian Joblin in June 1996. This put Martin in the bottom one to two percent of the Australian population. Officially determined to be incapable of engaging in meaningful permanent employment, Martin received a Tasmanian disability pension.

Additional insights into the mental incompetence of Martin Bryant have been provided by the young woman Petra Willmott, who in 1996 had an intimate relationship with him. This is what Willmott declared in one of her Witness Statements:

"He **doesn't remember** a lot of things that I say to him and **he forgets** what he's doing sometimes." (28 APR 1996; added emphasis)

From those who knew him personally – NOT from those who made negative statements based on unproved media accusations – we learn **Martin Bryant was handicapped mentally**. It seems he was born that way. Despite all the attention bestowed on him by his loving family, Martin did NOT mature mentally and he can be described as a *boy-man*. In April 1996, he was almost a 29-year-old man who lived life as best he could with the mind of an 11-year-old boy. ■

1967–20**
– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
WRONGLY & CRUELLY HELD INCOMMUNICADO

24 June 2005

Judge S. Tennent

Tasmania Supreme Court
GPO Box 167, Hobart TAS 7001

Don Pike

c/o Post Office
St. Mary's TAS 7215

Dear Madame,

I was pleased to read recently of your new appointment to the judiciary as one who was particularly interested in reform of Risdon Prison. It is always a concern that prisoners everywhere should be afforded fair and humane treatment during prison confinement and especially if that **confinement is one of isolation**. I feel you would agree that the forgoing should apply to all prisoners, irrespective of the nature of the conviction.

When Martin Bryant was imprisoned we were told that he refused to see his sister or mother. This morning the hospital section at Risdon informed me that he occasionally has consented to see his mother and did so. They further offered (or I requested) that they ask Martin would he consent to see me (a stranger). After a few moments I was informed that he had been asked the question, but had refused (he was said to have not answered his inquirer, but just walked away). I was further told that that behaviour was typical of his response when he was not interested in a visit.

The problem is, of course, when a **prisoner is held incommunicado**, it will always be easy for the authorities to say the prisoner doesn't want to talk to anyone, when in fact the truth may have been to the contrary. I am not suggesting that this is the situation in Bryant's case. However, and notwithstanding a person's right to refuse visits, it also follows that if justice is to be done (and not just *seen* to be done) a genuine determination must be made to show clearly and without any reservations that a prisoner did in fact refuse visitation and acted of his/her own *unaffected* free will.

To this end I believe that it is crucially important that a panel of *suitable* people be allowed to visit a prisoner, periodically, to make such determination and to establish, as far as possible, that there has been no coercion. Further, it would be equally important that affidavital documentation should be furnished from a medical officer (and others?) both inside and outside the prison system to establish that the prisoner has not been **subjected to mind bending or control drugs**. This would be particularly applicable to **prisoners who are subjects of doubt or controversy as to their conviction**.

I believe it should follow that the right of privacy, under no circumstances, should be regarded as priority over the above. A person's incarceration begets a regime of reasonable controls. Food and drink (special diet), recreation, exercise, medical attention, religion, *etc.* Perhaps as little as three visits per year to **determine the veracity** of their wishes, cannot be genuinely construed as an infringement of anyone's rights.

I would be pleased of your assistance in establishing what is suggested.

Yours sincerely,

Don Pike

(amended; original emphasis)

ARE YOU SURPRISED to learn that Mr. Pike did NOT receive a reply from Shan Eve Tennent, or any other official? For over 20 years, access to Martin Bryant was officially restricted to ensure the public never learnt the whole truth from or about him. The media however, was allowed to publish cruel demonising articles and false images about Martin during all that time. ■

1967–20**

– MARTIN BRYANT –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



KILLED IN CUSTODY

AUSTRALIA HAS A LONG HISTORY of criminal officials killing innocent people in their care – officials who records confirm are never convicted then imprisoned. For example: Chris Hurley a member of the Queensland Police Service (motto: With Honour We Serve *sic*) was charged with the killing of Mulrunji on Palm Island. According to a coronial post-mortem, the death of this innocent man, in November 2004, was the result of "an intra-abdominal haemorrhage caused by a ruptured liver and portal vein" – massive physical damage which the public was led to believe resulted from Mulrunji *tripping* on a set of stairs. But what really happened is that Hurley (judge, jury, and executioner) got things sorted at Palm Island police station and set up Mulrunji for the long box. And when the residents of Palm Island expressed their very understandable rage, Queensland Police unleashed its heavily-armed but lightly-brained racist thugs on the men, women, and children. As for the killer Hurley, he was declared NOT guilty by an all-White jury and subsequently was promoted. (see MASS MURDER; 2014: pp. 107-112)

Whether it's identified with the official euphemism death in custody, or identified with the phrase killed in custody, or called homicide or murder, really makes NO difference. All these words convey the same meaning – an innocent person has been killed while in the *care* of some official(s) of the State. Of course the State will say and do everything it can to absolve itself. Only in the most extreme situations will any State admit some degree of culpability. But in Australia and around the world, prisons, lock-ups, and watch-houses are notorious places of official violence leading to injury and death. NO State can ever claim total innocence about incidents past, present, or future. The State knows acts of official violence, up to and including murder, are attempted in places of incarceration – and some of those attempts are successful.

Killing innocent Martin Bryant was promoted by the media and by members of the public from 1996 onwards. In 2015, News Corporation Australia (NCA) published despicable images (allegedly taken by Gary Ramage) with unproved allegations which again demonised innocent Martin Bryant. Here are some of the Internet comments that NCA incited from the public, comments which the then attorney-general, minister for justice, and minister for corrections in Tasmania (Vanessa Goodwin) ignored: "Burn him alive"; "Firing squad"; "Give him a bullet"; "Injection soon"; "...inmates should knock him"; "Just shoot him"; "Kill him"; *etc.*

Through their inaction, mongrel officials ignored and/or abetted hatred toward Martin Bryant. The State knew it had the responsibility to protect Martin for 24 hours a day, every day of every year – **a responsibility it failed to fulfill**. It seems that in 2016, Martin was moved from the Wilfred Lopes Centre with its high internal security into the main buildings at the Risdon Prison complex where internal security for inmates is lower. The opportunity for someone (official or inmate) to kill Martin was thus greatly increased.

Martin Bryant was falsely convicted then wrongly imprisoned by the State. His death in prison was NOT natural because his whole life after April 1996 was controlled by the State, which determined how and where he was to live – and to die. Martin Bryant was innocent and should never have been in any prison in Tasmania or in any other part of Australia. His killing whilst in the care of the State was predictable. For his death, there is NO doubt the State is to blame. ■

1967–20**

– MARTIN BRYANT –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



CORONIAL POST-MORTEM

NOW MARTIN BRYANT IS DEAD, a coroner of the magistrates' court of Tasmania is required by law to inquire into his death as "the deceased was being held in care or custody at the time of death." (see magistratescourt.tas.gov.au/divisions/coronial/coronial_process) Note that an inquiry – also called an investigation – is NOT an inquest. An inquiry can be a superficial process in which the facts recorded are minimal, and conclusions are wilfully incomprehensive and/or benign. This is what is acknowledged on the above identified website: "In the vast majority of cases, the Coroner concludes the investigation with a written Finding prepared 'in chambers' without the need* for a formal inquest at which sworn evidence is taken in court from witnesses who can be cross-examined." (* This can always be corrupted by political pressure.)

The coroner who conducts the inquiry/investigation into the death of Martin Bryant will do everything he/she can to truncate and terminate that process to ensure there is no inquest. And the same coroner is NOT, under Tasmanian legislation, required to have a post-mortem (autopsy) conducted provided the cause of death is (allegedly) known. Have NO doubt the State will find some physician to sign the necessary documents declaring the cause of death – direct cause and antecedent causes – was benign. Martin will probably be blamed for his own death with the cause being listed as heart infarct (direct cause) with obesity and inactivity (antecedent causes) being listed. Alternatively, a *brain haemorrhage* from some alleged fight or fall will be used to complete the form. As for manner of death (natural, accidental, suicidal, or homicidal), it is **highly unlikely** to be recorded on any official document.

With reference to a complete*, three-cavity, post-mortem, such a procedure is **highly unlikely** to be performed. If such a coronial post-mortem is conducted, the findings will NOT be made public and it is **highly unlikely** that Martin's mother Carleen Bryant will be provided with the detailed findings. (* Necessitates testing for poisons – which includes prescription medications because intentional excess dosages may have been given to Martin to induce his death.)

NO official details related to the killing of Martin Bryant and the subsequent coronial inquiry/investigation can be readily accepted as the truth. In MY STORY (pp. 153-154), Martin's mother writes she was told his medical records were NOT available at Risdon Prison in 2009 – those records "disappeared." So whatever mind-altering drugs and in what quantities were pushed into Martin between 1996 and 2009 are NOT going to become public knowledge. And you can bet big money that Mrs. Bryant and the public are never going to be told what mind-altering drugs and in what quantities were pushed into innocent Martin from 2009 until the time of his death.

The inquest related to the official massacre in Tasmania in 1996 was wrongly terminated. This termination was abetted by the prime minister of Australia (see MONGRELS IMPLICATED) and is confirmed by a letter (31 JAN 1997) which the chief coroner's delegate Ian R. Matterson sent to Stephen Howard, a Port Arthur Historic Site employee whose dear wife was fatally shot inside the café near the inoperable emergency door. Matterson confirms the cover-up by the State: "...any finding I make must not be inconsistent with the decision of the Supreme Court." (see MASS MURDER; 2014: p. 252) Matterson knew his findings would be inconsistent with the decision made by the so-called court ("guilty"; 19 NOV 1996) – so he terminated the inquest. ■

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



MONGRELS IMPLICATED

AVERY, John

corrupt & criminal ex-lawyer

perverted course of justice

refused NOT guilty plea of Martin Bryant – his client; coerced him to accept Avery's plea of guilty; did NOT present exculpatory evidence

**SENIOR OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE
FOR KILLING MARTIN BRYANT**



BARNS, Greg

corrupt officer of supreme court; Tasmanian BAR member

unethical inhuman neglect

made accurate statements about Martin Bryant's legal rights but did NOT act on Bryant's false conviction and wrongful imprisonment



BEARD, Matthew

moral (*sic*) philosopher (human & soc sciences, UniNSW, Canberra)

incited hatred and killing

wrote and had published a demonising article encouraging readers to accept illegal assisted suicide (official killing) of Martin Bryant (IQ of 66)



BUGG, Damian

corrupt prosecutor

perverted course of justice

did NOT present exculpatory evidence; presented nonsensical never proved assertions as truths; refused NOT guilty of Martin Bryant

**SENIOR OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE
FOR KILLING MARTIN BRYANT**



COX, William

corrupt so-called judge

perverted course of justice

did NOT conduct a trial as required by Tasmanian law; convicted and imprisoned mentally-incompetent Martin Bryant NOT proved guilty

**SENIOR OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE
FOR KILLING MARTIN BRYANT**



GOODWIN, Vanessa

corrupt attorney-general, minister (justice), minister (corrections)

nonfeasance

did NOT acknowledge petition (2000+ signatures); ignored exculpatory evidence; ignored danger Martin Bryant faced in official care



1967–20**

– MARTIN BRYANT –


KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

GUNSON, David (aka *Brawler*)

corrupt and gutless lawyer

nonfeasance

accepted but then refused to defend Martin Bryant – his client – who Gunson unethically abandoned with NO explanation to anyone



HOWARD, John

corrupt politician (former prime minister); lawyer; sycophant

abetted the crime

for personal political reasons publicly encouraged Tasmanian officials NOT to allow legislatively required investigative & judicial procedures



RIGBY, Debra

corrupt lawyer

nonfeasance

with NO thorough investigation & NO hard evidence & NO legal guardian present, did NOT object to confused, hospitalised, opiated (3rd-degree burns) low-intellect Martin Bryant – her client – being charged within c.24 hours



SARRE, Rick

corrupt academic (law, UniSA, Adelaide SA)

inciting hatred

knowing NO trial was conducted, wrote and had published unproved assumptions demonising Martin Bryant thereby inciting public hatred



TENNENT, Shan Eve

corrupt judge

unethical inhuman neglect

did NOT acknowledge a documented concern and request related to Martin Bryant being held incommunicado at Risdon Prison in Tasmania



WEISBROT, David

corrupt media regulator (Australian Press Council, Sydney)

nonfeasance [failed to stop false image usage]

did NOT act against media in Australia which published demonising images of and unproved assumptions about innocent Martin Bryant



WHITE, Jennifer

corrupt and gutless officer of supreme court; Tasmanian BAR member

unethical inhuman neglect

sub-committee chair of Prisoners Legal Service (advisory program) who knew Martin Bryant's dangerous situation but who did NOT assist him



etc.

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



BODY DISPOSAL

WHAT WILL THEY DO WITH MARTIN'S BODY – his dead body which proves their guilt?

Will they return it in a long box to his mother and sister – with their official but heartlessly cold condolences? Will they slip it out of Risdon Prison in the dark of night in their 22-body mortuary truck headed off to the likes of corrupt embalmer Stephen Parry and undertakers Nelson Brothers? (*MASSACRE: Stephen Shane Parry*; notice to Senate of Australia; 2016. see RESOURCES) Or will they burn it and dispose of the ashes in some secret process hoping to prevent his grave from becoming a flowered shrine on Facebook – to official cruelty, injustice, and corruption in Australia?

But really, it doesn't matter. Because regardless of whether the body of Martin Bryant is buried or burnt he is now a martyr to truth – the indelible truth which the mongrels will never erase regardless of how hard they try.

NO official act or statement will ever hide, disguise, or excuse the cruelty and injustice inflicted on innocent Martin Bryant and his family – and on the 58 victims killed and wounded at the official massacre at and near Port Arthur in Tasmania in 1996, and on all the families, relatives, and friends of those victims. Like the massacre, this cruelty and injustice are official crimes. ■

MARTIN BRYANT WAS INNOCENT

"THE MONSTROUSNESS of this crime is precisely what prevents many people from rationally considering the evidence, for even to do so one risks being judged as excusing the crime. The evidence directly implicating Martin Bryant is nonexistent, so, instead the case against Bryant (which was never formally put because there was no trial) largely centres on supposed facts."

**James Sinnamon
candobetter.net
11 APR 2010**

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



STATE STIGMATA

MARTIN BRYANT WAS A PATSY. He was set up then blamed – the proof is documented and extensive – for the official massacre at and near Port Arthur. The official narrative is a blatant lie. Hard facts which incriminate mongrel officials will NOT go away regardless of their attempts to disavow their guilt related to the massacre, the cover-up of that massacre, the false conviction and wrongful imprisonment of innocent Martin Bryant, and his killing. Some of the indelible stigmata of the State are:

DECEPTIVE BALASKO VIDEO

THREE MONTHS AFTER the official massacre, a James Balasko appeared at a New Jersey (USA) police station. He claimed he had a video of the Port Arthur gunman. But he had NOT said a word about any video to any official when allegedly he was at Port Arthur in April 1996. Martin Bryant is NOT recorded on this fake evidence: all facial features of the alleged gunman are blurred; the hair (possibly a wig) is too long and straight for the person to be Martin Bryant; *etc.*

1. NO trial;
2. NO inquest;
3. NO public enquiry;
4. NO royal commission;
5. NO DNA-related evidence;
6. NO GSR (gunshot residue) found on Martin Bryant;
7. NO credible official explanation for any significant part of the incident;
8. NO competent and committed legal defence provided for Martin Bryant;
9. NO explanation for the black van photographed parked outside the Broad Arrow Café;
10. NO explanation for the cartridge case said to have been found beneath a Mikac child body;
11. NO complete list of evidential items – bottle of tomato sauce; handcuffs; handgun; infra-red sighting scope; marijuana, video camera; *etc.*;
12. NO official identification of "Tiger" who, eyewitness Petra Willmott wrote in one of her statements, disturbed/intimidated Martin Bryant;
13. NO credible explanation for the existence of a 22-body refrigerated mortuary vehicle in little Tasmania – the only such vehicle in all of Australia;
14. NO credible firearm evidence (acquisition, calibers, makes, ownership, quantities, storage prior to massacre, transportation to Port Arthur, *etc.*);
15. NO fingerprints – NOT even from the yellow Volvo, food tray, cutlery, metal drink (Solo) can, sports bag, video camera all of which a/the gunman handled then left behind;
16. NO credible timeline – based on written witness statements, Martin Bryant could NOT have been at all the places that he was said to have been at the times official alleged;
17. NO explanation of the footwear worn by the gunman/men – in writing, eyewitnesses reported Blundstone boots, grey-blue Nikes, lace-up boots, and white sandals;

18. NO explanation for why Debra Jane Buckley, who wrote she was c.30 metres from a/the gunman, did NOT hear a firearm discharge when the three Mikacs were allegedly shot;
19. NO explanation for absence of Tasmania Police at the historic site after the shooting which commenced just before 1:30pm – armed police in numbers did NOT arrive until 7:30pm;
20. NO explanation why allegedly Martin Bryant, who did NOT use drugs, would buy marijuana from two strangers after repairing their vehicle which Martin Bryant could NOT have done;
21. NO credible proof Michael Mick/*Rick* Dyson of Tasmania Police was/is innocent. His statement, given **139 days after the massacre**, is highly suggestive of his negative involvement;

COERCED CONFESSION

CHESTER PORTER QC, one of the more renowned lawyers Australia has ever produced, says the following in his insightful *THE CONVICTION OF THE INNOCENT* (see RESOURCES): "The point is that even if a confession is accurately recorded and completely voluntary, it may be false.... If a person has an IQ of seventy, it is not difficult for experienced detectives[officials] to persuade him of her to confess to almost anything." (p.19) Mentally-handicapped Martin Bryant had an even lower IQ of 66.

22. NO explanation for the highly accurate lethal shooting inside the café which an Australian military expert (Brigadier *Ted* Serong) confirmed could NOT have been done by Martin Bryant;
23. NO proof Martin Bryant burnt the BMW vehicle or Seascope cottage – evidence suggests that Martin (drugged or unconscious) was left in that cottage to be killed by being burnt to death;
24. NO explanation of the statement made by the police negotiator Terry McCarthy who said he thought *Jamie* "was reading from some sort of script" when they spoke over the phone;
25. NO credible proof Gerard Dutton of Tasmania Police was/is innocent. Analysis of his declaration reveals numerous highly questionable points arising from his ballistic **suppositions**;
26. NO explanation for the *permission to shoot* request from constable Pat Allen being answered with *do not shoot this has to happen* as broadcast on the intercepted Tasmanian Emergency Services radio;
27. NO explanation for the special embalming equipment "manufactured ready for the incident" by Nelson Brothers, funeral directors in Victoria as confirmed in writing (see RESOURCES) by Stephen Shane Parry;
28. NO explanation why suspicious Robert & Helene Salzmann (ASIO/CIA/MOSSAD handlers?) waited for a/the gunman at the tollbooth then went and sat inside the yellow Volvo which he drove there and spoke with him;
29. NO explanation how Martin Bryant, who had hair to his collar, could have had hair below his shoulders and down to his chest during the massacre which is what several eyewitnesses reported in writing (see RESOURCES);
30. NO explanation how a/the gunman in the café, who shot right-handed from the hip, could have been Martin Bryant who demonstrated to police (videoed by them) how he discharged a firearm left-handed from his shoulder;

31. NO explanation how Martin Bryant could have driven the gold-coloured BMW (plate/registration number DI 5858) away from the tollbooth given that vehicle had a manual-change gearbox which Martin could NOT operate;

32. NO official identification of the person(s) who covered the faces of the never-publicly-accounted-for bodies near the access road between the café and tollbooth as reported in writing by eyewitness Paul Anthony Cooper;

33. NO credible explanation for why the emergency door at the café was inoperable and could NOT be opened during the shooting which resulted in several people (employees & public) NOT being able to escape and thus being fatally shot;

NOT PROVED BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT

ROBERT N. MOLES declares the following *A STATE OF INJUSTICE* (see RESOURCES): "In criminal cases in Australia, the standard is proof of guilt 'beyond reasonable doubt.' This means that any doubts must be fully investigated in order to determine whether or not they are reasonable. A doubt cannot be regarded as unreasonable simply because someone* has determined that it would be inconvenient to explore that possibility. Such an attitude would be based on prejudice, which simply means that the issue has been 'prejudged.' All reasonable lines of inquiry must be pursued..." (p.xx) *eg, Damian Bugg and William Cox in Port Arthur case.

34. NO explanation for why eyewitness Gregory Keith Barnett, who wrote that, immediately after the shooting at the general store, he saw three bodies on the ground at the historic site tollbooth, but, did "not see any vehicles at all" there;

35. NO explanation for the gunshots recorded during conversations between police negotiator Terry McCarthy and *Jamie* – gunshots within Seascope cottage and deceptively described with the word "cough" (appears 22 times) on the official transcript;

36. NO explanation for all the yellow Volvos – with and without surfboards, with and without surfboard covers, and with different plate/registration numbers (CC 904?, CC 2835, CG 2835, CS 2835, DC ????) – seen at and near the Port Arthur Historic Site;

37. NO identification of the person who allegedly sold "guns" to Martin Bryant – it was NOT the Tasmanian gunshop proprietor Terry Hill, who mongrel lawyer John Avery wrote and attempted to intimidate (see Avery's letter to Hill: p. 31);

38. NO identification of a/the gunman reported by the eyewitness John Douglas Rooke who wrote in his statement that he was shot at by a slightly-built man about 5 foot 5 inches in height with "short mousy coloured hair with a full-faced beard that was light in colour";

39. NO explanation of how (type of payment?) Martin Bryant acquired the ammunition (allegedly thousands of rounds) and firearms (allegedly over 30) and where it was all hidden (allegedly) from Carleen Bryant, Petra Willmott, and his neighbours, NOT one of whom ever saw anything;

40. NO explanation how mentally-handicapped Martin Bryant could recall correctly the number of a passport during the middle of the so-called siege at Seascope (the siege that did NOT take place), but was unable to recall the shorter plate/registration number of his own yellow Volvo;

41. NO credible identification – NO person knew he/she had seen Martin Bryant. They were told it was him and naively repeated that false official allegation. The only person (James/*Jim* Laycock) who knew Martin, and who saw a/the gunman, wrote that gunman was NOT Martin Bryant;

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

42. NO explanation why the four people (Mary Rose Nixon, Robert & Helene Salzmann, Russell James Pollard) – all of whom were allegedly fatally shot – had just the week before most probably met at or near Bilambil Heights / Ocean Shores / Brunswick Heads in northern NSW;

43. NO explanation for the naked, black-haired, woman who several Tasmania Police reported, in writing, screaming and running near Seascope around 6pm on Sunday 28 APR 1996 – it was NOT Sally Martin the grey-haired co-owner of that cottage who officials declared was killed much earlier around midday;

44. NO explanation for the three shots which several people reported were fired in front of the Clougha building (Port Arthur Historic Site) at 6:30pm (Sunday 28 APR 1996), shots which could NOT have been fired by Martin Bryant who at that time was officially inside Seascope cottage approximately three kilometres away;

45. NO explanation for the presence of two sports bags which eyewitnesses reported were carried by a/the gunman at the historic site – one bag was left in the café by a/the gunman, and a second sports bag was reported being carried from the café by a/the gunman who put it in the boot of a vehicle at the car park;

46. NO credible explanation for the shotgun pellet wounds – allegedly a shotgun was NOT discharged inside the café – reported by an historic site employee (first-aid instructor Wendy Scurr) and confirmed by Dr. Stephen Wilkinson of the Royal Hobart Hospital who stated the following: "wherever we looked we found pellets";

47. NO credible explanation for why so many pages of the interview transcript were redacted, deleted, or not presented at the hearing, which was NOT a trial: "We know that 52 of the first 146 pages of transcript were not presented." (A.R. *Tony Pitt*; http://southeastasianews.org/portarthur/conspiracy_fact.html; JUN 2016);

48. NO explanation for what happened to the rented (AVIS) red Commodore (plate/registration number DK 2661) which was **abandoned by the two highly suspicious Buckleys** (allegedly from New Zealand) at the tollbooth and which at some unidentified time was driven away by some unidentified person, quite possibly the first gunman. (see Points 34 & 50);

49. NO explanation for behaviour of Tasmanian cop Chris Iles who spoke with eyewitnesses near the general store, where the body of Zoe Hall was and from where Glen Pears was taken, but who then drove away and disappeared from that scene – subsequently, Iles did NOT submit a witness statement, or if he did the corrupt prosecutor did NOT present it to the corrupt judge;

50. NO explanation for the written statements made by two witnesses: 1. Steven Howard – site employee said the following about a/the gunman he saw **before the shooting** at the café: "He looked slightly disheveled, like someone would look at the end of the day rather than the beginning of the day. He also appeared to me to be slightly dazed or perhaps slightly anxious"; 2. Debra Rabe (site guest said the following about a/the gunman she saw at the general store **after the shooting** at the café, at the car park, along the access road, and at the tollbooth: "I remember he was very neat and well-groomed." **Strongly suggests there were two gunmen.**

N.B. In the very true words of Andrew S. MacGregor, a former cop (VIC) and case investigator: "Martin Bryant was totally betrayed by the Tasmanian judicial system." (*A Question of Guilt*) ■

1967–20**
– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
WRONGLY & CRUELLY CONDEMNED BY MEDIA

"AUSTRALIANS will again be told lies about Port Arthur in Tasmania by Channel 7 this Sunday 6th [March 2016]. Saying the shooting incident that took place there in April 1996 is 'Australia's worst massacre' is absolute hype. Many massacres in Australia have resulted in more people being killed. The truth about the official killing at Port Arthur has been covered up by complicit officials who have denied truth and justice to all the families, relatives, and friends of the victims. It is the corrupt official narrative that Channel 7 will broadcast again. Mainstream media deception continues."

Martin Bryant Show By Channel 7 Sunday Night Will Not Tell The Truth About Port Arthur
cairnsnews.org
4 MAR 2016

"AS THE DOCUMENTARY [*A Question of Guilt: The Massacre at Port Arthur*] shows, there are *compelling* reasons for believing Martin Bryant's conviction and jailing were a cruel miscarriage of justice.... The Port Arthur saga is – in part – a story about the media. *En bloc*, Australia's mass media quickly embraced the orthodoxy that Martin Bryant was guilty of committing the atrocity, that he acted alone – and that these 'facts' are not in serious doubt. The media also promoted the view that anyone who *does* doubt these 'established facts' is likely to be a disgruntled shooting enthusiast, who may themselves be deranged and dangerous."

The Port Arthur Massacre: A Sceptical Re-Appraisal
sydwalker.info
17 DEC 2010

"WITH THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS about the Murdoch News Media and their proven ability to **influence people through lies and distortions** in other stories of late, we hope to broaden sympathy for an inquiry into the deaths of the 35 people at Port Arthur at the hands of **an unknown killer still at large**. It is not true that the Murdoch corruption has not extended to this country. I have been aware of it since the Lindy Chamberlain trials during which the media refused to report aboriginal women's evidence that dingos had taken their children too and so convinced the public that she had lied. Recent deaths of children being taken by dingos proves that the media were negligent in their reporting and contributed to the wrongful jailing of an innocent woman. The two media magnates who were responsible for the reporting of the Port Arthur massacre illegally entered Bryant's home and stole photographs from his kitchen table while he was in hospital and the house was marked off as a crime scene. They enhanced photos of him to make him look like a madman and then they were published before Bryant had even been interrogated by police. The Murdoch and Fairfax press were relentless to defame Bryant while at the same time ignoring evidence and obviously displaying dereliction of duty in finding the real killer."

Murdoch Media Proved To Be Corrupt in Court
members.iinet.net.au/~nedwood/Pam06.html#murdock
23 JUN 2016

WITHIN 24 HOURS of the massacre at and near Port Arthur, media were pushing the official narrative Martin Bryant was guilty. Within 48 hours, an image stolen from his home was published nationwide. The Australian altered this image making Martin look maniacal. That newspaper later apologised. Almost completely and immediately, the public was duped into believing mentally-handicapped (IQ of 66) Martin was solely responsible for the entire massacre. Ever since, this false never-proved allegation has been broadcast by corrupt media – via mongrels like Mike Bingham, Stan Grant, Derryn Hinch, Paola Totaro, Robert Wainwright, Mike Willesee, etc. ■

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



RIGHTS IGNORED

DURING THE WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT OF MARTIN BRYANT, successive governments in Tasmania and the media ignored guidelines, principles, standards, *etc.* related to incarcerated individuals. Before being killed, Martin was displayed at Risdon Prison and demonised nationally and internationally. Note the following extracts from the identified sources. (For a detailed exposition read *Submission Document to Australian Press Council*; 2015. see RESOURCES)

AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

Prisoners and Human Rights

"One right of special importance to prisoners is the right to be treated with humanity, dignity and respect while in detention. This human right is set out in articles 7 and 10 of the ICCPR, article 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and in the Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT)."

INDEPENDENT MEDIA COUNCIL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PRINT & ONLINE PRINT MEDIA PUBLISHERS

"PUBLICATIONS must take all reasonable steps to ensure reports are honest, accurate, balanced and fair and disclose all essential facts. **Reports must not suppress relevant available facts or give distorting emphasis.** Where a report disparages any person or organisation, all reasonable steps must be taken to provide a contemporaneous right of reply. Where a contemporaneous reply is not possible, publications should provide an opportunity for a suitably prominent response at the first opportunity. Reports should not refer to personal characteristics, including race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, family relationships, religious belief, or physical or intellectual disability, or mental illness, unless they are relevant. Publications should use fair, responsible and honest means to obtain material and **should not exploit a person's vulnerability** or ignorance of media practice." (added emphasis; extract downloaded 16 JUN 2016)

www.independentmediacouncil.com.au/code-of-conduct.html

AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Rights of People with Disabilities: Areas of Need for Increased Protection

SCHEDULE 4: DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF MENTALLY-RETARDED PEOPLE

"6. The mentally-retarded person has a right to protection from exploitation, abuse and degrading treatment. If prosecuted for any offence, he shall have a right to due process of law with full recognition being given to his degree of mental responsibility."

AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Rights of People with Disabilities: Areas of Need for Increased Protection

SCHEDULE 5: DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF DISABLED PERSONS

"10. Disabled persons shall be protected against all exploitation, all regulations and all treatment of a discriminatory, abusive or degrading nature." (see Insert above)

1967–20**

– MARTIN BRYANT –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

AUSTRALIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

Medical Ethics in Custodial Settings 2013. Amended 2015.

"This statement provides the AMA's policy on ethical issues related to prisoners and detainees in custodial settings including body cavity searches, hunger strikes, solitary confinement and protective custody, restraints, torture, cruel, or inhumane treatment and capital punishment.

"**1.1** Prisoners and detainees have a right to humane treatment, regardless of the reasons for their imprisonment, and should be treated with respect for their human dignity and privacy. They should never be denied treatment on the basis of their culture, ethnicity, religion, political beliefs, gender, sexual orientation, the nature of their illness, the reason for their incarceration, or their criminal history.

"**1.4** Governments and prison authorities have a duty of care to all prisoners and detainees under their control, including those in private correctional facilities. Governments must provide basic humane standards and should strive to achieve world's best practice in all Australian correctional facilities including police custody, prison, juvenile detention centres, and other custodial settings...."

AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL

Standards of Practice; 1 JUL 1987

Guidelines Identifying a Person with an Intellectual Disability

"The Press Council believes that normally the identification of someone as a person with an intellectual disability is undesirable.... There may be circumstances which justify the identification of a person with an intellectual disability, but newspapers should consider carefully the reasons for publication and the possible consequences [DEATH for Bryant]; every consideration should be given to the privacy of the person, their parents and relatives, and those who look after them."

CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT 1984 (ratified by Australia on 8 AUG 1989)

Part 1, Article 16

"**1.** Each State Party shall undertake to prevent in any territory under its jurisdiction other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture as defined in article 1, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. In particular, the obligations contained in articles 10, 11, 12 and 13 shall apply with the substitution for references to torture of references to other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

"**2.** The provisions of this Convention are without prejudice to the provisions of any other international instrument or national law which prohibits cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment or which relates to extradition or expulsion."

STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR CORRECTIONS IN AUSTRALIA

revised 2012; accepted by Department of Justice, Tasmania

Guiding Principles for the Management of Prisoners (p.15)

"Correctional services in Australia seek to improve and maintain safety of and confidence in the correctional system by managing prisoners consistently and with reference to the guiding principles that prisoners are:

1. Managed and contained in a safe, secure, humane manner." ■

1967–20**

– **MARTIN BRYANT** –

KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA

MARTIN BRYANT WAS INNOCENT

Supreme Court of Tasmania
website clearly states:

"People accused of serious offences, such as murder, manslaughter and serious drug offences, are dealt with in the Supreme Court after preliminary hearings have been conducted in the Magistrates' Court.

If there is a plea of not guilty, then a jury will decide whether the defendant is guilty or not guilty."

But in the Port Arthur massacre case, the **NOT GUILTY** plea of Martin Bryant was illegally refused.

He was kept isolated for over six months, which is torture and thus illegal, and coerced to accept the guilty plea of the state-paid mongrel lawyer John Avery. There was:

NO trial

NO inquest

NO public enquiry

NO royal commission

TRUTH and JUSTICE

have not been served to the families, relatives, and friends of all the victims, and mentally-handicapped

Martin Bryant

has been killed in custody after serving over 20 years in prison for **crimes he did not commit.**

1967–20**
– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



PRAYER

[T]o offer my condolence and sorrow to all of those affected on 28 April 1996, I placed a prayer in The Mercury newspaper in Hobart.

**TO all of humanity affected by the agony
resulting from the horror inflicted on innocence
at Port Arthur,
one deeply traumatic year ago.**

**Of all people, I weep with you –
with your bitter tears, with our suffering tears
and with unique, unshareable tears of my own.**

**With you, I am worn out with grief.
But we can try to live above it.
Let us encourage one another by showing love.
God is like that.**

**He gives us the love we want to share.
Hate can be overcome with love.
As we have compassion and express it
in practical ways, we will feel our self being healed.**

**To overcome our tragedy, our best chance is
to look forward with hope and overcome evil
with the goodness which comes to us from God.**

**Seeking healing with you.
With all my compassion and love.**

CARLEEN BRYANT – 1997

From that day to this, my prayer is always the same.

THIS PRAYER and prose above are from the heart, a mother's loving heart. Mrs. Bryant has NOT covered over failings nor has she dissembled as so many officials in Australia have done in relation to the case that involved her mentally-handicapped son. Mrs. Bryant has raised concerns and questions which should have been addressed and answered long ago. (see her book *My Story*; 2010) Much is terribly wrong – **so many people have been made to suffer.**

Now innocent Martin Bryant has been killed in custody. Objective readers who analyse the many hard facts will realise corrupt officials first manipulated a *boy-man*, then the public, to ensure more control of the populace long desired by the evil State. Since April 1996, the Truth has not been revealed. And contrary to Gordon Hewart's famous legal dictum (*Law Reports King's Bench Division* vol.1; 1924: p.259) – **Justice has NOT been done and it is seen NOT to be done.** ■

1967–20**
– **MARTIN BRYANT** –
KILLED IN CUSTODY, TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA



RESOURCES

AUDIO

- Keith Allan Noble. *Martin Bryant Is Innocent!*; fairdinkumradio.com; 21 MAR 2013.
- Keith Allan Noble. *Why Martin Bryant Could Not Have Carried Out the 1996 Port Arthur Massacre*; Richie Allen Show; richieallen.podomatic.com; 3 MAR 2016.

AUDIO-VISUAL

- *A Question of Guilt – The Massacre at Port Arthur*; youtube.com; JUL 2014.
- Cherri Bonney. *Wish I Knew How To Be Free* (dedicated to Martin Bryant); youtube.com, 2016.
- Greeley. *Question of Guilt*; on Apple Isle Child; iTunes, youtube.com; 2014.
- *Port Arthur Anniversary Uncovered*; cairnsnews.org; APR 2016.

PETITION

- Cherri Bonney. *Martin Bryant Deserves a Coronial Inquest and For All Our Sakes*; change.org; 2016.

PRINT & WEBSITES

- Stewart K. Beattie. *A GUNSMITH'S NOTEBOOK ON PORT ARTHUR*; 400 pp, DVD book; 2006.
- Carleen Bryant. *MY STORY*; 194 pp, ludekepublishing.com.au; 2010.
- A.J. Kierath. JUN 2016. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/PortArthurEnquiry/>
- Andrew S. MacGregor. *DECEIT AND TERRORISM: Port Arthur*; 1040 pp, DVD book; 2001-4.
- Mary Maxwell & Dee McLachlan. *PORT ARTHUR: Enough is Enough*; 288 pp; 2016. free download: <https://gumshoenews.com/>
- Robert N. Moles. *A STATE OF INJUSTICE*; 319 pp, Lothian Books; bookfinder.com; 2004.
- Keith Allan Noble. *Deception & Lies Presented to Australians*; 2 pp, summary of predicted facts not presented on 6 MAR 2016 to the people of Australia by Channel 7 (Sunday Night); 2 MAR 2016. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Keith Allan Noble. *Emails* (related to Matthew Beard whose demonizing writing appeared on vice.com; 7 & 25 May 2016. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Keith Allan Noble. *MASSACRE: Stephen Shane Parry*; 1 p, notice to Senate of Australia; 5 MAR 2016. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Keith Allan Noble. *Show Cause Notice*; 1 p, served on senator Stephen Parry (TAS-LIB); 24 FEB 2016. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Keith Allan Noble. *LEAKED DOCUMENTS: Statements of Port Arthur Massacre Witnesses Leaked from DPP Office....*; 112 pp; 2015. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Keith Allan Noble. *Submission Document to Australian Press Council*; 21 pp, relates to News Corp Australia articles and images inciting hatred & killing; 22 SEP 2015. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Keith Allan Noble. *20 YEARS CORRUPTION, DECEPTION, LIES: Official Mass Murder, Port Arthur, Tasmania*; 50 pp; 29 APR 2016. free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Stephen Parry. *Port Arthur Massacre – AFDA National Embalming Team – Detailed Report*; in *PORT ARTHUR SEMINAR PAPERS: A record of the Port Arthur Seminar, 11-12 MAR 1997*; pp. 104-119, Melbourne, VIC (ISBN 0642271364). free pdfs: murder.research@gmail.com
- Chester Porter. *THE CONVICTION OF THE INNOCENT: How The Law Can Let Us Down*; 287 pp, Random House Australia; 2007.
- Ned Wood. JUN 2016. members.iinet.net.au/~nedwood/Pam06.html ■

SUBMISSION TO AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL

THE FOLLOWING 21 pages are a document (27SEP2015) distributed after false images of innocent Martin Bryant kept appearing in the media, in videos, and on the internet in Australia. In these images, the eyes and gaze are exaggerated creating a maniacal appearance. Such deception strengthens the official narrative that the gunman at Port Arthur was a *lone-nut*. The misuse of these images **incites the public to hate INNOCENT Martin Bryant and to wish he be killed**. One user of such an image has been The Australian newspaper, which did apologize in print on 1 MAY 1996. Regardless, these false images have been broadcast, published, used publicly, *etc.* since 1996 until the present day. (search the internet) It seems there is not one bit of evidence confirming the Australian Press Council initiated action against or cautioned any party responsible for using these cruel images. Today, the internet is saturated with them. It can only be concluded that the Australian Press Council is quite content to allow the internet, the media, the public, *etc.* to use false images which knowingly have the effect of inciting the killing of a human being. That Messrs Pender and Weisbrot ignored this misuse at the ongoing expense of an innocent *boy-man* is completely unacceptable. (*Submission to APC* free pdf copies BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net)

Below is yet another example of the hate and desire for INNOCENT Martin Bryant to be killed, which is incited throughout Australia by the media using false images, a corrupt official narrative, and the likes of **Jacqui Lambie**. It seems this cruel, hate-filled, loud-mouth was once a senator for Tasmania, confirming the worst about that misled state.

***"That Martin Bryant,
he should have had
a round in his head."***



Jacqui Lambie

in article by
Ilaria Brophy
www.dailymail.co.uk
17 January 2019

Lambie's first employment was with the Australian Defence Force (motto: *Conditioned to Hate, Trained to Kill, Drugged to Forget*). After that mindless stint, this writer believes Lambie is capable of using a F88 rifle and firing a round through that *boy-man*'s skull. To Ms. Lambie, **murdering Martin Bryant** is the right thing to do. ■

John PENDER – Executive Director
David WEISBROT AM – Chairman &
Professor Emeritus, University of Sydney
AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL (APC)
info@presscouncil.org.au
t. 61-2-92611930

27 September 2015
27 January 2019 (amended)

News Corp Australia
SUBMISSION ACCOMPANYING COMPLAINT
AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL

Dear Mr. PENDER, Dear Prof. WEISBROT,

Thank you for your attention to this submission which accompanies an official complaint **related to newspaper and website articles published this month by News Corp Australia.**

This 21-page submission focuses on the cruelty, inaccuracy, and unethicalness of newspaper and website articles which demonize an individual and incite hatred against that person, and which might encourage an act of fatal violence by an official or inmate of Risdon Prison who has not been told the truth about the massacre (28 APR 1996) at Port Arthur in Tasmania.

These articles by News Corp Australia are blatant and outrageous. Thus, this submission will be distributed throughout Australia and around the world. Inciting hatred of a person possibly leading to the death of that person is unacceptable to moral people. Please note your reply detailing the corrective action taken will also be circulated throughout Australia and internationally. If the APC fails to reply detailing such action, then it will be declared an unethical and deceptive body. Such failure will be publicly and ongoingly associated with the cover-up of the official killing and wounding at Port Arthur. (How involved was ASIO in all of this?)

People in Australia have told me that no action in relation to this complaint and submission will be taken by the APC. It certainly seems that News Corp Australia publications can and do publish whatever they want related to the massacre at Port Arthur. And this is not some new development. Back on 30 APR 1996, The Australian front-paged an image it had manipulated which made the victim appear deranged. And even though The Australian quickly apologized for publishing this false image, the article headed **Face of a Killer** continues to deceive the public and promote hatred.* (It seems no APC action was ever taken against The Australian.)

And where one newspaper goes, others follow. On 19 DEC 2010, the Sunshine Coast Daily (not a News Corp Australia newspaper) published a hit-piece article inciting hatred, and it too was accompanied by a manipulated image which made the same subject appear maniacal. (* See dates and descriptions on p.139 of: Kyla McFarlane. *Tear*; in Anna Smith & Lydia Wevers eds. Victoria University Press on Display: New Essays in Cultural Studies; 2004: pp. 130-150.)

It seems APC has no interest in curtailing cruel, inaccurate, and unethical journalism related to the Port Arthur massacre and related matters. And if this is true, then the **APC is complicit.**

(cont. p. lxiv)

SPECIFIC ARTICLES

The following articles appear in newspapers and/or on websites owned, controlled, and/or used by News Corp Australia and its publications. (note this listing is not complete)

1. *Martin Bryant: The life behind bars of Australia's worst killer*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 12 SEP 2015 **The Advertiser**
2. *Monster on the inside*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **The Australian**
3. *Martin Bryant: A police officer on scene at the Port Arthur massacre says staff need to be protected from violent offenders*
Sarah Blake; »Senior Writer«; 14 SEP 2015 **The Courier-Mail**
4. *Monster on the inside*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **The Daily Telegraph**
5. *If you needed proof that Martin Bryant is a loser, you've got it*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 15 SEP 2015 **The Daily Telegraph**
6. *Mass murderer Martin Bryant is a danger to front line jail workers, says police officer instrumental in arresting him*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **Herald Sun**
7. *Martin Bryant: The life behind bars of Australia's worst killer*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **news.com.au**
8. *Mass murderer Martin Bryant is a danger to front line jail workers, says police officer instrumental in arresting him*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **NT News Facebook**
9. *Mass murderer Martin Bryant is a danger to front line jail workers, says police officer instrumental in arresting him*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **perthnow.com.au**
10. *If you needed proof that Martin Bryant is a loser, you've got it*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 15 SEP 2015 **RendezView**
11. *Martin Bryant attacked inmates, staff: report*
writer not revealed; 13 SEP 2015 **skynews.com.au**
12. *Bryant still a vile menace*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **Sunday Tasmanian**
13. *Mass murderer Martin Bryant is a danger to front line jail workers, says police officer instrumental in arresting him*
Sarah Blake, »Senior Writer«; 13 SEP 2015 **Sunday Times**

SPECIFIC WORDINGS

The following wordings have been taken from the articles listed in this submission. Each of the wordings is followed by an italicized comment (KAN).

»...a grossly overweight loner....«

In all the articles, there is no hard evidence or verifiable reference that the person identified in the articles and in the images [still & video] is actually Martin Bryant. Identification is one of the major never-resolved issues in the Port Arthur case and it continues in all these articles.

»[Barrister Greg] Barns is among a small section of the legal fraternity who question Bryant's representation at his emotion fuelled trial in 1996.«

*Sarah Blake either did not investigate, or she lied. She tells her readers that Martin Bryant had a trial which was fuelled by emotion. Well the truth is there was **NO TRIAL** – not in 1996 or at any time later. Three corrupt official mongrels (John Avery, Damian Bugg, William Cox) ensured there was nothing beyond a hearing. None of the witnesses who made written statements – there were over 100 – or Martin, or any other person gave evidence at a trial. Poor innocent Martin was arbitrarily condemned and is now dying in hell. **THIS IS A STATE CRIME.***

»Bryant has been involved in several assaults and was part of an attack in February that left a male nurse with a fractured jaw.«

What part (large part? small part? mere observer?) Martin Bryant played in this alleged attack is not revealed. This cruel statement is hearsay unsubstantiated by any reference and is unaccompanied by a name of a real person who could (would?) swear it was true.

»Bryant has wreaked a violent path through various wings of Hobart's sprawling jail, including vicious assaults on government staff and nurses.«

Again, this cruel statement is hearsay unsubstantiated by any reference and is unaccompanied by a name of a real person who could (would?) swear it was true.

»...Bryant stockpiled military grade automatic weapons.«

*There is no hard evidence confirming a stockpile of any weapons. This allegation is part of the official narrative which is corrupt, inaccurate, and deceptive. Martin Bryant's then girlfriend Petra Willmott declared the following in an official written statement dated 30 APR 1996: »I have never seen any firearms or ammunition at Martin's place.« The corrupt so-called expert Gerard Dutton made damning ballistic statements which were **NEVER PROVED** at a trial.*

»...he has also been known to pay other men with family blocks of chocolate in order to let him perform sexual services for them.« (sic)

Again, the so-called journalist has written hearsay which can never be verified by any member of the public – or at worst, the publications have lied to their readers.

»He was later described by experts as having the emotional and intellectual age of a five year old.«

Again no reference is given. No expert is named. If it is true, then the public is to accept the official incarceration, FOR LIFE, of a boy-man who the publications want the public to hate.

»...is drugged to point of being »almost a vegetable.« (sic)

It seems Martin Bryant has been drugged since 30 APR 1996. After he was apprehended, it was reported he had an IQ of 66 [retarded; what must it be now?] and he was functioning at a school-grade six level. It seems Bryant is officially and constantly drugged and the public is encouraged to hate him because he is now almost a vegetable.

»...one insider saying other prisoners would ›kill him in a spit if they could get him‹.«
Here the poison flows and the hate abounds. KILL HIM! KILL HIM! And the reference given for the source of this murderous statement is »...one insider.... « The content of this statement, which at best is hearsay and at worst a lie, cannot be proved or verified.

»Others talk of violent and unpredictable predator who targets the most vulnerable of his fellow inmates.«
And the reference given for the source of this statement is »...jailers.... « At best, this statement is hearsay and at worst a lie by the publication. It cannot be verified.

»Some jailers refer to him as Porky Pig....«
NO TRIAL and INCARCERATED FOR LIFE. An innocent human being of limited intelligence is struggling to hold on despite an appalling existence which Tasmania has forced upon him – and jailers laugh and call him Porky Pig. (God have mercy on your souls you mongrel screws.)

»...put the cost of Bryant's incarceration far higher than the \$2.2 million the state has so far spent housing and feeding him. Should he enjoy an average lifespan and live to 82 years, there will be at least another \$7.4 million spent on him.«
After having NO TRIAL and being incarcerated for life, Martin Bryant is now blamed for the costs of keeping him in a cage. His death [natural?] will be celebrated by the cost-savers.

»The fact is he's Martin Bryant, and in some circles, to kill Martin Bryant, well you could hold your head up.«
This murderous remark is said to have been made by Tony Bull, allegedly a former inmate. It is a good example of the outcome of the demonization of innocent Bryant, demonization which commenced even before he was left inside Seascope to be burnt alive on 29 APR 1996.

»...the images of a heavily-sedated lump who is wasting away....«
No compassion here. Sarah Blake has described a mentally-retarded human being, who has been wrongly imprisoned for 19 years and who is officially drugged, as a lump (of shit?).

»The last time we saw Martin Bryant, he looked like a fit, powerful young man. Now, he's a huge, middle aged, lonely and pathetic piece of work. An animal, caged in the prison where he will die.«
Here is hate unhidden. This so-called journalist knows nothing beyond the official narrative. Her failure to undertake a critical investigation is obvious. With investigative journalism on its last legs, her words confirm how bad things are with mainstream publications.

»...turned the weapons on both random strangers and those he believed had wronged him.«
There is no hard evidence that Martin Bryant shot any person at or near Port Arthur on the 28 or 29 APR 1996. NONE! There are however, written statements in which witnesses clearly declare that the shooter they saw at or near Port Arthur was NOT Martin Bryant. Only one person who was a witness personally knew him. And this witness – Jim Laycock – stated in writing that it was NOT Bryant. The same observation was also written by other witnesses. This conflicted with the official narrative so these witnesses were never called to give evidence. In fact no witness was ever allowed to give her/his evidence under oath during a trial.*

* For details of these statements plus the statements written by over 100 other witnesses of the Port Arthur incident see Part 7 (pp. 377-498) of MASS MURDER: Official Killing in Tasmania Australia. These statements given to Tasmania Police expose the corruptness of the official narrative. What is in the staggering witness statements – there are some real shockers from then members of Tasmania Police – is one reason why there was **NO TRIAL**. Martin Bryant was and is innocent beyond all reasonable doubt. But News Corp Australia will not tell you this.

SPECIFIC IMAGES

The following images have been taken from the articles listed in this submission. (Note that in its publication *Ethical Issues in Photojournalism*, the Centre for Journalism Ethics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison says: »Part 2 The development of long-range lens[es] and the demand for attention-grabbing photos combine to make privacy a major ethical issue....«)



TROUBLING CONCERNS ABOUT IMAGES

1. Most of the images are attributed to Gary Ramage. (image right) But not all images in all articles have an attribution. What images were taken as still images and what images were taken from a video is not clear. This is significant as different types of cameras are required for stills and videos. Attribution to Ramage does not clarify this difference.



2. Videos linked to articles contain images of a person alleged to be Martin Bryant to which Port Arthur incident related images have been added. Who supplied all the Port Arthur incident related imagery and who compiled the videos for News Corp Australia are not revealed.

3. In some of the articles it alleges the images were taken on public property, that is they were not taken whilst on Risdon Prison property or on Tasmanian government property: »From a vantage point on public land some 600m from Bryant’s exercise yard, we witnessed him....« It also states this in one of the articles: »The Mersey unit’s exercise yard is visible from a public reserve overlooking the jail, and it was from here that News Corp recorded the photos and video last Thursday [10 SEP 2015].« Now the stated distance is a guess. And what is not stated is the height of this vantage point above the ground level of the caged exercise yard in which the subject’s privacy was intruded upon with the camera lens. This is highly significant as any height above the ground level of said yard creates an angle – the person taking the image looks down at the yard, he/she does not look horizontally at the subject.

4. If images were taken on 10 SEP 2015, and were taken by Ramage, significant planning and travel were required. On au.linkedin.com, it states that he is a professional photographer with News Corp Australia and that he covers: »Australian federal politics in Parliament House.« Why expensive arrangements were made for Ramage to fly to Tasmania to take images there is highly dubious. News Corp Australia owns The Mercury newspaper in Hobart and it employs professional photographers there. How would Ramage know that the subject was going to be in that exercise yard on Thursday 10 SEP 2015? Ramage could not know with certainty – unless he had inside information that the subject would be in that yard on that date.

5. If images were taken on 10 SEP 2015 and were taken by Ramage – invading the subject’s privacy by making images of him for publication without the subject’s consent – then Ramage must have believed it was an ethical thing for him to do. If the subject is Martin Bryant, even News Corp Australia acknowledged in its articles that Bryant was mentally-incompetent.

6. If images were taken on 10 SEP 2015 and were taken by Ramage, those images were used to accompany cruel, inaccurate, and unethical articles published by News Corp Australia. All the articles are hit-pieces against Martin Bryant. They wilfully encourage hate against this mentally-incompetent person and have incited people in Australia to state Bryant should be killed: »Burn him alive.« This is a criminal offence in most parts of Australia. Was Ramage made aware his images were going to be used in a way that encourages the killing of Martin Bryant?

7. It seems not all images of the subject in the articles were taken from the public reserve some »600« metres from the Mersey unit’s exercise yard. Some images alleged to have been taken by Ramage show little or no angular distortion, as they should if taken from an elevated place. Said images seem right-angled, as if they were taken while Ramage(?) was on prison or government property looking horizontally/squarely at the subject. (note similar image of Ramage with cameras above) The possibility the images were manipulated electronically also exists. (not negated in the articles) Could these images be replicated, exactly as presented by News Corp Australia, with the same type of equipment as used by Ramage(?) on Thursday 10 SEP 2015?

(Original page amended 27 JAN 2019 to insert image of Gary Ramage.)

SPECIFIC INTERNET POSTS

The following posts appear on the website dailytelegraph.com.au and were downloaded on 24 SEP 2015. They appear in their entirety without any alteration, omission, or reordering. This writer has no knowledge of who these people/posters are.

Angie 1 day ago

»Sarah disgusting article a pack of lies and rubbish is it fun belittling someone who cannot speak? Name calling? Really, do yourself a favour and research the case then write a factual story about a man locked up for 18 years with no inquest no trial no evidence at all that he is guilty. It will take lots of courage and personal strength but I am sure you have what it takes to uncover the truth do it for all Australians.«

Jamie 8 days ago

»Ok Sarah so you read the paper the other day saw the story on Martin Bryant and now you are trying your hardest (not very imo) to write an interesting piece on him. Has anybody on this rendezview thingy actually done 'journalism 101'?«

Angie 1 day ago

»We want justice, a trial an inquest some evidence!! Otherwise free Martin.«

Ailsa 8 days ago

»@Sarah Blake...Just do a little research before putting your uneducated comments on paper for the public to read.....Start with the official police transcript of their interview with Martin Bryant.....Missing pages & missing paragraphs....Says it all I believe! And then do a bit more research....You never know you may learn the truth but you will never be permitted to publish the truth in any mainstream media....«

Angie 1 day ago

»Good on you for trying to lead these people to the truth. It's there in black and white for all to see now and thankfully a lot do but keep going drag as many as possible and don't give up on Martin fight on for the truth to be told about Port Arthur.«

James 9 days ago

»PM John Howard's powerful anti-gun laws and amnesty saw more than 600,000 weapons destroyed in the wake of the massacre. And yet nothing was ever investigated about the weapons used by him, that had been turned in to Vic police 2 years before during a gun buy back.«

Philip 7 days ago

»@James Breach [should be breech] blasts (highly unlikely) to both weapons supposedly used that day meant it was impossible to determine if the weapons at Seascapes were the weapons used at PA. Shots reported as late as 6pm at PA. Shots heard at Seascapes from other buildings while Bryant was in the main residence. No coronial inquest. That poor man has spent the last nineteen years in jail for a crime he knows nothing about.«

Angie 1 day ago

»Justice for Martin ! We want a trial!«

Glenn 10 days ago

»So you expect us to believe that Martin Bryant (someone with an IQ the equivalent of a child), was able to shoot 35 people using only 32 bullets, firing on the move from his right hip, and he's left handed? This kill ratio is better than the best of our SAS snipers, and you expect us to believe that!?!? The fact he's never shot anything more than a .22 doesn't count for anything? The fact he was never at Port Arthur (only Seascope cottage) doesn't make you question the official story? Shees, he didn't even get a trial, he was thrown straight in gaol! I suggest you wake up Sarah, and try writing an article with facts instead of blind emotion. Those who believe Martin Bryant committed a mass murder the likes of which our country's best shooters couldn't do themselves - you need to wake up and stop being sheep!«

Shane 9 days ago

»@Glenn I'm curious Glenn, If he didn't do it, who did? And why? And (assuming it involves a government conspiracy) why has no-one involved in the planning or execution of the crime ever spoken a word about it? And, finally, what does that mean for my neighbour who was at Port Arthur that day and actually saw Bryant with a gun? What did he actually see?«

Philip 7 days ago

»@Shane@Glenn Any eyewitness identification of Bryant would be deemed inadmissible as the media plastered his picture all over the papers (illegal) before any eyewitness statements were taken. Some eyewitnesses actually reported seeing him wearing the clothes in the pictures in the paper rather than what the gunman was wearing that day. Eyewitness statements are notoriously unreliable.«

Angie 1 day ago

»Research the case read the court transcripts it's all there your neighbor saw a blond haired man then Martin Bryant's face was across every newspaper front page in the world within days. How could he ever get a trial???? He had already been trialled by media and found guilty within hours!!! No need for a court room!!! He had no chance.«

Wynston 9 days ago

»@Glenn Right...«

Stephen 8 days ago

»@Glenn There was a pilot flying the rescue helicopters who reported taking fire while exiting the area. Interesting!«

Angie 1 day ago

»Glen you hit the nail on the head!! Wake up Australia and give Martin Bryant the trial he deserves then when you discover there is no evidence to convict him let him go!!! And say we are soooo sorry!! Convict the real gunmen now wouldn't that open a can of worms!! Sarah you should be ashamed of what you write with no research or fact behind it just a pack of lies but you may not know any better as so many Australians blindly believe what they are told to believe. Quite bizarre really. Please educate yourself in Martins case and publish a truly revealing truth on Port Arthur ... I don't think you'll ever be allowed to do that!!«

tina 10 days ago

»Everyone jumps up and down when sharks fatally attack / injure surfers and swimmers and call for them to be killed, yet vermin like this, who has taken 35 innocent lives and destroyed many families, we let live because it's inhumane to hang him or give him an injection. maybe this would be a better deterrent to ›young angry men‹ than showing a picture of a fat, lazy animal behind bars.«

Angie 1 day ago

»Tina please research the case before you as well want to be judge and executioner after you research this case let us know if you could still kill an innocent man.«

Damo 10 days ago

»Ummm I don't see any proof of anything other than the existence of an opinion. Have to do a bit better than that Sarah.«

Angie 1 day ago

»Well said damo just more media B S no facts except a man still waiting for a fair trial or any trial for that matter some 19 years later!! We have a lot to answer for as a society.«

Doug 10 days ago

»The mans stated goal was to break the mass killing record on that day . Now he basks in the knowledge he achieved that sick goal with perverted satisfaction at our taxpayer expense. Sounds like a great argument to bring back the noose for such elements.«

Glenn 10 days ago

»@Doug No mate, he never stated anything as such. If you honestly believe a mentally-handicapped young man can compile a better hit ratio than even our military's very best snipers, you need your head read. You're just another Sheeple.«

Angie 1 day ago

»Doug where was that ever stated? And by who? I suggest you research the case and educate yourself then start throwing stones. Don't believe everything you are told to believe. Use your own mind with all the knowledge you can find before you judge others.«

aron 10 days ago

»What a hollow article that photo is not proof of anything.«

Angie 1 day ago

»Yes it is a hollow article but all publicity is good publicity in this case it stops people from forgetting about a man who is sitting in a cage for 19 years with no trial no inquest and no evidence to convict him of anything except being an easy target. Come on Aussies demand the truth!!! Jump up and down. Demand an inquest!!!!«

McMickey 10 days ago

»ROT in prison... Never need to hear about him again...«

Glenn 10 days ago

»@McMickey Wow, strong words about a man that was never convicted of anything.«

Angie 1 day ago

»McMickey you have probably never even taken the time to investigate Martins case before you pass judgement. Like most others it's easier for you to live that way just keep being a sheep with your head under a rock and ignore the truth.«

Thomas 10 days ago

»Life has to have purpose to live. What purpose does an eternally caged person have? To kill him would be a breach of our fundamental beliefs in the sanctity of all human life. Is it any better to watch him die caged as a wild animal. There are about 7 billion persons on this planet. The cost of his incarceration would feed thousands waiting for him to die – that is his sole fate. Good luck!«

David 10 days ago

»So what's your point?«

Angie 1 day ago

»Thomas this is true but the fact remains he has never been proven guilty of anything no trial no inquest no dna no hope!! He should not be rotting away. Give him a trial then decide on facts guilty or innocent one very interesting trial!!!!!!«

The following appalling and murderous posts are from FACEBOOK (dailytelegraph/videos). They are presented here (alphabetically, unaltered, downloaded 24 SEP 2015) to reveal the vicious mindless hatred toward innocent Martin Bryant – hate that News Corp Australia has fuelled throughout the nation. Inciting hatred – evidenced by these posts on the internet about ending Martin Bryant's life – is a criminal offence in most parts of Australia. This writer has no knowledge of who the people/posters are.

Raye J AbooChoochy

»I quite like the idea of him just rotting in that cell. Capital punishment is too easy for him.«

Nassir Bechara

»We should have sent him to Indonesia for their firing squad practice sessions.«

Jorge Caceres

»Burn him alive.«

Dave Pip Callaghan

»Why is he aloud to live?« [sic]

Doreen Green

»Kill him.«

Jill Harper

»Injection soon.«

Wayde Harrop

»Burn in hell.«

Gavin Henness

»What has it cost tax payers to keep this miserable piece of crap alive?«

Carolyn Klumpp-Harris

»This is where the electric chair should come into play. He does not deserve to live. He took too many lives so why should he be able to live. He's getting 3 meals a day and what a waste. As a taxpayer we should not be paying for this scum. Bring back capital punishment especially for him. He is a wasted space.«

Darren Loss

»Should of brought back the death penalty not the gun laws he should of got the firing squad scum bag animal.«

Scott Osborne

»Just shoot him. Ffs. Simple solution. This pos sucks dicks to get chocolate. Need I say more.«

Mark Parker

»Don't stop him or revive him next time he tries to commit suicide. Why should we continue to pay for this scum.«

Lee Rayner

»It's fine I'll just keep working hard to feed this grub. Give him a bullet.«

Jacinta Ross

»That mongrel should have been put to death, and fancy putting out to that grub for a chocolate bar, one of these inmates should knock him.«

Hayley Rowlands

»Filthy fat scum!«

Helen Stanislawa Kukula

»What a shame he's been unsuccessful trying to kill himself !!!«

Toni-skie Steimel [sic]

»He doesn't deserve to be in a 4x4 cell he deserves to be 6ft under.«

Ibrahim Suleiman

»Why waste tax payers money on mass murderers likes this? He deserve the death penalty.«

Leanne Tammjarv

»Why is he still breathing ???«

Brock Vincent

»Well he is definitely getting fed.... I say use a bullet it's cheaper easier and more deserved!!«

Elizabeth Waldron

»They should send him to Bali to face the firing squad.«

SPECIFIC ETHICAL REQUIREMENTS

The following are extracts from international, national, and Australian guidelines, principles, regulations, rules, etc. related to ethical journalism and publishing. Each of the extracts is followed by an italicized comment (KAN).

I. AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

downloaded 24 SEP 2015

Prisoners and Human Rights

»One right of special importance to prisoners is the right to be treated with humanity, dignity and respect while in detention. This human right is set out in articles 7 and 10 of the ICCPR, article 37 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and in the Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT).«

definition of humanity: The quality of being humane; benevolence; kindness; mercy. Given the hate-filled statements in the published said newspapers/websites, News Corp Australia has treated Martin Bryant inhumanely and further diminished his dignity. Not only has Bryant's right to respect not been fulfilled, his privacy has been secretly invaded, and he has been severely condemned. Nationally, the statements published in News Corp Australia publications have and continue to promote hatred and encourage the killing of Martin Bryant. Articles published by News Corp Australia in its newspapers and/or on its websites are solely meant to demonize Martin Bryant through cruel, inaccurate, and unethical statements. These articles contain no information that is essential for the public to know. Invading Martin Bryant's privacy and broadcasting details about his (wrongful) imprisonment is not in any way justified.

II. AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

downloaded 24 SEP 2015

The Rights of People with Disabilities: Areas of Need for Increased Protection

SCHEDULE 4: DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF MENTALLY-RETARDED PEOPLE

»6. The mentally-retarded person has a right to protection from exploitation, abuse and degrading treatment. If prosecuted for any offence, he shall have a right to due process of law with full recognition being given to his degree of mental responsibility.«

Martin Bryant is retarded. This was known long before the incident at Port Arthur and he received a Tasmanian government pension as he could not work. The literature says his IQ was tested and found to be 66. The literature also says he lived life at a school-grade six level. During one official interview it is said he was asked what kilometres per hour meant and he was unable to explain this simple concept. Immediately after the initial shooting, his then girlfriend Petra Willmott gave a written statement (28 APR 1996) in which she revealed this fact: »He doesn't remember a lot of things I say to him and he forgets what he is doing sometimes.« But now, News Corp Australia has decided retarded/disabled Martin has no human rights. News Corp Australia believes it is quite acceptable to exploit him so as to increase its audience and thus its profits. News Corp Australia has done this by abusing Martin's human rights and describing him in a most revolting manner – even though in the articles that appear in said publications owned by News Corp Australia it states Martin is »almost a vegetable,« and »He was later described by experts as having the emotional and intellectual age of a five year old.«

So after documenting Martin Bryant is mentally-retarded, or, depending on definitions, is disabled, News Corp Australia went for him like a mad dog and wrote the most disgusting non-sense to degrade and demonize him to all Australians and other people around the world.

III. AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

downloaded 24 SEP 2015

The Rights of People with Disabilities: Areas of Need for Increased Protection

SCHEDULE 5: DECLARATION ON THE RIGHTS OF DISABLED PERSONS

»10. Disabled persons shall be protected against all exploitation, all regulations and all treatment of a discriminatory, abusive or degrading nature.«

see comment directly above

INDEPENDENT MEDIA COUNCIL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PRINT AND ONLINE PRINT MEDIA PUBLISHERS

PUBLICATIONS must take all reasonable steps to ensure reports are honest, accurate, balanced and fair and disclose all essential facts. Reports must not suppress relevant available facts or give distorting emphasis. When a report disparages any person or organisation, all reasonable steps must be taken to provide a contemporaneous right of reply. Where a contemporaneous reply is not possible, publications should provide an opportunity for a suitably prominent response at the first opportunity. Reports should not refer to personal characteristics, including race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, family relationships, religious belief, or physical or intellectual disability, or mental illness, unless they are relevant. Publications should use fair, responsible, and honest means to obtain material and should not exploit a person's vulnerability or ignorance or media practice. (extract downloaded 25 SEP 2015)

www.independentmediacouncil.com.au/code-of-conduct.html

IV. AUSTRALIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

27 MAR 2013

Medical Ethics in Custodial Settings 2013. Amended 2015.

»This statement provides the AMA's policy on ethical issues related to prisoners and detainees in custodial settings including body cavity searches, hunger strikers, solitary confinement and protective custody, restraints, torture, cruel, or inhumane treatment and capital punishment.

1.1 Prisoners and detainees have a right to humane treatment, regardless of the reasons for their imprisonment, and should be treated with respect for their human dignity and privacy. They should never be denied treatment on the basis of their culture, ethnicity, religion, political beliefs, gender, sexual orientation, the nature of their illness, the reason for their incarceration, or their criminal history.

1.4 Governments and prison authorities have a duty of care to all prisoners and detainees under their control, including those in private correctional facilities. Governments must provide basic humane standards and should strive to achieve world's best practice in all Australian correctional facilities including police custody, prison, juvenile detention centres, and other custodial settings....«

This AMA statement applies to Risdon Prison near Hobart in Tasmania where Martin Bryant is incarcerated.

V. AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL

downloaded 18 SEP 2015

The General Principles

»Publications are free to publish as they wish by reporting facts and expressing opinions, provided they take reasonable steps to comply with the following Principles and the Council's other Standards of Practice.

ACCURACY AND CLARITY

1. Ensure that factual material in news reports and elsewhere is accurate and not misleading, and is distinguishable from other material such as opinion.
2. Provide a correction or other adequate remedial action if published material is significantly inaccurate or misleading.

FAIRNESS AND BALANCE

3. Ensure that factual material is presented with reasonable fairness and balance, and that writers' expressions of opinion are not based on significantly inaccurate factual material or omission of key facts.
4. Ensure that where material refers adversely to a person, a fair opportunity is given for subsequent publication of a reply if that is reasonably necessary to address a possible breach of General Principle 3.

PRIVACY AND AVOIDING OF HARM

5. Avoid intruding on a person's reasonable expectations of privacy, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest.
6. Avoid causing or contributing materially to substantial offence, distress or prejudice, or a substantial risk to health or safety, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest.

INTEGRITY AND TRANSPARENCY

7. Avoid publishing material which has been gathered by deceptive or unfair means, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest.
8. Ensure that conflicts of interests are avoided or adequately disclosed, and that they do not influence published material.«

It is almost incomprehensible that News Corp Australia, which is a member of the APC, has done what it has done. It is totally unacceptable that publications and websites of News Corp Australia have published articles that do not comply with EVERY principle of the APC. Below are italicized comments (KAN) related to each of the four headings.

ACCURACY AND CLARITY

As stated above: »Bryant has wreaked a violent path through various wings of Hobart's sprawling jail, including vicious assaults on government staff and nurses.« This most cruel statement is hearsay unsubstantiated by any reference and is unaccompanied by the name of a real person who could (would?) swear it was true. Readers have no way to confirm any part of this statement, and all assurances by News Corp Australia are meaningless. The journalist/ editor has not provided any reference or detailed the source of this allegation. Where is the proof of this statement that demonizes Martin Bryant? If the source for this statement is an employee or associate of the Tasmanian government, what is the name of that person?

FAIRNESS AND BALANCE

*Martin Bryant is demonized from the first phrases in said articles – right there in the headings: **Bryant still a vile menace; Martin Bryant is a loser; Monster on the inside;** etc. Within the content of the articles it gets worse. The writing becomes a tirade of unsubstantiated tripe. And Martin Bryant is unable to respond to any of the demonizing statements that News Corp Australia has hurled at him. It is not just because he is incarcerated. He cannot respond because he is like a vegetable. And even if he was not a »heavily sedated lump,« he bears the heavy load of trying to cope in his mind-numbing world with the »intellectual age of a five year old.« So if the APC replies and states that News Corp Australia has published fair and balanced articles, then you pair and/or the APC are corrupt. That Sarah Blake (senior writer) and Stephen Burke (editor of the Sunday Tasmanian) believe it is good thing to write unfair and biased bunk about a mentally-handicapped boy-man reveals their lack of human understanding and compassion.*

PRIVACY AND AVOID HARM

There is no privacy in relation to the said articles. Martin Bryant did not give his consent to have images taken of him whilst in Risdon Prison. And Martin Bryant has rights, just as all prisoners have rights. He did not forfeit his right to privacy to an unethical company so it could take telephoto-lens shots of him to accompany trash articles that demonize him. News Corp Australia has no right to take images of Martin Bryant without his consent and then use them for commercial profit-making reasons. News Corp Australia has no right to publish images of him and thereby increase the possibility that some prison inmate or employee will see to it that, either directly or indirectly, Martin takes his own life or someone takes it for him. But it seems this is what News Corp Australia wants to achieve. Recall in one article it states this: »The fact is he's Martin Bryant, and in some circles, to kill Martin Bryant, well you could hold your head up.« Recall what Jacinta Ross posted on the Internet in reply to Blake's article: »That mongrel should have been put to death, and fancy putting out to that grub for a chocolate bar, one of these inmates should knock him.« It seems News Corp Australia wilfully published these hit pieces to promote hate and which also encourage the killing of Martin Bryant.

INTEGRITY AND TRANSPARENCY

Under this heading, the APC principle reads thus: »Avoid publishing material which has been gathered by deceptive or unfair means, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest.« So with reference to the images, allegedly of Martin Bryant, which News Corp Australia published in its newspapers and on its websites, all Australians are expected to accept that images obtained deceptively is an ethical act. Well all Australians don't. This is how the said images were obtained: »The Mersey unit's exercise yard is visible from a public reserve overlooking the jail, and it was from here that News Corp recorded the photos and video last Thursday« (Herald Sun); and, »From a vantage point on public land some 600m from Bryant's exercise yard, we [no names stated in the articles] witnessed him.... « (The Australian).

Note that at least one other prisoner whose face was caught by the camera had his face blurred. See the video on [facebook.com/dailytelegraph/videos/10152985487411105/](https://www.facebook.com/dailytelegraph/videos/10152985487411105/) for this deliberate blurring. It strongly suggests that some person associated with News Corp Australia knew the privacy of a prisoner was being infringed so the face of that prisoner was not made public. But as for the subject, that »filthy fat scum« who should get a lethal »injection,« he doesn't count. He doesn't have any rights and News Corp Australia believes it can demonize him to all of Australia and the world. And it has.

VI. AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL

1 JUL 1987

Standards of Practice

GUIDELINE: IDENTIFYING A PERSON WITH AN INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY

»The Press Council believes that normally the identification of someone as a person with an intellectual disability is undesirable.... There may be circumstances which justify the identification of a person with an intellectual disability, but newspapers should consider carefully the reasons for publication and the possible consequences [DEATH for Bryant]; every consideration should be given to the privacy of the person, their parents and relatives, and those who look after them.«

The very articles published by News Corp Australia raise Bryant's intellectual handicap. It does not matter that his disability is either natural or officially drug-induced. It is there and News Corp Australia knew it. But that did not stop Sarah Blake and her editors or other persons from News Corp Australia from publishing demonizing articles. On its website (themercury.com.au) The Mercury declares: »Davies Brothers Pty Ltd is bound by the Standards of Practice of the Australia Press Council.« This statement refers to the publisher of The Mercury newspaper, which is part of News Corp Australia. It is dated 27 AUG 2013. But perhaps now in 2015, the Mercury no longer abides by the Standards of Practice of the APC.

VII. COVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT 1984

ratified by Australia on 8 AUG 1989

Part 1, Article 16

»1. Each State Party shall undertake to prevent in any territory under its jurisdiction other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture as defined in article 1, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. In particular, the obligations contained in articles 10, 11, 12 and 13 shall apply with the substitution for references to torture of references to other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

2. The provisions of this Convention are without prejudice to the provisions of any other international instrument or national law which prohibits cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment or which relates to extradition or expulsion.«

Based on the content of the articles published by News Corp Australia newspapers and/or websites, Martin Bryant has been treated cruelly and inhumanely and said writings have, nationally and internationally, encouraged additional arbitrary punishment – DEATH.

VIII. MEDIA, ENTERTAINMENT, AND ARTS ALLIANCE

(absorbed Australian Journalists Association in 1992)

downloaded 20 SEP 2015

Journalists' Code of Ethics

»Journalists will educate themselves about ethics and apply the following standards:

1. Report and interpret honestly, striving for accuracy, fairness and disclosure of all essential facts. Do not suppress relevant available facts, or give distorting emphasis. Do your utmost to give a fair opportunity for reply.
2. Do not place unnecessary emphasis on personal characteristics, including race, ethnicity, nationality, gender, age, sexual orientation, family relationships, religious belief, or physical or intellectual disability.
3. Aim to attribute information to its source. Where a source seeks anonymity, do not agree without first considering the source's motives and any alternative attributable source. Where confidences are accepted, respect them in all circumstances.
4. Do not allow personal interest, or any belief, commitment, payment, gift or benefit, to undermine your accuracy, fairness or independence.
5. Disclose conflicts of interest that affect, or could be seen to affect, the accuracy, fairness or independence of your journalism. Do not improperly use a journalistic position for personal gain.
6. Do not allow advertising or other commercial considerations to undermine accuracy, fairness or independence.
7. Do your utmost to ensure disclosure of any direct or indirect payment made for interviews, pictures, information or stories.
8. Use fair, responsible and honest means to obtain material. Identify yourself and your employer before obtaining any interview for publication or broadcast. Never exploit a person's vulnerability or ignorance of media practice.
9. Present pictures and sound which are true and accurate. Any manipulation likely to mislead should be disclosed.
10. Do not plagiarise.
11. Respect private grief and personal privacy. Journalists have the right to resist compulsion to intrude.
12. Do your utmost to achieve fair correction of errors.«

It should be obvious to all objective readers which points as listed in this code have not been complied with by employees of News Corp Australia. Of course unethical journalists will claim they are not Alliance members and thus this Code of Ethics does not apply to them. This writer does not know if the so-called journalists who were involved with the preparation of the said articles are members of the Alliance. But it is known that the journalists are unethical.

IX. THE MERCURY

downloaded 19 SEP 2015

Code of Conduct

THE POLICY OF OUR PUBLICATION ACROSS ALL PLATFORMS

»This policy applies to News Limited and its editorial employees in both print and digital media platforms. It is an update of the News Limited Professional Conduct Policy which applies to editorial employees of News NSW; News Victoria, News Queensland, Davies Bros Limited, Advertiser Newspapers Limited and the regional and suburban newspaper and operations around Australia. News Limited group publications aim for the highest editorial and ethical standards. Editorial employees and contributors should be open-minded, be fair and respect the truth. To this end, all staff need to be familiar with the policy detailed in the following pages, to follow the rules they contain, and to apply their underlying principles.«

This newspaper document consists of nine horizontal pages of text. After the incriminating introduction above, there are 88 entries under 26 headings. It is a substantial document, but it has not been complied with by company employees. The following are very significant issues within the articles published by this newspaper.

1.2 »Publications should take reasonable steps to ensure reports are accurate, fair and balanced.«

This appears in the articles as if it is an accurate description of Martin Bryant's behaviour: »...he has also been known to pay other men with family blocks of chocolate in order to let him perform sexual services for them.« But it is hearsay, nothing but unproved demonizing hearsay. The statement is not impartial and the journalist did not and cannot confirm it is factually accurate.

1.3 »Clear distinction must be made between fact, conjecture, comment and opinion.«

*This was not done. Statements are made about the incident at Port Arthur in Tasmania, but no references are given – because there are none. There is no hard evidence Martin Bryant killed the owners of Seascope, nor is there any hard evidence he had a stockpile of weapons. After the Port Arthur incident, these allegations were made but they were not proved at a trial – because there was **NO TRIAL**.*

8.1 »Do not make pejorative references to a person's race, nationality, colour, religion, marital status, sex, sexual preferences, age, or physical or **mental capacity**.« (added emphasis)

This is exactly what is done in the News Corp Australia articles.

X. STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR CORRECTIONS IN AUSTRALIA

revised 2012; accepted by Department of Justice (*sic*), Tasmania

Guiding Principles for the Management of Prisoners (p.15)

»Correctional services in Australia seek to improve and maintain safety of and confidence in the correctional system by managing prisoners consistently and with reference to the guiding principles that prisoners are:

1. Managed and contained in a safe, secure, humane manner.«

Prison management in Tasmania has an ethical obligation to ensure Martin Bryant is kept – euphemism for caged – in a safe, secure, and humane manner. But this is not happening. Based on the alleged comments reported in News Corp Australia publications, inmates of Risdon Prison know that Martin Bryant is incarcerated there, and there is motivation for the inmates of or guards in the prison to, either directly or indirectly, kill Bryant. To allow and/or accept News Corp Australia publish articles in which hatred toward Martin Bryant is encouraged places him in an unsafe, insecure, and potentially fatal situation. This reality is not of Martin Bryant's making. He cannot be blamed for the intrusion News Corp Australia made into his life, a secretive intrusion for which he never gave his permission, and which neither the prison manager (Brian Edwards) nor minister of justice (Michael Keenan) in Tasmania should have approved – if they did, and if they did you can bet they'll deny it now.

So what do you gentlemen make of this? Perhaps you will ignore the associated complaint. Perhaps you really do not care an iota about these cruel, inaccurate, and unethical articles. (Be assured however that this matter won't go away regardless of what you do or don't do.) Perhaps you will pass *the monkey* to someone at News Corp Australia and ask for feedback. Perhaps you might even begin to realize the enormity of what is going on in relation to the Port Arthur incident – that incident of **official killing, and wounding, and lying, and injustice**. (Recent feedback from investigators in Australia says lawyers are finally speaking out. Here is one example from Tasmanian barrister Greg Barns: »We are not the only community in the world that's had this kind of tragedy and to simply have a form of censorship over it is absurd.«

Before ending this summary, there are significant points that need emphasis here. The two people whose names are mentioned in relation to this corrupt matter of demonizing Martin Bryant and, it seems, **paving the way for his killing** – either directly or indirectly by some inmate(s) or employee(s) at Risdon Prison – are Sarah Blake and Stephen Burke. (Do you think they will like having the public focus on them because of their cruel, inaccurate, and unethical journalism? Journalism that stimulates hate for Martin Bryant and words about killing him.)



Note this Internet image of Sarah Blake has not in any way been manipulated. Her canine teeth are exactly as they appear on RendezView, which is a Daily Telegraph website. It is interesting to recall that a colleague(?) of Blake, one Zara Dawtrey, wrote an earlier piece containing total rubbish which was published by The Mercury (9 MAY 2013). Dawtrey's article was all about the Tasmanian ex-cop Mick Dyson who said: »the overall command of violent incidents...is my passion.« Dyson was near Port Arthur. It is said that he was Rick the shooter at Seascope.

You can read allegations about Mick/Rick on: www.facebook.com/Port-Arthur-Massacre-Michael-Dyson-Guilty-Murder-at-Seascope-521721337978542/timeline/

As editor of the Sunday Tasmanian, Stephen Burke was involved with Blake's unethical article. (Sorry, have no image for Burke; perhaps a reader of this submission will place one on the Internet for us.) Clearly, Blake and Burke are content to ignore their own company's rules related to ethical journalism. This is what Burke stated on the front page of said (13 SEP 2015) newspaper in which Blake's evil piece appeared: »[W]e believe this story needs to be told.« But no story of hate which encourages the killing of a retarded *boy-man* should ever be told.

Finally, if you would like a free pdf of MASS MURDER: Official Killing in Tasmania, Australia, email BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net or MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com. But you probably won't, so an Insert from THE *WORST OF BRITISH JUSTICE* accompanies this submission (pp.lxv, lxvi). It is a summary of the Port Arthur incident. You will never see such details in publications of News Corp Australia – it seems Truth and Justice are of little concern to mainstream media.

We (people in Australia and around the world) now await a reply from the APC. **Thank you.**

Sincerely,

(distribute/email/website/etc. freely)

Keith Allan NOBLE

CLASSIC KANGAROO COURT CASE

– Tasmania, Australia –

THE SET-UP, TORTURE, AND IMPRISONMENT OF MARTIN BRYANT FOR (ALLEGED) CRIMINAL ACTS NEVER PROVED WITH HARD EVIDENCE AS THERE WAS NO TRIAL

Official Killing – PORT ARTHUR TASMANIA, AUSTRALIA NO! JUSTICE HERE

ON the 28th and 29th April 1996 at and near Port Arthur in Tasmania, an official shooting incident took place – 35 people killed, 25 wounded. Evidence confirms extensive planning involving prior preparations requiring money and time, plus skills (emotional, mental, physical), equipment, and intelligence far beyond that held by Martin Bryant who was immediately blamed. This official massacre was executed to raise public and political support for implementing national gun-control legislation. (How involved was ASIO in the incident?) **Hard evidence confirms all this.**

Martin Bryant DID NOT have the ability. He had a 66 IQ and functioned at a grade six level. He could not plan, prepare, and perpetrate a mass murder over seven crime scenes, from Sunday to Monday including all that night. Numerous [amended] phone calls took place – the police negotiator said it sounded like a prepared script, snacks were made inside Seascope for all those inside, a naked screaming woman (not the cottage owner) was seen on the grounds and documented in police statements, the heavily-armed SOG of Tasmania Police was *kept at bay* by inaccurate shooting. (Lethal accuracy at the café, useless at the cottage. Why?) Martin Bryant could not have done all these acts.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

Martin Bryant DID NOT design, order, or pay for the special embalming equipment prepared before the official incident. This equipment did not exist in Australia and in little Tasmania such equipment was entirely unnecessary. But it was needed after the massacre at and near Port Arthur. So arrangements were made and it was manufactured in Victoria.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

»One firm in particular, Nelson Brothers, had organised for an embalming machine box and a special large equipment case to be manufactured ready for the incident.«*

(* 7 Droop Street, Footscray, Victoria 3011)



Stephen Parry’s statement confirms the preparation prior the massacre. Parry was the leader of the team that embalmed victims (minimum 25 of 35). His statement is in a scarce official document: *Port Arthur Massacre*. (AFDA National Embalming Team Report; Port Arthur Seminar Papers) 1997: p.112. AFDA stands for Australian Funeral Directors Association. At the time that this Parry led his embalming team at Port Arthur with its »embalming machine box and a special large equipment case manufactured ready for the incident,« he was associated with Vincent Funeral Services, Burnie, Tasmania 7320.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

Martin Bryant DID NOT design, order, or pay for the 22-body refrigerated mortuary truck used by the State after the incident. No such vehicle existed in Australia. And in



little Tasmania such a vehicle was completely unnecessary, except after all the killing at and near Port Arthur Historic Site in April 1996. Ready for the officially planned and professionally perpetrated massacre, this highly specialized truck was manufactured in Tasmania. Two people associated with it were

Ray Charlton and Chris Wright. After being used it was advertised for sale on the internet.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

Martin Bryant DID NOT shoot anyone. The real shooter in the café was highly trained and shot from the hip with murderous accuracy. In her book *My Story*; 2010: pp. 136-137, Martin's mother Carleen Bryant says: »Colonel Ted Serong DSO OBE, former head of Australian Forces in Vietnam and one of the world's leading experts on counter-terrorist techniques, in an interview with Frank Robson in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 10 April 1999, said of the Port Arthur gunman: ›Whoever did it is better than I am, and there are not too many people around here better than I am. Whoever did it had skills way beyond anything that could reasonably be expected of this chap Bryant.« Martin showed police how he used a rifle in his left-handed way. But the Port Arthur killer – said to be Benjamin Overbeeke – fired his weapons in a right-handed manner. Martin was not an ambidextrous shooter. Not one firearm allegedly used during the massacre (see Avery's letter of intimidation [6 JUN 1996] to Terrence Hill) was proved at a trial to be Martin's.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

Martin Bryant DID NOT get identified after the shooting began. James Laycock, the only eyewitness who knew him, wrote it was not Martin Bryant. Several other eyewitnesses also wrote it was not Martin Bryant. Many others said the shooter had long hair below his shoulders, which Martin did not have. So-called eyewitnesses who were far away (at the old penitentiary for example) could not have accurately identified any person. The media rashly declared Martin Bryant was the shooter, which cruelly biased the entire nation.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

Martin Bryant DID NOT freely plead guilty. He was locked in isolation over six months. There he was demonised, intimidated, and falsely represented by scum officials including lawyer John Avery (now a convicted criminal), who was supposed to defend Martin but who badgered this distraught and helpless incompetent into accepting Avery's guilty plea. There was NO trial. Nothing Martin is alleged to have done was proved in a sound court.

Hard evidence confirms all this.

Martin Bryant was wrongly convicted by a kangaroo court with NO TRIAL. Official mongrels involved were John Avery, Damian Bugg, William Cox.

TRUTH

2



CONCERN

The whole truth related to all significant components of the incident at Port Arthur has not been told, thus the public's understanding of this incident of psycho-political terror is incomplete and perverse.

CONTENTS		PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS		3
■ INTRODUCTION		5
■ SOME WORDS ON TRUTH	Noble	7
MEANING OF OFFICIAL NARRATIVE		
INNOCENTS IMPRISONED		
■ UNANSWERED QUESTIONS....	freestatevoice	13
MARTIN BRYANT DID NOT DO IT		
22-BODY VEHICLE FOR SALE	Image	
GUNMAN'S TRAY, BAG, & CAMERA	Images	
■ PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT	Pitt	19
TRUTH ABOUT PORT ARTHUR....		
UNTRUTHS & TERROR		
JOHN HOWARD'S END....		
■ A TANGLED WEB OF POLICE CORRUPTION	MacGregor	29
LETTER OF INTIMIDATION		
CRIMINAL COPS		
■ SOME WORDS ON BOOKS	Noble	35
PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT BOOKS		
■ ENDING		40

COUNTS

Images 4, Inserts 12, Notes 61, Pages 40

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

FORETHOUGHTS

- A belief is not true because it is useful. (translation)
Henri Frédéric Amiel
1821-1881

- We do not know a truth without knowing its cause. (translation)
Aristotle
384-322

- There are in fact four very significant stumbling-blocks in the way of grasping truth...namely, the example of weak and unworthy authority, longstanding custom, the feeling of the ignorant crowd, and the hiding of our own ignorance while making a display of our apparent knowledge.¹ (translation)
Roger Bacon
Opus Majus
1266-7

- Truth breeds hatred. (translation)
Bias of Priene in Ionia
fl. c.570 BCE

- "Truth has rough flavours if we bite it through."
George Eliot
Middlemarch
1871-72

- "As a rule, we disbelieve all facts and theories for which we have no use."²
William James
The Will to Believe
1897

- Children say that people are hung sometimes for speaking the truth. (translation)
Joan of Arc
defence at tribunal
23 February 1431

- "Speak then the truth, and the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."
Ben Johnson
Tales of a Tub
1633

- Men readily believe what they want to believe.
■ What we desire we readily believe.³ (translations)
Julius Caesar
DE BELLO GALLICO
50s or 40s BCE

- Stake life on truth. (translation)
Juvenal
c.60-140

¹ These four stumbling-blocks described by philosopher and scientist Roger Bacon are easily identifiable in comments on the Internet about the incident at Port Arthur.

² Literature on crime investigation makes this point **again** and **again**. What happens is that investigators make a hurried decision on who the perpetrator is, then they discard, discredit, and deny any evidence that conflicts with their decision. Once an investigator develops **tunnel vision**, the likelihood of a miscarriage of justice occurring is greatly increased. Innocent people are made guilty; the guilty are made innocent. It is a tragic thing for individuals and their families and friends.

³ These translated variations of the original Latin describe one of the most significant facts about the Port Arthur incident. Members of the public **accept the official narrative** because it fits with their needs. The story is there in basic black and white terms: *lone-nut* gunman; Martin Bryant; guilty; end of story. And everything that does not fit with this is not desired and thus not given any consideration.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

■ True words are not pleasant. Pleasant words are not true.
(translation)

Lão-Tzu
fl. 5th cent. BCE

■ If you judge by appearances in this place you will often be deceived; what appears on the surface is almost never the truth.
(translation)

Marie Madeleine de La Fayette
The Princess of Clèves
1678

■ "Inquiry is human; blind obedience brutal. Truth never loses by the one, but often suffers by the other."

William Penn
Some Fruits of Solitude
1693

■ Nothing is more sublime than love of truth. (translation)

Prudentius
348-c.405

■ Satan is the father of lies and God of the truth. (translation)

Renée de France
1510-1574

■ Truth has not special time of its own. Its hour is now – always and indeed then most truly when it seems unsuitable to actual circumstances. (translation)

Albert Schweitzer
1875-1965

■ "Truth is the only safe ground to stand upon."

Elizabeth Cady Stanton
The Woman's Bible
1895

4 Be attentive to how the State reacts to and addresses the authors of the articles compiled in this book. The editor too will be condemned.

■ The first reaction to truth is hatred. The moment it appears, it is treated as an enemy.⁴ (translation)

Tertullian
Apologeticus
c.197 CE

5 Like all other corrupt cases and incidents where the truth has been covered up, the truth is not only owed to those who are alive, but also to those who have died. If the lives of people in Australia can be taken then covered up with lies, as has occurred in relation to the incident at Port Arthur, it means justice in that country is a cruel joke played out on the populace. The judicial con (*sic*) now prevailing in that country is similar to that in England prior the signing of the *Magna Carta* in 1215. See the Insert *MAGNA CARTA 1215* in Part 9.

■ "Truth is a very aggressive principle; it does not stand still to be attacked, but marches on, under the conduct of faith, to assail the enemy, to make conquests, and to recover what falsehood has stolen, or violence wrested away."

Charlotte Elizabeth Tonna
1790-1846

■ To the living we owe respect; to the dead we owe the truth.⁵
(translation)

Voltaire
1771-1845

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

THIS part of the book has a smaller number of pages. But, what it addresses is the most important thing in the entire Port Arthur case, which includes everything that has happened since 28 April 1996 – **the Truth**. This whole case, plus all the official documentation as well as all the literature associated with it, has come into being because **truth has not been the guiding principle**.

In Australia, there is a political process to bring about changes in the national fabric of life. This process only achieves results upon which legitimacy can be conferred when the guiding principle of truth is constantly adhered to. When truth is ignored, the end result of this process never attains the nation-wide legitimacy needed to make it an accepted and unquestioned part of life in Australia. Whenever deception has been part of the process, the weave of the national fabric is flawed.

There can be no national legitimacy conferred by the people on any legislation arising from a political process which is corrupt. Regardless of the subject and regardless of the many political points of view, if the truth is not told – verbally, non-verbally, and/or by behaviour – then it matters not what the end outcome might be. No political process has integrity if that process in any way incorporates any immoral activity. And this is exactly what happened with reference to the political process of restricting gun ownership in Australia.

Please note that the editor of this work is not affiliated with any fire-arm association. Nor does he possess a firearm. That is not the point of the argument. Nor is any restriction on the ownership of firearms in Australia the point of the argument presented in this book. What is the matter of substance is the manner in which such controlling legislation came into existence in Australia? This manner is the issue. And it is an issue no person, political party, and/or prime minister has any right or authority to pretermite because legislation now exists. If this continues to be the approach taken, it can be concluded that the person, political party, and/or prime minister **is/are complicit**. Never forget, there are silent lies.⁶

Before the first shot was fired at the Broad Arrow Café, evidence confirms that untruths must have been told to many witting and unwitting individuals. The official mass murder at the Port Arthur Historic Site in Tasmania did not commence with a rifle shot at c.13:30 on 28 April 1996. It began much earlier than that as there is evidence detailing extensive planning and preparations before that time and date. Planning and preparations which patsy⁷ Martin Bryant could never have carried out, because he lacked the intellectual capacity and the proven desire and/or need. So the lies or untruths, call them what you will, commenced long before the first victim (William Moh Yee Ng) died in the café. And they continued through that day, and the next, and the next, right on through the setting up of Martin and his illegal incarceration, right up to this day. Until Martin is set free, all the lies as well as the deception they have engendered will be said to be the truth – even though there is **not an iota of evidence proving their truthfulness**.

⁶ In her book *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence*; 1979, Adrienne Rich says: “Lying is done with words and also with silence.”

⁷ A slang word of unknown origin. Originally, a person who is cheated, victimized, or made the butt of a joke. Now also means a person who is set up to appear guilty of a crime he/she did not commit and who is charged with that crime. (see Part 5)

What evidence does prove is that the deceptions achieved through dishonesty have been used to justify no inquiries into how these deceptions came about. Once the desired end result was achieved, the State has resisted all efforts, and complaints – even those lodged by family and friends of the victims and by witnesses of the shooting. To the State, the END justified the MEANS. What those means were is not something the State wants Australians to know and think about. The whole process is a **chain of corruption**, each link being used as the reason why the previous link need not be investigated.

*Because the gunman had long blond hair, there was no need to investigate that – it had to be Bryant as he had long blond hair. Because the gunman had firearms – it had to be Bryant as he had firearms. Because a yellow Volvo was abandoned by a gunman at the tollbooth – that gunman had to be Bryant as he had a yellow Volvo. Because Bryant was arrested at Seascope – he had to have killed the Martins. And so on and so on. Then there was the coronial inquest, which was so conveniently **stopped** – Bryant had been charged with murder. Then the proposed trial was **stopped** – Bryant was coerced into pleading guilty, so there was no need to prove anything. Etc.*

Step by calculated step, the State avoided every request and forum where the evidence could be examined. So, no evidence was ever examined to clearly determine what was a truth and what was a lie/untruth or deception based on lies/untruths. With the guilty plea submitted by the corrupt lawyer John Avery, the State won a jackpot larger than that ever offered by Tattersalls⁸: **i.** The proposed trial was **stopped** from happening. No one was going to learn the details (THE MEANS) of the case – what was the truth and what was a lie; **ii.** The patsy Martin Bryant was locked well away from the media, the public, and his family. No one was going to be allowed near him to conduct any meaningful discussion to determine what he really knew about the killings and officials involved; and, **iii.** The legislation (THE END) so badly desired by the State became law in record time.

It was a chain-reaction. Each corrupt link was connected to another. Provided no link was examined closely, that chain of corruption held. In fact, the chain in its entirety is promoted as the truth by the complicit media which has totally failed its investigative responsibility. This **mass murder of 35 people** and **wounding of 23 more**, received the *in-depth* reporting given to bus accidents or to an exposé of some participant on *Strictly Come Dancing*.⁹ Negative adjectives are used generously every time the media addresses Martin Bryant. And you will look a long time before you find a bit of journalism raising the need for him to be tried before a jury in a sound court.

⁸ Established in 1881, Tattersalls (*Tatts*) is a privately-run government-approved company which operates gambling systems in Australia. (The word was formerly written with an apostrophe: Tattersall's)

⁹ UK television program with the substance of a marshmallow.

Finally, this should have made every lawyer and every judge in the land stand up and say NO! – **but not one did**. They all went along with the setting-up and sending off of an 11-year-old *boy-man*, with his 66 IQ, to prison for the remainder of his life. No further evidence is required to prove lawyers and judges (all ex-lawyers) have no interest in Truth and Justice. **Not one lawyer in all Australia stood up for innocent Martin Bryant** – who now, bewildered, broken, and bereft of all hope for the Truth, is at death's door. – **ed.**

SOME WORDS ON TRUTH

Port Arthur Incident

Keith Allan Noble¹⁰

*Truth for authority,
not authority for truth.*¹¹

MYTHS are powerful things.¹² They are said to be eternal truths not just empirical truths. Like every other nation, Australia has its fair share of myths, old and new, which are interwoven into the fabric of life in that place called *Down Under* – it too being one of those myths. They are real and fictional, involving recurring themes, characters, and behaviours, which appeal to the people who live there and which attract those who do not. Like the sound of the sacred didgeridoo, they reverberate in ways comforting and assuring.

But all that changed at **Port Arthur in Tasmania on 28 April 1996.**

That day, the anteroom of Hades was opened and assuring myths died along with the victims of a mass shooting – ending forever the naive belief that Australia was a safe place to live, and to visit, and to travel within. **It was psycho-political terror at its terrible worst:** purposeful; premeditated; planned; then, professionally executed. And along with all those whose lives were ended at Port Arthur, other things ended as well. Some myths lost their appeal. Logic and reason ended and other less refined ways of thinking took over the mind of the nation. To say what happened was a collective knee-jerk reaction would be to trivialize it. It was far greater than that. People wanted vengeance satisfied, their vengeance which overrode any thoughts of judicial fairness and the belief that people are innocent until proven guilty at a trial conducted within a sound court.

The media whose business was, so Australians thought, the reporting of the truth, quickly lost that interest. Demonizing some sad mentally-handicapped nobody became the subject of editorials and front-page photospreads of condemnatory images. Big name news celebrities poured out their acid,¹³ and spoke as if they did so on behalf of the entire nation. For the majority of the Australian population, they probably did. It was mindless anger and with some a hate only half-hidden. No doubt some would have been pleased if that *boy-man* had been shot, just as Jack Ruby shot Oswald less than 48 hours after Kennedy's killing in 1963.¹⁴

That *boy-man* who police burnt out of a bed-and-breakfast premises called Seascope on the Tasman Peninsula was cuffed hand and foot. He had no real understanding of why he was being vilified by people around Australia. But how could he if he had not done anything?

¹⁰ editor of *MASS MURDER*

¹¹ Personal motto of the American abolitionist, equalitarian, and reformer Lucretia Mott (1793-1880).

¹² See Rollo May. *The Cry for Myth*; 1991.

¹³ The following words are from the topix.com website (22 March 2013) – Benny of Brisbane, Australia, said: “MARTIN BRYANT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PUBLICLY CASTRATED WITH A RUSTY BLUNT KNIFE AN THEN WASH-ED WITH SULFURIC ACID THEN SENT TO GALLOWES.” (*sic*; original capitals)

¹⁴ See the *JFK AND PORT ARTHUR* article at Part 6.

¹⁵ *A question of egress denied*; 2012: p. 33.

¹⁶ Stewart K. Beattie. *A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur*; 2006: p. 399. Selected from a piece of outstanding work – 7 pages covering the period 7 April 1996 to 3 May 1999.

¹⁷ Reader, for a moment put yourself in the position that Martin Bryant was in. He was: confused over what had happened at Seascope cottage; troubled by being arrested then cuffed hand and foot; shocked over being told he had killed and injured people which he knew not a thing about; frightened by a guard at his bedside; feared the hate people had for him; forced to lie on the severe burns on his back; worried about what had happened to his girlfriend Petra Willmott; baffled by a psychiatrist then cops telling and asking him strange things he knew nothing about. He had to make sense of all of this with the intellect of an **11-year-old boy**. That's the mental age of a child in school **grade 6**. Think back to your grade 6 school days. Do you think you would have coped? Do you think a boy that age should have been charged? Do you think a boy that age should have been imprisoned for life – **FOREVER** – without a trial? Please do not reply and say that if Bryant hadn't done it he wouldn't have got into trouble. That is an evasive reply. There is not one shred of evidence proving Martin Bryant had anything to do with killing and injuring people. This is why there was NO trial. All there has ever been is criminal and corrupt officials asserting Bryant is guilty when **not one bit of alleged evidence was ever assessed during a trial**. Though I do not know you, I'm confident enough to say that if the same thing had happened to **your 11-year-old son**, and he was locked away from you for the rest of his life, you would be screaming your guts out – and I would be right there with you. What has been done to innocent Martin Bryant is **WRONG! WRONG! WRONG!** A psychopathic murderer is still out there and there are criminals sitting in official places. **It is so very wrong.**

In a paper focused on the inoperative door at the Broad Arrow Café, which trapped people who were subsequently shot inside, Stewart Beattie states this: "Most are unaware that it was Mr. [Ray] Groom [former premier of Tasmania] who delighted in telling a witness at a Peninsula gathering soon after Martin Bryant was hospitalized, **'be assured he [Bryant] is suffering. We have him lying on his burns.'** The orthodoxy had to have their lone whipping-boy upon whom they could steer the public's outrage."¹⁵ (original emphasis)

MEANING OF OFFICIAL NARRATIVE

THE **how-what-when-where-why** of an event, issue, or history, which is generally accepted and promoted by political establishments and their alliances. The detail of such narratives can vary considerably between the ruling and opposition wings of establishments, thus defining the respective positions and rivalries of established political parties, their programs and manifestos – in other words, the boundaries of acceptable opinion and debate. Opinions and beliefs held outside those **clearly defined** (though unwritten and unspoken) boundaries, cannot be expressed without serious risk of ostracism by *The Establishment* – even where there is **ample evidence** to support those opinions and beliefs. The Holocaust is the pre-eminent (2012) current example of rigid imposition of an official narrative, to the point that to question any aspect of it in many European countries is illegal and will result in a prison sentence.

wikispooks.com/wiki/WikiSpooks: Definitions

6 February 2013

(amended; added emphasis)

And in his book on the case, the same author reveals the following in his detailed timeline of Port Arthur case-related events:

1-May-96 bedside remand hearing Royal Hobart Hospital
Magistrate Peter Dixon presided
Martin Bryant forced to lie on his burns
psychiatrist Ian Sale present¹⁶
(amended; added emphasis)

Martin had several third-degree burns on his back and later had to have corrective surgery. Those bad burns occurred about 48 hours before that remand hearing, which means Martin must have been forced onto his back by being strapped or shackled to the bed. He was forced to **lie on his burns**. He was also probably drugged, supposedly with medication – do not bother asking as they will never tell you; you couldn't believe the reply if they did – which would have, without any doubt, clouded his mind and thinking which were already way overtaxed. The whole process would have been out of Martin's understanding. But the *monster* had to be charged, so he was – even though he was badly burnt, bewildered, and intellectually an *11-year-old boy*. If you believe Australians are caring people, then Groom, Dixon, and Sale prove your belief is not well-founded.¹⁷

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A true fact in the Port Arthur case is that **the truth found itself at the end of the queue** behind cruel vengeance, venom, and vitriol. Opinions of the clueless fuelled conversations. What-should-be-done-to-him talk worked up the small-minded. And, as was said by some, mob-hysteria took over the collective mind. There was no place for compassion, for legally assessed proof, and certainly not for truth.

Even to raise a concern about what was going on, a reasonable thing to do, was to risk blistering condemnation. The (so-called) evidence was there, the mind of the public was made up, and officials were not raising any cautionary flags. Anything on an official list became proof of Martin Bryant's guilt. And given it was decided he was guilty, absolutely no credence was given to anything he stated. It did not trouble the public that everything that Martin said was **not** made available in its original form. People were told what officials wanted them to know, and the public did not care it seems, because the public firmly believed: he was guilty; he was the *lone-nut* gunman; and, he did it. Deception stemming from the official narrative had, and still does, **shut out the truth**. This narrative is not just the source for every answer to every case-related question, it has become **a shield for those who refuse to think about the truth**.

One of the most accurate statements related to the official killing at Port Arthur is from a James Sinnamon: "[T]he monstrousness of this crime is precisely what prevents many people from rationally considering the evidence, for even to do so one risks being judged as excusing the crime."¹⁸ The evidence directly implicating Martin Bryant is nonexistent, so, instead the case against Bryant (which was never formally put because there never was a trial) largely centres on **supposed facts...**¹⁹ (added emphasis) It is these supposed facts which are interwoven into the official narrative.

Defying the good investigative principles like logic and reason, and dismissing the wisdom of Benjamin Franklin (1706-1790), who told us: "It is the first responsibility of every citizen to question authority," Australians have been encouraged by the State, by the media, and by compliant families and friends, not to question the official narrative. Because, harsh words await all those who raise the rug and declare that a lot of ugly odorous things have been swept underneath, away from public view. Those things are still there under the rug of State. You can see them, smell them – **they won't go away**.

One of the things working against a wider realization that the killing at Port Arthur was a **psycho-political incident of State terrorism** is the conditioning almost all of us have received to some degree. This conditioning, which goes back to our infancy, develops in us the desire to please authority figures. The mother in the first instance. Then the teacher. Then the employer. And so on. We are rewarded for doing as we are told, for doing what is expected of us. The sooner we do it, the more praise we receive. The better we do it, the more praise we receive. Whether it is evacuating our bowels, or answering class-room questions, or asking how high when the boss says jump, it is all the same. The rewards go to those who comply, those who do not raise troubling concerns and questions.

¹⁸ James Sinnamon. *An example of what may convince some of Bryant's guilt*; candobetter.net; 11 April 2010. Note here that one of Roger Bacon's four stumbling blocks to the grasping of truth appears: *the feeling of the ignorant crowd*. People are intimidated by their peers. People are concerned over what others will say about them. People do not want to upset their family and friends. So, in general, people shut up and do not tell the truth. And in particular, middle-class people who have the intelligence to initiate corrective action do nothing, because they fear losing respect. To members of the middle class, respectability is a deity they worship.

¹⁹ American philosopher and psychologist William James (1842-1910) stated this: "Every great institution is perforce a means of corruption." Never presume that any institution popularly considered great in size or purpose is corruption-free. As James points out, great institutions, by necessity (the meaning of perforce), can be associated with corruption. Big houses of law, spuriously revered as great and having *Justitia* atop their pediments, can entertain crime and corruption in their basements.

And then there is **negative reinforcement**. The reinforcement associated with criticism, derision, laughter, scorn, *etc.* directed at those who are unable or unwilling to please authority figures, or who **refuse to accept official narratives**. It is predominantly the latter who are identified as *conspiracy theorists*, which is the latest phrase of condemnation.²⁰ Many people lack the inner strength to stand up for their beliefs and it is they who succumb to negative reinforcement. They buckle, then live their lives as conformists espousing whatever is accepted by the general public. Their beliefs become those of the flavour-of-the-month type. They go with the flow, and at the very worst they remain silent rather than reveal their real beliefs and risk criticism, derision, laughter, scorn, *etc.*

Once people accept an official narrative as being a truthful story, it stops them from considering other facts, possibilities, scenarios, *etc.* Acceptance of the narrative becomes the **default position**. Even when it is explained in detail why an official narrative is not the truth, or is seriously wanting in some way, that narrative remains the accepted belief. It is beyond many (most?) people to abandon an official narrative and to consider and/or accept an alternate explanation. It is far easier intellectually, less stressful, and free of criticism to fall back on the **default position** – acceptance of the official narrative.

Given the subjective influences that come to bear on the determination of truth, people are reluctant to seek out and consider any alternate fact or explanation if that fact or explanation contradicts their accepted beliefs. People tend to seek out things which confirm their existing beliefs, not things contrary to their beliefs. In his book (chapter, **Seeing what we want to see**), Cornell University psychologist Thomas Gilovich tells us this: “When the initial evidence supports our preferences, we are generally satisfied.”²¹ And if our preferences are the same as the majority of people, then this develops a strong societal force with much inertia. A force that constantly reinforces our belief, while at the same time suppresses those things (evidence, facts, theories, *etc.*) which are not compatible, and which crushes people who dare propose alternate arguments.

And when large entities in society adopt official narratives, the force these entities can exert on people is marked. Once such a narrative is adopted by the police, for example, whole lines of investigation can be terminated or redirected. The media (includes book publishers) with its great potential to influence can convince many people that an official narrative is THE story and will cease the broadcasting of all conflicting thoughts. Another negative fact is that employees of these entities insidiously censor themselves to avoid the condemnation of peers and management. All of which can lead to a blatant, biased and belligerent presentation of an issue. Contrary arguments, even well-rounded arguments presented by deep thinkers, are eschewed for arguments using words in line with the official narrative.

It is for these reasons that official narratives do not arise from the facts of any case. These narratives are pondered and prepared in outline form beforehand with the right supportive facts being selected as the case unfolds. Nothing is left to chance. If you study

²⁰ This phrase is just another in a long list of words and phrases that have been used over the centuries to condemn those who refuse to accept or adopt the beliefs of the Establishment/State/*etc.* In her article entitled *Violence and the gospel*, which appeared on lewrockwell.com (24 January 2012), Ellen Finnigan states: “[M]ost of the time the term ‘conspiracy theorist’ is used to slander people who are merely asking questions that mainstream journalists have been content to ignore, or who simply have a higher bar than *the media said so* or *the government said so* when it comes to accepting something as truth.” (original italics)

²¹ Thomas Gilovich. *How We Know What Isn't So*; 1991: p. 82.

INNOCENTS IMPRISONED²²

■ "THE British Criminal Case Review Commission, which assesses applications by those who believe they have been unjustly convicted, has estimated the rate of false convictions at about **five per cent**. In the USA, researchers at Michigan University have claimed 'there are **thousands of innocent people in prison today**.' They studied 328 criminal cases in which convicted people were later exonerated and observed that in more than half of the cases, the defendants had been in prison at least **10 years**. Almost all the cases involved charges of murder or rape, where heavy sentences are awarded. Extrapolating from the rate of wrongful convictions in the UK, it is likely that about **10,000** US prisoners, including many on death row, are serving time for crimes they did not commit. In Australia, the same proportion translates into about a **thousand people**." (added emphasis)

Robin Bowles

Rough Justice

2007: p. 3

■ "There is no system in place in Australia for testing unsatisfactory verdicts. In the United Kingdom, the Criminal Cases Review Commission has discovered in the five years that it has been established about 160 unsafe convictions – people who were wrongly convicted on false evidence or on misguided or mistaken evidence."

Peter Breen

Roseanne Carr

Motion: Parliament of New South Wales

6 April 2006

■ "By the end of this book I hope to have opened minds to the disquieting knowledge that far from reducing crime, **our criminal justice system [UK] actually generates it by placing over 3,000 wrongfully convicted people a year into prison** while allowing the guilty to go free." (added emphasis)

L.A. Naylor

Judge For Yourself

2004: pp. 7-8

■ "There are systemic flaws that lead to injustice. There are apparently...up to 20 innocent people in prison in New Zealand today. **The number may be much, much higher....** It seems not many people in the justice system truly care about innocence. They don't *believe* in it. Presumption and protection of innocence remains a vacuous promise. We suffer the great **legal fiction** that a conviction is presumptively correct. Unless there is reform, true perpetrators of crime will go on to commit more crimes whilst the innocent serve their jail terms, the public will be less safe, and the criminal justice system will **fail** in its primary moral objective, protection of the innocent." (original italics; added emphasis)

Christopher Stevenson

A case of wrongful conviction in New Zealand

victoria.ac.nz

December 2007

22 See 5-country (AU, BR, CA, NZ, US) review by Bruce A. MacFarlane at canadiancriminallaw.com; 18 December 2005: *Convicting the innocent: A triple failure of the justice system*. For details of serious Australian cases see the netk.net.au website. Note Britain kept two people in prison – **without charges** – since 1998, it seems. This is the *best of British justice* which official there do not want you to know about. So much for the *Magna Carta* of 1215 and all that. Khalid al-Fawwaz and Adel Abdel Bary were illegally imprisoned for **14 years with no trial**: "The British Government, which claims to pride itself on establishing the rule of law and dispensing justice for all continues to deny these men *habeas corpus*, basic rights in relation to freedom from imprisonment without trial." (Moazzam Begg, cageprisoners.com; 29 August 2012) In 2012, the human-rights lawyer Frances Webber wrote the following about what these two men could expect once they were extradited to **the most evil nation on earth**: "Prisoners are fed through a slot in the door, they eat alone and rarely have contact with another living thing, except the gloved hands of the officers; they communicate with each other by yelling, which is frequently banned, but are kept awake at night by the screams of severely mentally-ill prisoners). They don't see the sun, never touch soil, see plant life or view the surrounding mountains. Outdoor recreation is in a cage in a concrete pit, and even this 'privilege' is removed from those who commit infractions such as leaving crumbs for birds. The conditions 'tended to induce a range of psychological symptoms ranging from panic to psychosis and emotional breakdown.' There is overwhelming evidence that solitary confinement causes severe psychological and sometimes physiological damage, very quickly. UN and European bodies for prevention of torture condemn the use of solitary confinement as inhuman and degrading treatment when it leads to such effects." (cageprisoners.com; 2 October 2012) The two men were extradited to the US in October 2012.

*Most Australians
do not know
the truth
about all the killing
the State has done,
and ignored,
over the centuries
– in and out of
Australia.*

official narratives, there is always a disturbing fit between whatever incident has taken place and a linked subsequent action initiated by the State. In the Port Arthur case, it was State control over firearms which was the **desired subsequent action** (legislation; buy-back). So, as is obvious from the documented facts, the official narrative contained all the right points leading to legislation then action to take firearms away from the people. The only problem that arose was that Martin staggered, burnt but alive, out of Seascope cottage. Facts suggest **he had been abandoned there to die in the blaze**.

What the State has presented to the public is a narrative with criminal foundations: there was a *lone-nut* gunman; the gunman killed for some personal motivation; the gunman is guilty and has been imprisoned; *etc.* But the true facts of the case do not support only a criminal case – they support primarily a **political case**. It was too planned and too well executed (except for Martin saving himself), just to be a shooting spree to be blamed on one person. Facts confirm it is a **State-orchestrated case of mass murder** which the State then used as its rationale to exercise its power and take control of firearms in Australia – **control** was the State's motive for murdering (and injuring) all those people at and near Port Arthur. Controlling firearms was the motive before the incident, not a motive that arose after the incident. **The State killed for political reasons.**

Here in this book, observations of eyewitnesses and the findings of investigators, as well as many people who have pondered the official narrative are presented. What they have declared conflicts with that narrative. This does not prove all their conclusions are right – but it does prove the official narrative is **NOT** right. Because if there is a plausible alternate narrative, the existing official narrative cannot claim to be the truth. Any plausible alternate narrative proves an existing narrative cannot be the whole true story.

When considering what authors have written in their works which make up this compiled book, keep in mind that described beliefs, even when they relate to specific defined facts (true or false), are not necessarily the outcome of objective assessments. The formulation of a belief generally involves subjective processes, historical precedents, public opinion, related knowledge, personal confidence, *etc.* When an official details something it might reflect no more than her/his belief expressed in keeping with an official narrative. Because something streams from the lips/keyboard of some State official, certainty and morality must not be presumed. And if an investigator concludes some point, that conclusion should be accompanied by a logical line of reasoning with supporting references where necessary. Science is not exchanging one confounding bias with another.

And here, the final truth that must not go unrecorded is the fact that **innocent people are imprisoned**. It is not uncommon. Even innocent people who have been through a trial are wrongly convicted and locked away. For the State, stopping Martin Bryant from having a trial made it much easier to *shut him up* – in every sense. A major shocking truth about the Port Arthur case is that **the State has wilfully taken many steps to keep the truth silent.** ■

**UNANSWERED QUESTIONS,
UNADDRESSED CONCERNS**

freestatevoice.com.au

February 2013

*[M]ove that this assembly of
Australian Citizens
from Tasmania and other Australian States,
in light of the evidence
presented here tonight and on other occasions,
demand that the Parliament of Tasmania
obey the Law and cause a Coronial Enquiry
to be held into The Murders at Port Arthur on
Sunday April 28, 1996.²³*

YOU probably believe that Martin Bryant, acting alone, carried out the Port Arthur massacre.... If so, can you reconcile the following facts with the official story [narrative]?

On Sunday 28th April 1996, it is alleged Martin Bryant shot and killed 35 people and injured 23 others at Port Arthur in Tasmania, Australia using military type semi-automatic rifles. It was the biggest massacre alleged to have been executed by a *lone gunman*.

Bryant, an intellectually impaired 29-year-old, pleaded **not guilty** for months to the murders until pressure was brought to bear by his lawyer [John Avery] and he eventually pleaded guilty to the crimes. There was no confession by Bryant - in fact at the time of his first police interrogation, he **strongly and repeatedly denied the accusation**.

Immediately following this, in what appeared at the time was a knee-jerk reaction under threats from the federal government through prime minister John Howard, all Australian states [and territories] banned the private possession and use of semi-automatic rifles and implemented the wish-list that gun control groups **had been pushing for 10 years**.

Since then, details have surfaced arising from people who were there on the day and aggrieved relatives of victims being unsatisfied about the investigation and prosecution of Bryant. There are too many inconsistencies, irregularities and unanswered questions about the incident that raises questions whether Bryant was the murderer and has been framed, and whether Tasmanian police and government officials were involved, and whether the whole purpose of this incident was to create an excuse for national gun laws banning semi-automatic firearms and requiring gun registration on the pretext a *lone gunman* did it all himself.

²³ Motion passed at public meeting. *People for Coronial Inquiry Into Port Arthur Massacre*; Launceston, Tasmania; 29 September 2004.

24 Past tense is used. Since 1996, Martin Bryant has been kept in a cage at Risdon Prison at Hobart, Tasmania. Reports say he lives in a vegetative state and this suggests the level of his intelligence has been reduced – probably intentionally by officials – from what it was when he was living and interacting socially as a free person with other people prior to him being imprisoned.

25 The following is from Wikipedia (15 November 2012), specifically the Office of Police Integrity, Victoria: “In September 2006, an investigation into physical assault by members of the Armed Offender Squad (now disbanded) culminated in a public hearing. During the hearing, covertly recorded material of the actual incident was played. Members were shown to have **committed perjury**. This hearing generated strong public debate.... The most recent public hearing, held in November 2007, involved matters relating to misconduct in public office, propensity of **police witnesses to lie on oath, information leaks and attempts to pervert the course of justice**. The OPI investigation that resulted in the hearing involved, among others, Victoria Police assistant commissioner Noel Ashby (now resigned), Victoria Police media director Steve Linnell (now resigned), and Police Association secretary Paul Mullett (now suspended). The public interest was immense and media outlets Australia-wide reported the hearing.” The problem with corrupt cops is the same throughout Australia – Victoria is not anything exceptional. As Valerie Blake says about cops in the *FORETHOUGHTS* section Part 8: “**No-one is safe from their unethical behaviour. They have too many powers and are nothing more than thugs in uniforms.**” (added emphasis) You will see criminal cops at their court proceedings – which happen too infrequently – in their slippery Mafia suits and usually hiding behind sunglasses. Regardless of the criminal acts they have committed: bashing, shooting, or tasing someone to death; stealing/selling/doing drugs; *etc., etc.*, it does not matter as they always claim they are innocent. And their unethical mongrel unions kick in whatever it takes to protect their members. And it just goes on and on and on throughout all of Australia – an endless national disgrace.

MARTIN BRYANT DID NOT DO IT

AN event of the magnitude, complexity, and significance of the incident which took place at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, on 28 & 29 April 1996, necessitates extensive long-term planning. This event could not have been the work of one individual no matter how intelligent he/she is. And given Martin Bryant is mentally-handicapped and had²⁴ a very low (retarded) IQ of 66, it is simply impossible that he planned then performed all the many essential arrangements and acts. Below are just a few examples.

■ Facts of the case confirm that the gunman at the Broad Arrow Café demonstrated such a ruthless skill and such psychological power that attributing them to Martin Bryant is idiocy. Not only does time evidence confirm he was not at that café when shooting went on there, Bryant did not have the physical ability, or the training, or any natural talent, to kill and wound over 30 people at close range. His intellect could not have planned it, his body could not have not done it, his mind could not have handled it.

And there is another fact, a truthful fact, which adds great doubt to anything that cops say about Martin Bryant. On 23 June 1996, the *Sunday Herald Sun* published an article in which Bill Drysdale of Yass, Victoria, said he believes the rifle, an AR-15, which was allegedly used at Port Arthur was the same one he once owned. Drysdale voluntarily surrendered that rifle to Victorian police in February 1993. It was to have been destroyed, but it seems that did not happen. Then valued at \$1700, it seems corrupt cops sold that rifle back into the gun market.

Victorian cops deny it – but **cops lie**. On 16 June 1996, the same newspaper printed the admission of then assistant commissioner Graham Sinclair who revealed: “17 high-powered semi-automatic military weapons similar to one used in the Port Arthur massacre were sold by police,” after the previous owners were told by cops that the surrendered weapons would be destroyed. Sinclair also admitted that AR-15 rifles given to the cops (to be destroyed), were used by the “**Special Operations Group**” before being sold with that money going to some corrupt agency/official(s).

It seems however, that there is no evidence proving any of those rifles were obtained by Bryant. But there is evidence that cops in Tasmania **lied** about Bryant – just as their corrupt colleagues in Victoria **lied** to the public about all those surrendered rifles.²⁵

■ Then there is the refrigerated truck capable of transporting 22 bodies. Ask yourself how Bryant figured out how to have it ready in time for that big job at Port Arthur. And if he did not, then which government person/department did? That vehicle did exist because there is an image of it and a for-sale notice related to it appeared on the Internet in September 1999. (see over) Now the average number of homicides a year in Tasmania is about six – one every two months. Mass murder is not happening there on a regular basis. If the vehicle was needed for all types of emergencies, why was it sold? And if it was sold because it was too old or in need of major repairs, why has it not been replaced? **(cont.)**

22-BODY VEHICLE FOR SALE
Genuine Enquiries Only



"Yellow Chevrolet 350 V8 truck with refrigerated body, holds 22, this vehicle was primarily used as the disaster vehicle in the **Port Arthur Massacre**. This vehicle is currently for sale and all reasonable offers will be considered. The vehicle has value as not only a refrigerated unit for body removal, it is the only one of its kind in the entire country. The memorabilia value of it for anyone making a movie/series or writing a book on Port Arthur is limitless. Not only would the purchaser be getting the disaster vehicle, but the whole Port Arthur Story would be given as well. This vehicle is currently for sale and all REASONABLE OFFERS will be considered." ■

Email cwright@trump.net.au²⁶

■ Then there were the three official gatherings which took place around the same time that the historic site incident occurred:

- i. On the **27-28 April**, an emergency medical services training (EMST) program was held at the clinical school near Royal Hobart Hospital. It was attended by many senior trauma management specialists from southeastern Australia;
- ii. Staff (10 managers & supervisors), some of whom would have worked at the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS) on **28 April**, were, on that very day, expected to attend a workshop at a place (Swansea) two and a half driving hours from PAHS. Never before had a training session away from the site been planned, and by all accounts there has never been one since away from the site; and,
- iii. About 700 journalists (print & television) from 17 countries were in Hobart for a conference which commenced on **29 April**.

These three gatherings were highly significant. So much so, it is inconceivable that their common occurrence was coincidence. Medical specialists did everything they could to help the victims of the shootings. The Royal Hobart Hospital became the setting for a mercy drama which was broadcast live across Australia and far beyond. And for members of the media, Tasmanian officials made a plan which involved getting buses to drive to PAHS and there conducting a guided tour of crime scenes – all while the cottage at Seascapes was still smouldering, body removal had not been completed, and PAHS staff were numbed by shock and grief.

Martin Bryant had nothing to do with any of these things. He is the patsy who evil planners wanted **burnt to death** at Seascapes. – **ed.**

²⁶ It seems that Chris Wright was then a copper with Tasmania Police. Now how did he get to own, or have responsibility for selling, this 22-body refrigerated morgue vehicle? If you know how, please email your info to: MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com

*The truth is
– the State took
every step
necessary to
STOP
details of all
significant parts
of the case
from being
made public.*

DISTURBING FACTS

1. Evidence says Martin Bryant was 58 kilometres away when Mr. David Martin, husband of Sally Martin the co-owners of Seascope was believed shot at that cottage, at 10:40 a.m.

2. Just before the shootings at the Port Arthur Historic Site commenced, the only two policemen [Hyland & Whittle] in the region were called away on a wild goose chase. They were sent to the coal mine at Saltwater River, to investigate a heroin drug stash which turned out to be soap powder. This was too far for them to get to the Broad Arrow Café in time to be of any use. Had a cop remained at Dunalley, he could have closed the swing bridge to prevent the killer(s) from escaping off the peninsula. Did Bryant with his IQ of 66 organise this decoy?

3. Before the massacre, a specially-built 22-body capacity mortuary truck was built. It attracted some derision at the time, but its effective use at Port Arthur was unquestioned. After the massacre it was advertised, unsuccessfully, for sale via the internet, then converted for another purpose. Without the foresight of Port Arthur, why build it? When it had proven its worth, why get rid of it? Just another coincidence?

4. Martin Bryant has never been properly identified as the gunman. A young woman who ate her lunch near the gunman just before 1:30 p.m. said he had a freckled face. Graham Collyer, the wounded ex-soldier, who had the best opportunity to observe the killer, said he had a pock-marked or acned face. Neither description fits Bryant who has a beautifully smooth complexion. **Graham Collyer says that it was not Bryant who shot him in the neck.**

5. On 30th April, The Mercury newspaper in Hobart printed a week-old photo of Martin Bryant on the front page. This was illegal because at that stage some of the witnesses had not yet been asked to identify the killer, and the photo would have become fixed in the minds of the witnesses. When one witness was asked to describe the clothing worn by the gunman, she described the clothing on the photo instead of what the gunman had worn. That newspaper and other which did similar things **were not prosecuted** for breaking the law.

6. Mrs. Wendy Scurr, nurse, tour guide and ambulance officer, rang the police at 1:32 p.m. to report the shooting that was then taking place at the café. She and other medics then cared for the injured and the dead without any police protection for **six and a half hours**. Who ordered the armed police to stop at Taranna, where they **had a barbecue**? The police who arrived by boats were a stone's throw away from the main crime scene, the café, and they too failed to come in to see what was going on. Was this meant to increase the trauma of the survivors?

7. Three more shots were fired at Port Arthur Historic Site at 6:30 p.m. while Bryant was, with absolute certainty, at Seascope cottage. Who fired those shots?

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

8. Same Question - Different Answer. At a recent seminar in Queensland on forensics where the Tasmanian Police forensic gun inspector, Gerard Dutton, gave a lecture, the first question came from Mr. Ian McNiven. He asked if there was any empirical evidence to link Martin Bryant to the Broad Arrow Café. Sergeant Dutton immediately closed the 15-minute question time and would not reply. When McNiven managed to say "I have here Graham Collyer's police statement..." Dutton threatened him with arrest and called for security agents to escort McNiven out of the building.

9. Yet a police video tape exists which proves that the police had an excellent opportunity to get DNA samples and fingerprints of the gunman. The video briefly shows the blue sports bag on a café table. The gunman had carried his 3 firearms in this bag and left it right next to his drinking glass, his Solo soft drink can, knife, fork, plate, video cameras, etc. Why did the police fail to take DNA samples and fingerprints?

10. According to the official story, Bryant first killed David and Sally Martin at Seascope cottage in the morning, then went on to Port Arthur. Yet two policemen reported seeing a **naked woman with black hair**, screaming and running from one building to another at Seascope well into the afternoon. If Sally Martin was dead, who was this woman?

11. Proof of other gunmen in Seascope cottage. While Bryant was calmly talking to police by telephone in the cottage during the siege and the conversation was recorded, **someone else fired an SKK rifle at least 20 times**. In the transcript the gunfire is recorded as "coughs" but an electronic analysis of one of the "coughs" shows that it was an SKK shot. [see Part 6]


12. On the Sunday morning, some 25 specialist physicians (Royal Australian College of Surgeons) from all over Australia had attended a training course in Hobart. Their last lecture was on Terrorist Attack and Gunshot Wounds. They stayed on to take care of the wounded victims.

13. Also, more than 700 reporters and journalists from 17 nations came to a seminar in Hobart. They were asked to arrive during the weekend as the seminar was due to begin early Monday morning. How handy to have 700 scribblers churning out their anti-gun and disarmament propaganda to the whole world!

14. *There will never be uniform gun laws in Australia until we see a massacre in Tasmania*, said Barry Unsworth, then NSW premier, in December 1987 at a conference in Hobart. Prophecy or planning?

15. "If we don't get it (gun laws) right this time, next time there is a massacre, and there will be, then they'll take all our guns off us," the deputy prime minister, Tim Fischer, told gun owners at Alice Springs in May 1996. Who is the THEY who would order the removal of our guns? Did Fischer let slip that gun confiscation has been ordered by someone other than our own leaders?

GUNMAN'S TRAY BAG & CAMERA



Images of inside the Broad Arrow Café. Tray of the gunman which he placed on a table inside the café before he started the shooting. Items that he handled are still on the tray. The blue sportsbag he left behind almost obscures his black video camera. (white arrowed) That officials wilfully ignored this evidence suggests to us that it was **exculpatory** for Martin Bryant.*

* Tasmania Police training video

16. No Respect for the Law. Our laws demand that a coronial enquiry must take place: (a) when foreign nationals are killed; (b) when anyone dies in a fire John Howard acted illegally when he ordered the coronial enquiry to be abandoned.²⁷

17. It is evident that the massacre was planned to happen on the ferry which sailed to the Isle of the Dead every day. The victims were to be eighty elderly American tourists who had come in two coaches. But the plan went awry because the sailing time of the ferry had changed from 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. All the preparations were made for a 1:30 massacre, so the killer began his work at the Broad Arrow Cafe at 1:30, instead of on the ferry at 2:30.

Here is some evidence suggesting that the plan was to kill the Americans at 1:30 on the way to the Isle of the Dead where tourists are shown the ancient convict cemetery:

- a) The gunman had tried to buy a ticket for the 1:30 p.m. sailing;
- b) When the gunman began pulling out his weapons in the Café, one *professional* witness [Anthony Nightingale] stood up shouting "No, no, not here!" If it was not meant to be "here," then it was meant to be somewhere else. Nightingale was shot for he had obviously given the game away;
- c) Had the gunman waited for the 2:30 sailing, the decoyed policemen may have returned with their firearms and two-way radios and upset things;
- d) Also, with the later start the trauma surgeons at the Royal Hobart Hospital may have dispersed and not been available to treat the wounded victims;
- e) In a video made by the Tasmania Police we are told that some policemen came by sea to Port Arthur in patrol boats. These police did not go ashore. They did not come to the crime scenes at the café or elsewhere to help the victims or to guard the first-aid workers who needed protection. Obviously they expected a massacre at sea, when they saw nothing they returned to Hobart.
- f) On his way to the Historic Site the gunman stopped to help some girls who had problems with their car. He told them of his intention to kill some WASPS [White Anglo-Saxon Protestants] on the Isle of the Dead;
- g) On the very day Martin Bryant was being sentenced in Hobart, president Clinton²⁸ was addressing the Australian parliament in Canberra. Was he there to make sure poor Martin copped the blame for the massacre and that nothing went wrong with the gun confiscation scheme, which of course was the reason for the Port Arthur massacre?

18. On the Sunday morning, two hours before the murders, ten of the senior managers of Port Arthur were taken to safety many miles away up the east coast [to Swansea], for a two-day seminar with a vague agenda and no visiting speakers. Was the timing of this trip just a mere coincidence? ■

(amended; added emphasis)

²⁷ John Howard, then prime minister, actually did not have the authority to, nor did he order the enquiry by a coroner be abandoned. It was put as a suggestion and couched in words of concern about the families and friends of victims. Regardless, by the law of Tasmania a coronial enquiry was required. No one in Tasmania, or Australia, had legal authority to override that legislation.

²⁸ Most disgusting and dishonest president the United States ever had. Pulitzer Prize winner George Will said the following in relation to Clinton: "This is America's tawdriest presidency." In Canberra, the master of immorality Clinton presented himself as an intelligent statesman. But back in Washington, he had himself shamelessly fellated inside the White House, then he lied about it to the entire population of his country. To see how he as a person and president has been described, read this compilation of quotations about him: *THAT WOMAN: Lies; Damned Lies & Clintonisms.* (amazon.co.uk)

PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT²⁹

Tony Pitt³⁰

loveforlife.com.au; 7 July 2009

A hell of a cover-up.³¹

PORT Arthur survivor Wendy Scurr has called for an inquiry into the Port Arthur massacre on 28 April 1996 when 35 people were killed.

BEFORE INCIDENT

- In 1987, the premier of New South Wales, Barry Unsworth said: "I suppose it will take a massacre of the proportions we have seen in Queen Street³² and Hoddle Street³³ to bring Tasmania and Queensland around."³⁴
- In March 1996, less than a month before the Port Arthur incident: "The Gun Coalition's Tasmanian coordinator Mr. Rowland Browne wrote to The Mercury newspaper warning of a Dunblane-style massacre in Tasmania unless the gun laws were changed."³⁵
- The gun legislation of the then prime minister (John Howard) was drafted and printed before the massacre.
- Senior Port Arthur staff members were sent away to a work seminar that Sunday.
- The Royal Hobart Hospital had put their Emergency Plan in place two days before the massacre.
- The Hobart Hospital had a Trauma Seminar timed to end at the exact moment the shooting started.
- Several helicopter pilots were readily available to work on that Sunday, the 28th April. (Most unusual in Tasmania.)
- The local police were decoyed to be at the opposite end of the peninsula at the exact moment the shooting began.
- There was an international Media Convention **in Hobart** on the 30th April so there were plenty of reporters on hand.
- Martin Bryant was an intellectually impaired, registered invalid with an **IQ of 66**.
- There was a **22-body morgue truck** available. (In Tasmania?)

IMMEDIATELY PRIOR INCIDENT

The killer sat next to the witness, Rebecca McKenna. The vital parts of her statement³⁶ to the police were: "This male was carrying the tray with his food on it..." & "His facial skin appeared to be freckley and he was pale." & "When he sat down, he placed his video camera and bag on the floor and began to eat his lunch, I noticed that he had a can of Solo and a plastic Schweppes cup on the table." & "I saw him drink his cordial and I noticed that he appeared anxious..." & "The last thing I saw with regard to him was his tray falling out [*explanation hand written*: "tipping – didn't actually see it fall."] of his hand as he was going back inside the cafeteria."

²⁹ Original title: Port Arthur's Survivor's Doubt – Survivor Wendy Scurr Says "A Hell Of A Cover-Up" Has Occurred and She Is Pushing For An Inquiry.

³⁰ social activist and investigator; now deceased

³¹ Statement by Wendy Scurr.

³² Street in Melbourne, capital of the Australian state of Victoria, where a shooter killed **nine people** in 1987 (December).

³³ Street in Melbourne, capital of the Australian state of Victoria, where a shooter killed **seven people** in 1987 (August).

³⁴ The Mercury; 23 December 1987.

³⁵ The Australian; 29 April 1996.

³⁶ Rebecca Kate McKenna. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

But Martin Bryant **doesn't** have a freckly face. That tray was extremely **important**. It was a personal ID card from the shooter. It contained fingerprints, thumbprints, palmprints, saliva, sweat, skin and possibly hair from the shooter. That tray contained real physical evidence as to the identity of the shooter. **Where is the report on this tray and what was on it?**

THE SHOOTING

The killer was right handed. Martin Bryant is left handed.³⁷ The killer shot from the hip (right handed). The killer shot 32 people killing 20 and injuring 12. The killer scored 20 head shots, from the right hip, in 90 seconds!³⁸ There are only about 20 shooters that good (better than Olympians) in the Western World. The killer stopped shooting after firing 29 shots (of the 30 in a magazine). This leaves a live round in the breech while changing magazines. To count while firing at a rate of 48 rounds per minute is a technique that requires tens of thousands of shots to perfect. It is a military skill-at-arms far beyond a mentally-retarded youth who fired at a few tins and bits of cardboard in the bush.³⁹

The *official* police version says the massacre was first reported at **13:35** p.m. by Port Arthur security manager, Ian Kingston. According to police, he went into the café while the shooting was going on, and backed out. Then [allegedly] he reported the massacre. [The information officer, tour-guide, and first aid instructor Wendy Scurr was actually the first person to telephone for help. She called the police at Hobart at **13:32**.] Wendy Scurr was the lady who held the telephone out of the window to convince the police shooting was in progress.⁴⁰

FLAWED EVIDENCE

- According to police the Martins were shot at Seascope, while police evidence also proves **Bryant was at a service station c.57 kilometres away**.⁴¹
- Police say he [the gunman] arrived at the historic site at 13:15. But the police have proof that he was there earlier at 12:45.
- [A woman thought to be] Sally Martin was seen to run around Seascope naked that afternoon. Police say Bryant killed her that morning.
- Audio tape of the *negotiations* recorded shots from a rifle from upstairs at Seascope while Bryant was downstairs talking to police on the phone. There was no phone upstairs.
- Police were pinned down by fire from the shed and the Seascope cottage. That is a good [two-places-at-once] trick for one gunman.
- Bryant [allegedly] fired shots at 18:30 at Port Arthur Historic Site while he was under siege by police at Seascope.
- There was a suspect black van allowed outside the Broad Arrow Café afterwards. It wasn't the federal, state or interstate police. All civilian vehicle traffic was excluded.
- Several suspicious non-locals exited the area via the bridge at Dunalley. This bridge was a security shut down point operated by police in case of an emergency.
- All evidence of the shooting was removed from the building to make it a sacred site. This is no coincidence.

37 Martin Bryant is right-handed. But, as he unhesitatingly demonstrated to two police interrogators, he shot at his targets (cans & pieces of cardboard) in a left-handed way. (see *SUBJECT INDEX*; handedness, shooting)

38 This short time seems inaccurate. It suited the official claim related to the quick firing rate achievable with self-loading rifles. But witnesses and investigators conclude that the gunman was shooting inside the Broad Arrow Café for a time longer than 90 seconds. And witnesses confirm that the gunman did **not** fire all the shots from his hip. He did fire sighted shots from his shoulder.

39 Admitted to and described by Martin Bryant to two police interrogators. He also said he did **not** shoot animals or use glass bottles as targets because the broken glass could cut animals.

40 Evidence provided to the editor says that Ian Kingston **did not**, as he says, enter the Broad Arrow Café while the shooting there was underway. A check on a police computer confirmed Kingston did telephone at **13:35** and Wendy Scurr called at **13:32**. Kingston **did not** phone from the information office. It seems that he would have called using the next closest telephone which was at the Parsonage. That building, which was locked, is approximately half a kilometer uphill from the Broad Arrow Café. It seems that no one witnessed Kingston at or in the café as he says. His location at **13:35** and how he got there is not known with certainty.

41 Forcett, Tasmania; see Gary John King. *Witness Statement*; Part 7.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

CONFLICTING EVIDENCE

- Bryant must have had infra-red night vision to tell police their sniper was unwelcome and had to move on.⁴²
- Police records indicate they were shot at from two Seascope buildings at once during the night of the siege.⁴³

DELIBERATELY CHANGED EVIDENCE

The killer sat next to the witness, Rebecca McKenna. She said this: "This male was carrying the tray with his food on it...." & "His facial skin appeared to be freckley and he was pale." & "When he sat down, he placed his video camera and bag on the floor and began to eat his lunch, I noticed that he had a can of Solo and a plastic Schweppes cup on the table." & "I saw him drink his cordial and I noticed that he appeared anxious...." & "The last thing I saw with regard to him was his tray falling out [*explanation hand written: "tipping – didn't actually see it fall."*] of his hand as he was going back inside the cafeteria."

The statement has been altered to say: "The last thing I saw with regard to him was his tray falling out of his hand as he was going back inside the cafeteria." However, Rebecca caught the change and hand wrote into the margin: "tipping – didn't actually see it fall." So the police, just four weeks after the massacre, were trying to get rid of the tray as evidence. **Why hasn't it been mentioned?**

The disappearance of this vital evidence is not accidental. **They have got rid of the tray evidence.** There will have been a successful conspiracy to **pervert the course of justice** if there is no trial with all evidence put to a jury by a lawyer that is loyal to his client, honest, competent, or at least impartial.⁴⁴

TOO MUCH COINCIDENCE

The rifles were destroyed by **breech blasts** so ballistic tests could not be carried out to identify the murder weapons. Breech blasts that could destroy a gun are **so rare** as to be unheard of this century. One blast pushed fluid brass into the steel breech block. It must have been a nuclear charge. That is just nonsense or a **planned demolition** to allow false evidence [to be presented].⁴⁵

ILLEGALITIES

There was **no coronial inquiry**. There should have been one by law. A coronial inquiry is required: **a)** When foreign nationals are killed; & **b)** When there are deaths by fire. Both requirements were met. Why was the law broken to prohibit the inquiry?⁴⁶

The Evidence Act requires that ALL evidence be considered. At the Kangaroo Court more evidence **was concealed** than was presented. There is a difference between presenting a transcript and dealing with specific sections, and editing a transcript until there is nothing left by way of evidence. In the case of Martin Bryant, the prosecution so gutted the transcript that there was nothing left. Only a few comments favourable to the prosecution's case got to the court. **The court transcript shows that more was edited out than was presented.**

⁴² Martin Bryant **did not have** any infra-red night vision equipment, and he **did not have** any laser sight. The cops suggested he did, but there was **no evidence** of such items found at Seascope cottage. (Ashes were sifted and identifiable metal parts of such items would have been found, if they were there.)

⁴³ There is evidence which confirms there were two shooters at Seascope. But there is **not a shred** of evidence that Martin Bryant was one of them.

⁴⁴ Martin Bryant never had an ethical lawyer to defend him. The three* who were assigned to him were – and still are – **gutless mongrels**. (* **1.** Debra Rigby; **2.** David Gunson; **3.** John Avery – he actually aided the State with setting up Martin to be imprisoned for life.) All three are intelligent people who, without any doubt, knew exactly what was being done to innocent Martin Bryant, and why it was being done to him. These mongrels refused to stand up and fight for their client. They let him be condemned to a slow painful death in a cage, so they could continue living their very respectable lawyer lives – in the vernacular, *piss on truth and justice*. Lawyers are **not** concerned about the determination of truth and justice, a prevalent misconception of the public. Most lawyers have only one interest in their lives – money. The quintessence of lawyering is **GREED** – not Truth and Justice.

⁴⁵ See Andrew S. MacGregor's *STATUTORY DECLARATION EXTRACTS* at Part 6.

⁴⁶ Pitt seems to have meant an inquest, which is a **more detailed** investigation conducted by a coroner. An inquiry can precede an inquest.

TRUTH ABOUT PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE

– Part 1 –

AUSTRALIA has a deep, sinister, evil past that has to be told, one involving loose agents within federal government departments and intelligence agencies. ASIO, Tasmania Police, and Tasmania SOG and others **deliberately carried out this attack** so as to help politicians push for tighter gun laws Australia wide. And then they helped the Tasmania state government and employees within certain departments and agencies to railroad Martin Bryant, the chosen stooge/patsy.

An innocent person by the name of Martin Bryant was the fall guy/patsy for this false-flag operation. He is **completely innocent** and the media and those in the above-named government departments and agencies that participated in this attack know he is.

Innocent lives were wasted, when there was no need for these people to be slain in cold blood. If the government in Australia wanted gun laws passed, why not just introduce these laws and pass them? Why go to all the trouble of killing innocent people so as to push an agenda? These **evil people** who participated in this false-flag terrorist attack have all moved on to higher positions in life, while they destroyed Martin Bryant's life, and the lives of all those they killed in the attack and their families.

It's time to hold accountable all those people who took part in this false-flag terrorist attack, upon Australian citizens and Australian shores. The issue is not the government passing gun-law control. The issue is the police, ASIO, federal-attorney general's office, with the blessing of government and later a cover-up by government, **carried out a terrorist attack against their own people.**

How dare these people arrange a terrorist attack which was carried out against their own people – **murdering them in cold blood.** When any government carries out terrorism against its own people, then that government has become corrupt and no longer serves the Australian people.

OBJECTIVE CONCLUSIONS ABOUT PORT ARTHUR

So what does all this material mean? Simply the claim that Martin Bryant was behind the Port Arthur Massacre is phoney. There is too much evidence to the contrary to say otherwise. **This conclusion is based upon the enormous number of facts that point to persons at high and middle levels in the Tasmanian government and police service and persons in Canberra being behind it.**

SPECIFICALLY THESE POINTS BECOME CLEAR

1. Martin Bryant was not and could not have been the gunman at the Port Arthur Historic Site as **photographic and witness evidence says otherwise.** Nor did he do anything at Seascape.

2. Senior Tasmanian police **deliberately** did not attempt to collect evidence, and in fact they allowed evidence to be destroyed or tampered with.

3. Tasmanian DPP **Damian Bugg lied to, misled, and withheld evidence** from the court about the incident which would give Martin Bryant an alibi. [see Insert *DPP TAMPERS WITH & WITHHOLDS EVIDENCE* in Part 6]

(cont.)

4. The **failure to hold a full Coroner's inquest** afterwards and legislative changes in 1995, just before [the incident], by the then premier Ray Groom to prevent such an inquest indicate **premeditation**.

5. Only a small group of people really knew what was going on the day of the massacre and most others in the Tasmanian police didn't.

6. It is quite clear this massacre had only one purpose – a large gun massacre falsely blamed on a private citizen – aimed solely at justifying a **gun-control** agenda, in particular the banning of semi-automatic firearms.

7. Federal ALP appointed bureaucrats in the justice department had been pushing the same gun-control agenda at Australian Police Ministers Council meetings without success and had touted their revised proposals just months before in November 1995 (which were the same as those adopted after the Port Arthur incident). And these same bureaucrats also had access and control of ASIO and police services under federal-state arrangements entered into in the early 1990s. When the Port Arthur incident happened, they isolated the then prime minister John Howard from other advisors and pushed as hard as they could the agenda they had been running.

All these things added up point to one conclusion – and it is a conclusion that politicians in Australia today are too afraid to face and why they run for cover whenever there is a mention of Port Arthur.

That the federal ALP Keating government, which had been pushing an anti-firearm agenda since getting elected in 1983, and more particularly since 1988, somehow coerced the Tasmanian state government to having a gun massacre to occur after the 1996 federal, an election it knew it was going to lose. **Blackmail of some type was involved.**

Its purpose was to justify a gun-grab, cause political trouble for John Howard and the coalition – particularly the National Party – and result in a back-lash at the state levels (which at the time in 1996 were controlled by the coalition in all states but NSW). All of which would only benefit one party, the ALP.

Put another way, the Australian federal government entered into a covert arrangement with a state government to engage in genocide [mass murder] for the sole purpose of defrauding persons in Australian states and territories of their property, and creating political mischief as a result. If this is the case, it constitutes an unlawful conspiracy (**homicide** and **fraud**).

AN ACT OF PUBLIC SECTOR TERRORISM

If the Port Arthur incident involved federal-state financial arrangements it constitutes an unlawful and most serious abuse of the *Commonwealth Constitution Act* 1901. The only alternative to this conclusion is persons within the federal and Tasmanian public service (ASIO, Justice Department, Tasmania Police, etc.) were running the same agenda on their own – and compromised persons in the Tasmanian government into cooperating with them. However, it would have been unlikely the attack at Port Arthur could have occurred without the knowledge and sanction of federal politicians. ■

Lloyd T. Vance, Steve Johnson

scribd.com

10 February 2013

(amended; added emphasis)

In the *court document*, Mr. Perks, for the prosecution states this: "Your Honour, if I could take you to Volume 3 of the Crown papers, a transcript of that interview commences at page 19 and, if I could refer your Honour to the actual page numbers of the interview I will give an indication as to which parts of the interview have been deleted for the present purpose."⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: pp. 190-194. The only purpose of deleting anything – one word – is so that you will not be told the whole truth about the **setting up of the patsy Martin Bryant**. Before the first shot was fired at the Port Arthur Historic Site there was secrecy. And here we actually see it in documents from a so-called supreme court. This secrecy continues **to this day**. Australians pay for this bloody abomination called *the law* in their country and are treated like mushrooms: *kept in the dark and fed on shit*. **35** people were murdered, **23** were wounded, and the subsequent misery and pain is incalculable. But the State has not dealt with this in a moral way. No. What has been pushed is an official narrative which is incomplete, inaccurate, and an insult to that nation. **SECRECY and LIES have prevailed**. And to compound the whole matter, the li(n)e that we are not to upset the families of the victims continues to be used as if seeking and speaking the truth were harmful – when, *only the truth can set people free*. That a grinning goat by the name of **John Howard**, who was the prime minister (*sic*) of Australia during the Port Arthur mass murder, has aided and abetted the cover-up should not surprise us one bit. For he too is a corrupt lawyer – one of those mongrels who have ruined that country. Roman historian and orator Tacitus (c.55-120) said: *The more corrupt the republic [nation], the more numerous the laws*. Now, legislation is a ligature around the neck of every Australian.

Page 1-9	DELETED
Page 10	DELETED (except for last few Qs & As on that page)
Page 11-16	PRESENTED
Page 17	DELETED partially
Page 18	DELETED
Page 19-22	PRESENTED
Page 22-23	DELETED
Page 24-31	PRESENTED
Page 32-35	DELETED
Page 36	DELETED Question No. 1
Page 37-38	PRESENTED
Page 39	DELETED from "Warren" down
Page 40	DELETED
Page 41	DELETED all above "pain"
Page 42	PRESENTED
Page 43	DELETED all below "Warren"
Page 44-46	DELETED
Page 47	DELETED half
Page 48-74	PRESENTED
Page 75-77	PRESENTED
Page 78	DELETED partially
Page 79-81	DELETED
Page 82-90	PRESENTED
Page 91	DELETED partially
Page 92-98	DELETED
Page 99-114	PRESENTED
Page 115	DELETED partially
Page 116-141	DELETED
Page 142	DELETED partially
Page 143-144	PRESENTED
Page 145	DELETED partially
Page 146	DELETED remainder of interview

We know that **52 of the first 146 pages of transcript were not presented**. [c.36% of the entire transcript] The excuse was that the video recorder failed so the transcript had to be reconstructed from the audio tape that was made independently at the same time. The back-up didn't fail. **How the hell could the written transcript be in any way affected?** This is baloney.

Many hundreds of pages that followed were not presented. Of those I have read I do not believe any sane police officer would suggest Martin Bryant was the killer. That is why the police didn't get to testify. Bryant was not just one sandwich-short-of-a-picnic; he was obviously not capable of what we would consider normal thought processes.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Nor did he have a clue about the events at Port Arthur. The killer used the acronym WASP (White Anglo Saxon Protestant). This term may be familiar to well-read Australians but Martin wasn't even in the same [intellectual] ball-park. AND he wasn't pretending. The transcript revealed so much as to Bryant's mental capacity that it could not be allowed into a court room if the intent was to frame Bryant, and convince the jury that this handicapped individual was the Rambo-Class killer who killed 35 in a random shooting spree.

THERE WAS NO TRIAL

There was torture.⁴⁸ This is illegal. Bryant was held in solitary confinement for at least ten times the maximum allowable as punishment in war under the Geneva Convention.

He confessed to get a TV set in his room. After that much solitary, men go mad or confess to anything. Bryant was mentally-retarded.

What happened to the lab report on the tray/cutlery/can/cup/plate? Did Bryant's fingerprints and DNA show up on the tray and contents? The evidence was tampered with and not presented. Evidence was withheld. WHY? The sportsbag also carried samples of the killer's DNA.

If some vital evidence is given to the prosecutor, then the prosecutor is duty bound, **by law**, to give that vital evidence to the defence. We know there were heaps of the killer's DNA. Does anyone believe the News South Wales CIB **didn't fingerprint and DNA** that tray/cutlery/can/cup/plate, recorded in witness statements, and which is clearly visible on the police video⁴⁹ and forensic photos. We know where the tray was - it was right next to the *blue bag*. It was left exactly where the shooter put it down [on a table inside the café]. All the evidence was preserved for the police investigation.

Bryant managed to get himself convicted of murder and get life in prison **without one witness being called**. He managed to stay in a heavily burning building, shooting and yelling at police and get severe burns **only on his back**.

MEDIA MISCHIEF OR FRAMING

Nationwide, the media displayed his photo to witnesses to influence them; and to print false stories about him. Channel Nine fabricated a video showing Bryant running away from the Broad Arrow Café. According to [one] analysis - the Bryant head superimposed on the running figure is a still photo, with a fixed angle and facial expression. This is not possible while running.

There is enough material for investigators to believe Bryant is innocent and put up a good case. If it was your son in jail you would want him to have a trial. Scores of other witnesses can't understand why the media reports differ greatly from what they saw and heard. A thirty-year embargo was placed on evidence in relation to the Port Arthur massacre. WHY? That smacks of skullduggery. There can be no legitimate excuse. **It is impossible for any reasonable person to come to the conclusion Bryant was the lone killer.**

⁴⁸ The following definition appeared on aussielegal.com.au on 13 March 2011: "*Torture* A person who tortures another person commits an offence, and is liable to be imprisoned for up to fourteen (14) years. '*Torture*' is defined to mean the intentional infliction of severe pain or suffering on a person by an act or series of acts done on one or more than one occasion. 'Pain and suffering' includes physical, mental, **psychological or emotional pain or suffering**, whether temporary or permanent." (original & added emphasis) In her book, Carleen Bryant states the following: "Martin was held in solitary confinement at Risdon Prison for approximately **120 days**." *My Story*; 2010: p. 132. (added emphasis) Think on this a few minutes. Martin was kept in solitary confinement for 120 days, almost a third of a year. Officially, it is said he was isolated because other prisoners had animosity toward him. But Martin was not a convicted prisoner. He was on remand. There had been **no trial**. (There never was a trial.) He could have been kept in a more relaxed way, but the State had to show the public it was in control, and **the State had to break Martin**. So it was isolation for **120 days**. What mind-bending drugs (don't call it medication) was forced into him? What psychiatric manipulation was used on him? For three months the State **tortured** Martin who was totally helpless.

⁴⁹ This is the police *training video* which was purchased from a second-hand shop by the Tasmanian resident Olga Scully. It shows the condition of the Broad Arrow Café (with victims) after the shooting there on 28 April 1996. The sports bag and camera which were left behind by the gunman are clearly visible. The presence of this bag confirms absolutely that **Martin Bryant was set up by the State**. There was no other reason why the gunman would have brought two sports bags (one inside the other) into the café. Witnesses saw him leave with a bag and place it inside the boot of a yellow Volvo, having left the other bag in the café, which allegedly contained items belonging to Martin Bryant.

⁵⁰ Abdurrahman Wahid; 1940-2009; president of Indonesia 1999-2001; staunch defender of human rights, ethnic minorities, and secularism.

⁵¹ But mainstream media has encouraged Australians to believe that all the deaths and injuries were the work of *Moslem* extremists. The media, and officials in Australia want Australians to hate *Moslems* – which makes it easier for the State to kill them in other parts of the world. Get your troops/murderers to verbally abuse Moslem people by calling them camel-fuckers, ragheads, terrorists, etc.* then take those killers and let 'em loose. Why, even Harry Windsor thinks it's okay to take them *out of the game* from his Apache helicopter gunship: "The prince, who was in charge of firing the Apache's Hellfire air-to-surface missiles, rockets and 30mm gun, also said his taste for video games helped him in battle. **'It's a joy for me** because I'm one of those people who loves playing Play-Station and Xbox, so with my thumbs I like to think I'm probably quite useful,' he said." (added emphasis; guardian.co.uk; 4 February 2013) So for Harry, **it's a joy** to explode those *Moslem* fuckers into dog meat – and don't think for one minute in human terms about what you are doing you brainless, heartless, parasitic mongrel. (* The most-recent term is *savage*. What follows is an extract from *American Sniper*, [2012: p. 4] an autobiography by the official **mass murderer** Chris Kyle, who they say **killed 255 people**: "**Savage, despicable, evil. That's what we were fighting in Iraq.** That's why a lot of people, myself included, called the enemy 'savages'.... **I only wish I had killed more.** Not for bragging rights, but because I believe the world is a better place without savages out there taking American lives." [original & added emphasis] Of course, most Americans think this is heroic killing at it best. America **can murder as many men, women, and children as its wants to**, anywhere in the world, at any time – including its own people – if it suits their political or military objectives. Americans might have been behind the whole Port Arthur incident.)

UNTRUTHS & TERROR

■ LAST night the biggest fraud in the history of Australia was disclosed to the Australian people on TV. The former president⁵⁰ of Indonesia (who was widely known in Indonesia as the only honest politician there) directly stated in no uncertain terms that the Indonesia police and/or military had perpetrated the infamous Bali bombing in which **over 200 people were killed... about half of them Australians.**⁵¹

■ On 20th November 2003 on his visit to London, Bush had become trapped in Buckingham Palace where he was staying. Anger on the streets of London prevented him from being able to even wave at a crowd. A last, tomorrow's headlines were going to be about the US President having to cancel all British engagements due to public indignation! That couldn't be allowed to happen, of course: he and Blair were rescued by a bomb – in Istanbul, in a nearby empty British embassy. The next day the news was: B & B walk tall, defying terror.... On his next visit two years later, it was London's turn. Bush arrived on 6th July, shook hands with Blair, and then, as on the previous occasion, a day later the bombs went off. The G8 Summit was aborted, the hopes of the world to "make poverty history" successfully sidelined, and the next month a whole raft of civil liberties were successfully withdrawn from us, the British people. **Terror works – State terror, that is.**

■ Most people are just not willing to credit elements of their government with complicity in domestic terror. Let us aspire to calm and factual exposition, and note that, on days before and after the anniversary of July 7th in 2006, Sky News and BBC News both continually presented images of the four alleged bombers in their visit to London on June 28th, 2005, as recorded by CCTV cameras at Luton and Kings Cross Thameslink. The time-stamps had been removed to make them look as if they had been shot on July 7, ten days later. Three of the four suspects had indeed visited London on June 28th for a day trip. Al-Qaeda (assuming for a moment that it did really exist) cannot do this, cannot make the BBC show fake CCTV footage for the purpose of deluding the British people.... We live in a world where discerning what is real and what is not has become rather difficult and where **seeing is no longer believing.**

■ **We are bombarded with untruths through our media,** because journalists print what they are told, leaked from un-attributed sources. They cannot spend days listening to both or all sides' point of view, but have to commit themselves in print the next morning. We therefore live in a society where the truth that matters can be found on the Web, as an expression of the collective intelligence of the human race, whereas it is **hardly to be found in a newspaper.**

Nick Kollerstrom
Terror on the Tube
2011: pp. 259-270
(amended; added emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

It is impossible that others weren't involved. It is obvious that a **set-up and cover-up has occurred**. Those who were prepared to leave him to burn to death in Seascope saw Martin Bryant as expendable. The eyewitnesses can't understand why their testimony recorded by police **was not used**. Many honest police can see that the bulk of evidence points to others.

Bryant is so retarded he might know what guilty means but he **would not have a clue as to the implications of a guilty plea**. There are grounds for a trial. This is not a retrial. This would be a first trial with evidence presented to a jury.

A **faked picture of the bag** was shown on TV and put up on the internet. When alert viewers saw the ploy the picture was replaced with a **fake tracing**. In the digital camera era one is forced to ask – WHY A TRACING? What is going on?

Getting rid of the lab report in regards to the tray is one thing. However, anyone taking a look at that [*police training*] video would immediately ask about the tray and whether there was a lab report – **so the tray also had to be lost!** No tray, no report. Thus the fake picture we all saw on television. But WHY?

THE ETERNAL QUESTION

Why would anyone conduct a massacre, kill 35 innocent people, and frame a mentally-retarded youth? The real question is can you, the Reader, cope with truth too terrible to contemplate? Nobody asks you to blindly believe what I put to you. I do ask that you ask for the results of the DNA tests on clues left by the real killer to be cross-checked with the DNA of Martin Bryant.

You know, in your heart, that the police and the government will never answer your request or comply with the requirement so you already know their guilt. What are you going to do? You also might think that you are powerless but that feeling of entrapment is only in the mind. You can send this⁵² to hundreds of people asking them to keep sending it to hundreds of people **until the truth comes out one way or the other**.

WHO GAINS?

Whenever we are confronted with so-called *conspiracy theories*, it often helps to ask the question: *Who gains?*⁵³ In the Port Arthur massacre, it was the desire to bring in onerous gun legislation. They knew we have inherited the right to keep and bear arms from the Bill of Rights 1688 and they can't change it.

However, they also knew that if they had a good excuse, a large number in the population would forego one of our basic rights to try to protect themselves from a similar incident in the future. **Without the Port Arthur massacre, the people of Australia would never have allowed the governments to take away one of their most precious rights.** ■

(amended; original italics; added emphasis)

⁵² The author Tony Pitt is referring to his own work. But note there is no copyright on the book which you are now reading. It can be freely copied, emailed, linked, websited, etc.

⁵³ *Cui bono* is a Latin phrase meaning *to whose benefit?* (pronounced KWE.bono) In law, it is posed to stimulate thinking, and possibly an answer, to the matter of determining who committed some act. The rationale for posing the question is the belief that the person responsible for an act is the one who benefits from it – the benefit perceived to be forthcoming motivates the perpetration of the act.

The
Port Arthur
incident
benefitted
the prime minister
– so, just how
much did
John Howard
know about
that planned
mass murder
before it
took place?

JOHN HOWARD'S END

ONE man in Australia who should not be overlooked in the long list of Howard's possible victims is Martin Bryant. He lives in an institution of confinement in Tasmania. It's rumoured he is overweight, listless and despondent. For Bryant, Howard's era in power was to become the beginning of **hell on earth**.

Whether [Martin] Bryant truly killed all those people at Port Arthur in Tasmania more than ten years ago is a matter that can – and should – be tested in an appropriate judicial process.... [But] evidence for his guilt was **never tested in court**.

Ah, but what about the inquest – or coronial inquiry – you may be thinking. That's where basic facts of unnatural deaths are competently examined – and an official, public determination made about the probable cause of death. True, under normal circumstances. But apparently, and despite pleas from survivors among others, **no such inquiry was ever held**.... This is what retired policeman Andrew MacGregor said about the aftermath of the massacre at Port Arthur:

■ The next moves made by Mr Howard...are mind-boggling. The prime minister stated that since the perpetrator had been apprehended, it would help ease the suffering of the survivors if they did not have to experience the pain of a coronial inquest. By making such a comment, Mr Howard has made a legal presumption;

■ Under Australian law, a person must be considered innocent until proven guilty. Mr Howard must have been aware that stating Bryant was the guilty person was an offence within the meaning of the Act, of contempt;

■ Radio commentators have been gaoled for making similar remarks. Any barrister worthy of [her/his] station would immediately condemn such statements as being prejudicial to his client. No such criticism was levelled at the prime minister; and,

■ There was another problem with Mr Howard's dictum, of which he must have been well aware. Mr Howard is only a politician. It is normal under State law that every death not covered by a doctor's certificate, must undergo an inquest. There are no ifs or buts about it.

Now, please don't write me complaining that I'm citing references from people associated with the Shooters Party, and therefore I'm a shooting fanatic whose opinions can be automatically disregarded...I'm not.... Please spare me the *guilt by association* style of rebuttal. I can't vouch for the factual content of their material having never spent long periods studying the detail of the Port Arthur massacres. What appalls me is that no-one seems to answer the important questions they raise about the Port Arthur killings – questions that cry out for **real answers**.

Michael Moore

Howard's end. Due Process to be resumed?
cairnsblog.net, 2 Dec 2007
(amended; added emphasis)

**A TANGLED WEB OF
POLICE CORRUPTION**
Andrew S. MacGregor⁵⁴

December 2011

*Oh what tangled webs we weave,
When first we practice to deceive.*⁵⁵

WITH the implementation of the new firearm laws introduced to Victoria by the Cain government in 1987, after the Hoddle Street massacre,⁵⁶ there was suddenly another way for corrupt police to make a dishonest dollar. In the gun amnesty that followed the new Cain government's legislation that criminalised the owning of high-powered so called semi-automatic centre-fire rifles, within the State of Victoria, while other States such as Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania permitted that ownership, some members of the Victoria Police found themselves in a position to make a lot of money in **the sale of surrendered firearms.**

It is not surprising that some members of the Victoria Police would act in a corrupt manner when given the opportunity to earn some extra money. But, what is surprising is the fact that once this corruption was discovered by the Victoria Police command, the corruption was condoned and the offenders protected, by the very body that is supposed to ensure the integrity of the Victoria Police. However this protected corruption did one thing that the Victoria Police hierarchy never anticipated, it made a direct link with the Victoria Police and the murder of 35 people in the Port Arthur massacre. In fact, it could be stated that the Victoria Police supplied the main weapon used in that massacre to the Port Arthur gunman.

With the implementation of Cain's new firearm legislation in 1987, and the surrender of the recently banned centre-fire semi-automatic rifles, 15 AR-15 rifles were handed into the Victoria Police. The owners of these firearms were compensated with an amount varying from \$900 to \$1700 with a total cost to the Victorian taxpayer of \$19,050. There were another two AR-15 rifles confiscated by the Victoria Police, and these 17 firearms were then used to equip the Victoria Police Special Operations Group.

In 1994, the Victoria Police received funds to update the firearms of their Special Operations Group (SOG). The requirements for this specialist equipment would have been set by the only qualified personnel within the Victoria Police, that is, the SOG itself. Furthermore, this type of specialist firearm could only be purchased from a *specialist* dealer, and that was Garnet Featherstone of the Bendigo based firm, Granite Arms, a firearm dealer who had a very good relationship with the SOGs of the Victoria Police.

⁵⁴ Former senior constable with Victoria Police (1968-85); author; investigator.

⁵⁵ Walter Scott. *Marmion*; 1808.

⁵⁶ 9 August 1987 in Melbourne capital of Victoria, Australia.

*Gun registries
staffed by officials
are susceptible
to human failings
– unintentional
and intentional.*

The replacement weapon for the 17 AR-15s was the Australian made Steyr AUG 7.62mm NATO sniper rifle at a cost of approximately \$5,000 per unit. Now once the SOGs had received the Steyr sniper rifle, there was no need to retain the banned AR-15s and they were sold to Granite Arms for the sum of \$32,164.00.

What is interesting is that for this sale of the AR-15s to take place, these rifles had to be removed from the Victoria Police firearms registry. The fact that five of these firearms were required to be re-entered into the firearms registry, when they came into ownership of Victorian shooters with the appropriate firearms licence, demonstrates that the 17 AR-15s had in fact been removed from the firearms registry.

Furthermore, when the assistant commissioner of Victoria Police, Graham I. Sinclair, stated that the AR-15 (Serial No. SP128807) which had been handed in by Bill Drysdale of Yass had been destroyed on the 9th March, 1994, at Simms Metal Furnace in North Laverton, Victoria, which is a year prior to these firearms being sold to Granite Arms, then we have sufficient evidence to demonstrate that a criminal deception has taken place.

Now let's look at the money side of this deception. The 15 AR-15s that were surrendered to the Victoria Police cost the Victorian taxpayers \$19,050. The two confiscated AR-15s were of no cost to the taxpayer. When the SOGs sold these 17 AR-15s to Granite Arms of Bendigo, they realised \$32,164.00, or a \$10,000 mark up on their surrender value. Now when Granite Arms sold four of these rifles to Victorian shooters they sold for \$2,500.00 each, or \$42,500 for the 17 rifles, giving Granite Arms a profit of \$10,000 on the deal.

However, the AR-15s were only part of the deal. In total there were 56 high-powered firearms sold by the Victoria Police SOGs to Granite Arms. The 39 other firearms were Sturm Ruger 5.66mm (Mini-14s) which Granite Arms then sold to the Victorian and Queensland prison service. Of the 17 AR-15s that the Victoria Police SOGs had illegally sold to Granite Arms, five were then sold by Granite Arms to Victorians, who were legally licensed to own such firearms. However, when they initiated their entry into the Victoria Police firearms registry, it was discovered that the individual firearm data had been finalised and that the former Victoria Police weapons purchased from Granite Arms required to be re-entered.

Although senior police denied any knowledge of the discovery of this illegal movement in firearms, inspector Chris Penno the firearms registrar caused a *Police Policy Paper* to be issued on the 5th October, 1995. In other words, the Victoria Police hierarchy were fully aware of the black-market firearm dealings by SOG members of the Victoria Police, but had decided to cover up the corrupt and illegal behaviour. There can be no denying by the Victoria Police command that they were not aware of this corruption, because the existence of the *Police Policy Paper* reiterating that all surrendered weapons must be destroyed tells us quite specifically that the Victoria Police Command learnt of the traffic in banned firearms and had moved

LETTER OF INTIMIDATION
John Avery to Terrence/Terry Hill

JOHN W. AVERY LL.B.
ASSOCIATE:
MARCUS TURNBULL BA, LLB.

6th June 1996

Mr Terrence Hill
56 Sattler Street
GAGEBROOK TAS 7030

Dear Sir,

We write to confirm that we attended with you at Police Headquarters this morning when a discussion was had with Inspector Ross Payne and other Police Officers.

We made it clear to those Police Officers what your position was, namely that at no time had you sold any guns to Bryant, but that you had sold ammunition to him but on each occasion he had shown to you a gun licence which, of course enabled you to sell not only ammunition to him, but guns as well.

In a private conversation that was had between the writer and Inspector Payne, Inspector Payne made it abundantly clear that Police have very strong evidence to suggest that you did in fact sell guns to Bryant and unless you are prepared to in effect change your story, they will press on and try and find sufficient evidence to charge you with some offences. ←

However, it was also made abundantly clear that the Director of Public Prosecutions is prepared to offer you an indemnity against prosecution if you are prepared to accept that you did sell guns to Bryant. ←

Quite clearly you need to very carefully consider your position over the next few days. If in deed you did sell guns to Bryant but that at all times he showed to you a gun licence, then of course you will have committed no offence at any rate. If on the other hand you did sell guns to Bryant and you were aware that he had no licence, then clearly you have committed an offence but the indemnity being offered to you would ensure that you are not prosecuted for any gun offence. ←

120 Main Road, Moonah
Tasmania 7009
P.O. Box 78, Moonah
Telephone: (002) 72 7761
Facsimile: (002) 72 7851
DX: 70603 Moonah

We would suggest that you give this matter your careful consideration over the ensuing weekend and contact the writer, perhaps next Tuesday afternoon in order that we can discuss the matter further. We have indicated to the Police that we will not be able to come back to them before Wednesday or Thursday of next week and that is acceptable to them.

Yours faithfully
JOHN AVERY

Per: 

JOHN W. AVERY

(best available copy; underlining as received by editor)

*Officials
in Tasmania
tried to use
Terry Hill,
a firearms dealer,
to set up
Martin Bryant,
but Hill refused
to buckle and lie
– mongrel officials
then closed Hill's
lawful business.*

to stop that illegal practice. However, none of the Victoria Police SOGs were charged in regard to these criminal acts.

After the Port Arthur massacre journalists from Melbourne's Sunday Herald Sun newspaper began a series of investigations. Since the Sunday Herald Sun newspaper was only a weekly paper, it must be remembered that any fact uncovered by journalists working for this newspaper would only be revealed on the Sunday of each week. On the 9th June, 1996, journalists Phil Maguire and Wayne Jones ran their story under the headlines, *Vic Police had massacre weapon*:

"A high-powered military rifle allegedly used in the Port Arthur massacre was surrendered during the 1987 Victorian gun amnesty, police sources said yesterday." & "The Victoria Police Minister Bill McGrath and the head of the Tasmanian Police Port Arthur Taskforce, Supt Jack Johnston last night pledged to investigate the claims immediately." & "The allegations on the rifle were made by two senior police officers who have worked closely with the Victorian Firearms Registry."

It was at this stage that both the Victoria Police and the Tasmania Police Port Arthur Taskforce went into damage control. The following week, on the 16th June, the Sunday Herald Sun continued their exclusive coverage with: *Police admit sale of banned guns*. There is no further mention of the AR-15 used in the Port Arthur massacre being linked with the Victoria Police. The goal posts were moved to concentrate on the sale of firearms by corrupt police members. However there was one very interesting piece of information at the end of this article: "On Thursday, Tasmanian police raided several gun dealers, searching for details on the purchase and disposal of Sturm Ruger 5.66mm (Mini-14s) military weapons and materials used in the manufacture of fake shooting licences."

Now this Tasmanian aspect is very interesting. From the Sunday Herald Sun article published on the 9th June, we know that the journalists had spoken to Supt. Jack Johnston, but we are only aware that the conversation would have taken some time prior to the 9th June 1996, we do not know the exact date. However, the solicitor John Avery wrote a letter to his client, the gun dealer Terry Hill, dated the 6th June 1996 [see preceding Insert] in which Avery stated he was requested by Det. Inspector Ross Paine [Payne] of the Tasmania Police Taskforce, to have the gun dealer Terry Hill admit selling the Colt AR-15, serial number SP128807 to Martin Bryant.

In other words, the solicitor John Avery was approached by Det. Inspector Ross Paine to have Terry Hill admit selling the Colt AR-15 (serial No. SP128807) to Martin Bryant, that very same weapon that two senior members of the Victoria Police stated had been handed in to the police station at Bayswater, Victoria, the very same weapon which assistant commissioner Graham Sinclair said was destroyed at the Simms Metal Furnace in North Laverton on the 9th March 1994, and one of the 17 Colt AR-15 firearms sold by the Victoria Police SOGs to Granite Arms of Bendigo in March 1995. Terry Hill the gun dealer declined the request of Det. Inspector Ross Paine.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A week after Avery's letter was written, on Thursday the 13th June 1996, Det. Sergeant Keygan of Hobart CIB (Criminal Investigation Branch) raided the gunshop of Terry Hill and confiscated amongst other items the dealer's *Gun Registry*. This registry would have supplied the Tasmania Police with factual evidence if the Colt AR-15 (serial No. SP128807) had been entered. The fact that the registry was never returned to Terry Hill, along with the fact that Hill was never charged with any breaches of the Firearm laws suggests that the *Gun Registry* was retained for other purposes.

CRIMINAL COPS

WHENEVER a product or service is made illegal, an illegal (black) market immediately starts to flourish. Whether it is abortions, alcohol, ammunition, drugs, firearms, etc., it makes no difference. The State can never control every dark corner of society. That Victorian cops were illegally selling illegal weapons should not surprise us – the cash is too tempting, the possibility of being convicted then imprisoned is non-existent. Of course selling illegal weapons is not all that cops do. On 17 March 2013, theage.com.au reported the following under the heading *Police hit with 661 criminal charges*: "Victorian police officers have been charged more than 600 times with criminal offences including drug trafficking, rape, and possession and production of child pornography since 2006."⁵⁷ But this is normal. The Internet reveals the terrible truth: **police corruption, violence, and killing** goes on all around Australia – year after year after year. – ed

It was from this raid that the Tasmania Police insisted that the gun dealer Terry Hill had sold the Colt AR-15 to Martin Bryant, but they never produced any evidence to back up their claim, nor did they ever produce the confiscated gun registry, which would have allowed Terry Hill to refute the police claim.

So when the journalists from the Sunday Herald Sun were informed of: "On Thursday, Tasmanian police raided several gun dealers, searching for details on the purchase and disposal of Sturm Ruger 5.66mm (Mini-14s) military weapons and materials used in the manufacture of fake shooting licences" what was actually occurring was that the first part of the Victoria Police corruption story was being pinned on Terry Hill, in the fabricated story that Terry Hill had supplied the weapons used in the Port Arthur massacre. All the Victoria Police had to contend with now was the illegal and corrupt sale of government property by the Victoria Police SOGs.

On Wednesday the 19th June 1996, the Bendigo Advertiser carried the story that Garnet Featherstone of Granite Arms had recanted his denial of any involvement in the illicit trade of police firearms. Now during his recanting of his denial in the trade of illicit firearms, Garnet Featherstone made this statement: "The deal involved a number of firearms and police have full and complete details on where each and every one had gone."

⁵⁷ Ten days later, theage.com.au reported this: "In a development with parallels to the links between gangland figures and **corrupt police** during Melbourne's underworld war, separate investigations by several agencies have uncovered at least a dozen police who are suspected of having inappropriate links to bikies." The two big bike gangs mentioned are the Bandidos and Comancheros. You can imagine how high Truth and Justice is on the agenda of those corrupt cops. Then just one day later on 28 March 2013, theage.com.au states: "A policewoman who secretly dated a Hells Angels enforcer while he was on bail for a violent crime and a sergeant who maintained close ties to a criminal bikie boss for **more than a decade** both **avoided dismissal**... Lauren Conte was allowed to remain in her job despite being found guilty of **illegally accessing the force's confidential database** to snoop on an associate of Hells Angels Nomads sergeant-at-arms Paul Peterson." (added emphasis) Cops can break the law and keep their jobs forever – *no worries*. When was the last time you heard of a cop being convicted of a crime then being incarcerated? Members of the public get fired for their workplace screw-ups, but not cops. They break the law, then get sent home – **on full pay**. Then all the protracted inquiry nonsense starts and goes on for months/years until eventually the cop goes back to work as if he/she had done absolutely nothing wrong. This double-standard and hypocrisy breeds the very best public cynicism – which **destroys the relationship** police must have with the public to perform all their duties.

*For
the State,
TRUTH
is whatever
the State
wants it to be.*

In other words, Garnet Featherstone has just stated that the COLT AR-15 serial No. SP128807, that was handed to the Victoria Police, was used to equip the Victoria Police Special Operations Group, was sold by the SOGs to Granite Arms in March 1995, and was found outside Seascapc cottage on the 29th April 1996, and named as the chief weapon used by the gunman in the Port Arthur massacre, had been sold by Granite Arms and that the name of the purchaser of that weapon was in the hands of the Victoria Police.

On 25th June 1996, assistant commissioner of police Graham Sinclair issued a statement; The Sale of Guns by the Victoria Police, which glossed over the criminal behaviour of the Victoria Police SOGs in the illegal sale of *State* property. There was never any mention in regard to the Colt AR-15 which had come into the possession of the Victoria Police SOGs and then sold by them illegally, and as a direct result of that sale, ended up at Seascapc cottage after the Port Arthur massacre. That situation was being well and truly covered by the Tasmania Police.

In the only police interview of Martin Bryant on the 4th July 1996 by detective inspectors Ross Paine and John Warren, there is no statement made by police to show they were aware of how, when or even if Martin Bryant gained ownership of the Colt AR-15 serial No. SP128807. In the sentencing of Martin Bryant in November 1996, there was no mention of any exhibits such as Terry Hill's gun registry, or of the Granite Arms firearm register to show that Martin Bryant had purchased the AR-15 from Terry Hill as claimed by the Tasmania Police.

Let me reiterate. The Colt AR-15 serial No. SP 128807 was handed to the Victoria Police during the 1987 gun amnesty. It was then issued along with 16 other Colt AR-15s to the Victoria Police SOGs. It was **illegally sold** by the SOGs to Granite Arms of Bendigo in March 1995, and was placed on the firearms register of Granite Arms. The sale of this weapon was recorded in this register as stated by Garnet Featherstone, and that information was passed on to Victoria Police, which was also declared by Garnet Featherstone. However there is no empirical evidence linking the sale of this weapon to either the gun dealer, Terry Hill, or to Martin Bryant. So just who did Granite Arms sell the Colt AR-15 serial No. DSP128807 to, and why is it that Victoria Police has never divulged this information?

As a side issue to this article, in 1997 Neville Quin, with the aid of the then head of Tasmania Legal Aid, Roland Browne decided to sue Terry Hill for supplying Martin Bryant with the weapon that murdered Neville Quin's wife. Perhaps it may be a better proposition for Neville Quin to now consider taking similar action against Granite Arms and the Victoria Police for their part in supplying that particular weapon to the gunman at Port Arthur. ■

(amended; added emphasis)

SOME WORDS ON BOOKS
Port Arthur Incident
Keith Allan Noble

*The search for truth begins with
the doubt of all truths in which
one has previously believed.*⁵⁸

FOLLOWING every major murder case, books about it soon appear in the marketplace. Sometimes, there seems to be a race between publishers to offer: *the first; the most revealing; the true story; how they did it; everything you need to know; facts hidden until now;* and so on. Publishers, certainly their sections responsible for book-covers, have leave to lie for rarely do their eye-grabbing phrases deliver their promises. **It is all about sales** – selling books to make money. Hype is everything. The business of all publishers is money, not adherence to meanings defined in dictionaries.

And alas, this is the reality in which most of the books about the Port Arthur incident must be placed. (Two notable exceptions are the DVD books by **Stewart K. Beattie** and **Andrew S. MacGregor**; see following Insert) This editor uses the word alas because he believes the subject matter not only requires a serious approach from all authors, but it also requires a brutal accuracy to help prevent writers and readers succumbing to emotional effusion. And by this, the editor does not mean making attempts to stymie emotional writing, but to prevent subjectiveness getting the upper hand over the ascertainment of facts and their objective interpretation.

Overall, there are three things which publishers of true-crime genre books are concerned about. We can identify them as the three **Ss**: **Sensation**; **Special Point**; and, **Speed of Release**. Cases for which the level of public interest is great are, because of that public interest, potentially sensational book material. In marketing terms, the special point is the USP (Unique Selling Point), which is used to promote sales. This is the stuff of exclusive interviews, pictures of the corpse, evidence the jury never heard, *etc.* Stuff that publishers can use on book covers and promotional summaries, reviews, *etc.*

The third point refers to the quickness publishers can get their books out in the marketplace to capture the first eager buyers/readers. While any murder case is *fresh-in-mind*, the potential for sales is always highest. Add a few months, a year or two, and that keenness to buy a book on any case has greatly diminished. Then, publishers are compelled to fall back on some special point to induce later purchases. A death-bed revelation about personal involvement in some famous plot, or an updated edition, are examples.

⁵⁸ Nietzsche (1844-1900); German philosopher, scholar, writer.

PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT BOOKS

- 1. TITLE: AFTER PORT ARTHUR**
AUTHOR: Carol Altmann
YEAR: 2006
REFERENCES: yes
PAGES: 250+
COVER PROMO: Personal stories of courage and resilience ten years on from the tragedy that shocked the nation.
- 2. TITLE: A GUNSMITH'S NOTEBOOK ON PORT ARTHUR (DVD Book)**
AUTHOR: Stewart K. Beattie
YEAR: 2006
REFERENCES: yes
PAGES: 400
COVER PROMO: Published in the National interest.
- 3. TITLE: BORN OR BRED?**
AUTHOR: Robert Wainwright & Paola Totaro
YEAR: 2009
REFERENCES: no
PAGES: 288
COVER PROMO: Why did the little boy with the funny grin turn into a mass murderer? Was he born to kill, his life's trajectory preordained by genes? Or was his mind indelibly warped by a lifetime of derision and alienation?
- 4. TITLE: DEADLY DECEPTION AT PORT ARTHUR**
AUTHOR: Joe Vials⁵⁹
YEAR: 1997-99
REFERENCES: no
PAGES: 108+
COVER PROMO: Scientific evidence questions Australia's Port Arthur massacre.
- 5. TITLE: DECEIT AND TERRORISM – PORT ARTHUR (DVD Book)**
AUTHOR: Andrew S. MacGregor
YEAR: 2001-04
REFERENCES: yes
PAGES: 1040 (*sic*)
INTRODUCTION: On the 28th April 1996 a gunman killed 35 and wounded another 23 victims at what has become known as The Port Arthur Massacre, in Tasmania Australia, with national gun laws implemented within 14 days.
- 6. TITLE: MY STORY**
AUTHOR: Carleen Bryant
YEAR: 2010
REFERENCES: no
PAGES: 184+
COVER PROMO: There were a large number of direct and indirect victims as a result of the Port Arthur Massacre. Many have spoken out, but one of them has remained silent: Bryant's mother Carleen.
- (cont.)**

⁵⁹ Also known as Otho Jewel Vials and Ari Ben-Menashe; *etc.* Evidence strongly suggests that this Joe Vials was/is an evil professional deceiver. Be warned.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

7. TITLE: **PORT ARTHUR**
AUTHOR: Margaret Scott
YEAR: 1997
REFERENCES: yes
PAGES: 246+
COVER PROMO: Records the experiences and feelings of the people who were at Port Arthur on the day as eyewitnesses, members of the police and ambulance services, local residents and employees from the historical site. Many of them continue to live and work there. Their determination to remain hopeful, and their honest, confronting attempts to understand what happened in their corner of the world are both remarkable and inspirational.

8. TITLE: **A PRESENTATION ON THE PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT**
AUTHOR: Noel McDonald
YEAR: 2001
REFERENCES: yes
PAGES: 280
SUBHEADING: Prelude to a Royal Commission (never held)
COVER PROMO: none; rare work highly regarded by investigators; CD of book was also released 2003; seek via bookfinder.com

9. TITLE: **SUDDENLY ONE SUNDAY**
AUTHOR: Mike Bingham
YEAR: 1996
REFERENCES: no
PAGES: 180
COVER PROMO: The true story of that terrible day, as seen and recalled by countless eyewitnesses. Written by Hobart journalist Mike Bingham, it is the story that the proud people of Tasmania want told, to set the record straight. At once chilling and inspiring, *Suddenly One Sunday* is a story of courage in the face of tragedy, and strength in the face of mind-numbingly senseless murder.

10. TITLE: **TO HAVE AND TO HOLD**
AUTHOR: Walter Mikac & Lindsay Simpson
YEAR: 1997
REFERENCES: no
PAGES: 279
COVER PROMO: A modern day love story cut short. – ed.

*NOTE that promotional buy-me statements on book covers are most often prepared by publishers, not authors. Also note books can be re-released in 2nd, 3rd, etc. editions with new titles. A shorter 1st edition of the corrupt book (**The Story Behind a Massacre**⁶⁰) allegedly by Dale McGregor was titled **Massacre, Murder, Mayhem**. Also note the Port Arthur incident is addressed in superficial books of compiled cases. Finally, though logic might predict it, the more recent books about Port Arthur are not necessarily the most up-to-date. Authors of so-called new books who do not read widely and who fail to think, end up pushing the false and deceptive official narrative. This has happened with most books on the Port Arthur incident. – ed.*

DALE R.R. MCGREGOR(?)

What is known about him and is it his image below?



60 The Story Behind a Massacre

contains plagiarized writing (why?), which McGregor did not declare is that of Andrew S. MacGregor – see *NAME INDEX*. Dale McGregor said he “grew up in Tasmania.” And he also claimed to be a counsellor in New Zealand where he might have once been the manager of *RATA Counseling* in Christchurch. Soon after this editor phoned *RATA*, McGregor ceased working there. Why? Then the editor’s emails to McGregor went unanswered. Why? Recall the killing at Aramoana in New Zealand. In 1990, the population of little Aramoana was just c.250. Who really shot the 13 victims there? This editor has been told that **Michael Dyson**, then with Tasmania Police and having a documented passion for violent incidents, was in attendance at the massacre in Aramoana. (Evidence suggests Dyson was also at the Port Arthur massacre, possibly a shooter inside Seascope.) This editor was also told that **Paul Mullen** a psychiatrist from Australia was near Aramoana prior and during the killings there. (And facts confirm Mullen was one of many medical people who was *involved* with **innocent Martin Bryant**.) Why would a psychiatrist from Australia be near a small area/village c.380 kms south of Christchurch, New Zealand? More questions arise: Is McGregor a qualified counsellor? Did he have a role at Aramoana and/or Port Arthur? Is the name McGregor an alias? Did this person identify himself as Thomas Mark Buckley from New Zealand when at Port Arthur? (see Part 7) Was ASIO and/or ASIS at Aramoana? In 2018, this editor was unable to locate this Dale McGregor anywhere in Australia or New Zealand. So where is he now? If you have related info please email martinbryantisinnocnt@gmail.com

(Before going any further here, the editor is compelled to state that his critique of the listed books⁶¹ on the Port Arthur case is not to be interpreted as a personal attack on any author. As an author himself [since early 1990s], the editor has some understanding of the processes and problems associated with the writing and publishing of books. It is the editor's belief that all the listed books are well written in a literary sense. Writing styles and word usage are not issues. What concerns the editor is the foundational flaw in most Port Arthur related books which have been based on the alleged – **not proved** – guilt of Martin Bryant. Books written with this presumption of guilt as their foundation are corrupt and can never rise above this.)

Without any doubt, the sensation of the Port Arthur incident drove some authors to complete their books with great speed for waiting publishers. Recall the book that is in the marketplace first will capture a big, if not the biggest, share of the potential sales. But given the incident took place at the end of April in 1996, and that it would have taken the police many months to have some sort of understanding of what transpired, plus the fact there had not been a trial (and never was one), we must ask – How accurate could a book be if it was released in 1996? And there was one (*Suddenly One Sunday*) released in 1996. Three more followed quickly in 1997.

No one could ascertain all the significant facts, then reflect on all the innumerable combinations and relationships between all those facts, then sit down and write a sound work based on a foundation of truth, in that time of eight months – from which all the weeks for the publisher to prepare and print the book must be deducted. Many of the facts were not known in 1996. Many are not known to this day. For example: Why the cops failed to present forensic evidence from the second sports bag left in the Broad Arrow Café. The books which were released in 1996 and 1997 are incomplete, contain inaccuracies, were far too hastily completed, and have flawed foundations.

The 1997 book by dubious Joe Vials (see *NAME INDEX*) is **troubling**. Inquiries into this **self-proclaimed** "investigative journalist with thirty years direct experience of international military and oilfield operation," provide disturbing findings. Any book using the phrase "scientific evidence" on its front cover, but which contains no scientific references or sources – **just Joe says** – which can be checked is rubbish. Nearly two fifths (40 pages) of Vials' pseudo-scientific scribbling actually consists of the police interrogation transcript. But instead of going through it, point by point, Joe the scientist states: "This is probably the least convincing interrogation transcript anyone is ever likely to read." Joe is totally unconvincing too.

The ultimate tragedy amongst the authors has to be Walter Mikac. The very person who denied him the possibility of knowing who murdered his dear wife, and his two daughters, is the same person who Mr. Mikac asked to write the Foreword for his 1997 book. John Howard bullied Mikac and bullied the people of Australia.

Five to 10 years later (2006), more books appeared. The two DVD books reveal the benefit of investigation and reflection. But sadly,

⁶¹ This list might not be definitive. There could be other books on the Port Arthur incident/case which have not come to this editor's attention.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

the others do not – standard false facts of the official narrative are presented *ad nauseam*, and that the innocent Martin Bryant had not been tried before a jury **is not even mentioned**.

Then we had the work by two authors who seem weighted down by many accolades, *investigations*, and experiences. In 2009, these authors Robert Wainwright and Paola Totaro presented the world with *Born or Bred?* If they and their publisher see it as the seminal work on the Port Arthur incident, then they are totally mistaken. Thirteen years after the incident and with an ever-increasing volume of case-related writing on the Internet and two outstanding DVD books on the case, Wainwright and Totaro wrote a **work of nonsense**.

A check in mid 2013 of amazon.co.uk reveals *Born or Bred?* was ranked 4,055,284th on the bestseller list, and after being available for 14 years the fact not one person has posted a review on the book says something. That two allegedly experienced and worldly authors wrote such rot based entirely on the official narrative is staggering. They actually believe it is a good thing that an *11-year-old boy* with an IQ of 66 was put in prison **for the remainder of his life** – without a trial and because his defence (*sic*) lawyer recommended he live in Risdon Prison until he dies there from despair.

And as for the title of their book, Martin Bryant is doomed. According to Wainwright and Totaro, Martin was born a mass murderer, or was bred to be a mass murderer. But these authors present no hard evidence in their book to show Martin killed any person.

Of all the books listed, the two which have absolutely no reason for existing beyond making dirty money off the dead are *Born or Bred?* and *After Port Arthur*. The latter is galling not only because its foundation is a lie, it actually contains a coloured image of Martin which was manipulated to make him appear deranged and demonic. An image that the **media admitted** had been manipulated about 10 years earlier. Be sure to read the review of Altmann's book by *Jack of Alltrades* at the amazon.co.uk website.

Earlier books, the ones hurried out to get the early lucrative sales were written by authors who could claim naivety. Those authors could say they just did not know the official narrative was not the truth. They could say that. But Wainwright and Totaro, as well as Altmann cannot claim naivete because the undeniable facts are there and have been on the Internet since well before their books were released. But these three authors **ignored all the exculpatory facts**. Never even raised them in a chapter on alternate views of the case. No. It was straight in and condemn that deranged *lone-nut* mass murderer who was strapped down on his third-degree burns, set-up, then sent away to the *wacko wing* at Risdon Prison. With every book sold the royalties trickle in – as poor **Martin's soul is slowly strangled**.

And there, with all the frightening uncertainties, all the anguish of a truly caring person, and all the pain of a mother silently waiting for her dear son to die, stands Carleen Bryant. Grasping at glimmers of hope, she has written a powerful book of tragedy, truth, and love. ■

*Every book
tells a story
– about
its author.*

ENDING

TRAGEDIES surrounding the Port Arthur incident are many. Loss of life and injury hold our attention, as they should. But we will never truly understand those two tragedies and all the others because we do not have a complete knowledge of **all significant truths** associated with the incident. Our understanding of the incident and its many components **has been curtailed and corrupted by a lack of truth and an abundance of untruths**. Combined, those two failings have resulted in an official narrative which is dishonest, deceptive, and, as this book reveals, deviously dangerous.

State agencies and their officials have not only let the public down through their shockingly **unethical acts** (malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance), they have erected barriers to prevent people from learning what exactly the Port Arthur incident was and is all about. Every conceivable argument has been used by the State to stop any further determination, exposure, and subsequent analysis of the associated facts. And this further confirms that the official narrative is **a concocted story having the sole purpose of deception**.

Another factor contributing to the public's lack of understanding is the size of the incident, and the conditioned response of viewing it in a criminal not political way. Yes, the incident involved many criminal elements. But truths behind the incident (motive, execution, cover-up) have political foundations. This is why the *lone-nut* gunman story is what holds the minds of people who are unable to see that story as an untruth, which it is. They are unable to grasp the fact that the incident was **mass murder approved, arranged, and acted out by State officials**. That a State would do – AND HAS DONE – such a thing is not something closed minds can contend with. Even though the proof is undeniably there, closed minds continue to fall back onto the default position – acceptance of the official narrative.

The problem is even worse with the truly naive who live unaware the legal system in Australia, and everywhere else the adversarial legal system exists, is grossly corrupt. (see kangarocourtsofaustralia.com) A system that **does not have the determination of truth** as a foundation stone must inevitably lead to **miscarriages of justice**. Innocent people are most probably in every prison around Australia, Martin Bryant being just one of a very large number. Those who think black robes and white wigs are a sure sign of justice, have no understanding of the **grey-slime legal world** where the truth will not necessarily set people free. Being innocent or being right does not protect anyone from the vagary and/or vengeance of the State.

The only way to understand the Port Arthur incident is to cease accepting the official narrative is the truth – the whole truth. Every significant fact has to be assessed with an objectivity which does not have as its motive the setting up of a patsy, but which is motivated by the need for undeniable truth. We must, in Roger Bacon's words, resist "weak and unworthy authority, longstanding custom, the feeling of the ignorant crowd, and the hiding of our own ignorance," all of which send us back to the official narrative. As soon as your truth torch lights up, you will see **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!** ■

STATE KILLING

3



CONCERN

There are historical antecedents to this tragedy in Tasmania and unless their influence is understood it is inevitable any related investigation can lead to immediate and obvious, but incorrect, conclusions.

CONTENTS	PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS	43
■ INTRODUCTION	45
A SCEPTICAL REAPPRAISAL	
■ GUN ALLEY	Morgan 51
STATE MURDER	
STATE MURDER/IMPRISONMENT....	
SOME STATE MURDERS – AUSTRALIA	
LETTER TO COLIN CAMPBELL ROSS	
■ AMERICANS TO NERVE GAS AUSSIES	Coulthart 63
MORE MURDERS, MORE TERROR	
■ MARALINGA’S AFTERLIFE	Keane 65
BRITAIN BOMBS WESTERN AUSTRALIA	
BRITAIN TESTS NUCLEAR WEAPONS....	
POISONED FOREVER	Image
■ AUSTRALIA’S AGENT ORANGE CRIME	Chitts 77
AUSTRALIA’S CHEMICAL....	
AGENT ORANGE	
■ HILTON HOTEL BOMBING	ultimate.... 83
AFTERMATH OF OFFICIAL BOMB	Image
THIRTY-FIVE YEARS NO ANSWERS	
■ DISQUIET	Tapp 87
COP SHOOTING COVER-UP	
POLICE CORRUPTION	
DISQUIET	Image
ANOTHER STATE MURDER	
POLICE & TRUTH ILL-ASSORTED	
■ OFFICIAL BRUTALITY & KILLING	Bassi et al. 103
AUSTRALIA’S POLICE & MILITARY....	
SPECIAL OPERATIONS GROUP....	
TJ HICKEY RALLY, SYDNEY	Image
TJ HICKEY RALLY POSTER	Image
CHRIS HURLEY	Image
STOPPING PEOPLE FROM LEARNING....	
QUEENSLAND POLICE	Image
WHY SOME COPS GET AWAY WITH IT	
CRAIG MYLES	Image
COP TASERS TONY TO DEATH	
COPS KILL FOR BISCUITS	
KWEMENTYAYA BRISCOE	Image
BILL McDONNELL	Image
KILLING KWEMENTYAYA BRISCOE	
CRADLE TO GRAVE....	
MASSACRES IN AUSTRALIA	
■ ENDING	132

COUNTS

Images 11, Inserts 29, Notes 131, Pages 92

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

FORETHOUGHTS

■ "On November 22 [1996], Bryant was sentenced to life in prison. Are all these discrepancies and unanswered questions just the result of coincidence and official ineptitude? **Or were the lives of 35 innocent victims sacrificed for the sake of politics?** In the course of researching the Port Arthur shootings, the more we learned, the more questions we found without answers. One thing seems irrefutable: the Australian government was - and still is - **afraid of the truth.**" (added emphasis)

Joanne Eisen, Paul Gallant, Andrew MacGregor

A shortcut to Australia's civilian disarmament

keepandbeararms.com

11 February 2013

■ "As the federal government increasingly exposes itself as viewing the population as its actual enemy, we amongst the masses need to view the federal government as nothing but a group of invaders, intruders, and criminals. We need to view the federal government as an invading foreign government,¹ one that has been occupying America by force of gunpoint. With that in mind, we need to withdraw our consent to its monstrous acts of criminality and stand up for ourselves, if we are to save this country and our freedom."

Scott Lazarowitz (blog)

U.S. Government Now Treats the American People As the Enemy

reasonandjest.com

25 February 2011

■ "What did we have at Port Arthur? We had the Tasmania Police, the Tasmania Police Special Operations Group, the Victoria Police Special Operations Group (six members), the NSW Police Special Operations Group, the Australian Federal Police Anti-terror Squad, ASIO, PSCC, the Australian defence forces helicopter pilots and the SAS. **It was a bloody big exercise and much of that had to have been organised prior to the event.** Three army helicopter pilots to fly the rescue helicopters on the Sunday. They were there prior to the event. The SAS van arrived at the oval to guide in the helicopters. This van indicates the preparedness, as they could not just have been in the area at the time."² (added emphasis)

Andrew S. MacGregor

Port Arthur Massacre:

A closer look at State terrorism in Australia

rumormillnews.com

21 December 2012

■ "In the 20th century, the greatest unnatural killer of human beings was not plague, cancer, or accidents. It was **democide: death by government.** Governments murdered more people in the last 100-plus years than any other killer in existence on record." (original emphasis)

Melissa Melton

Democide:

How many people will government kill this year?

prisonplanet.com

4 January 2013

¹ Australians should wake up to the **shameful and threatening** fact that the big USA now has a military base at Darwin - in addition to its evil killing equipment at Pine Gap, etc. How long will it be before those *good* Americans set up torture chambers in parts of Australia **they control?** Perhaps their victims are already being tortured to death there. You too are their enemy. The following words, which appeared 12 May 2013 on truthdig.com, are those of Chris Hedges, an American: "Murder is our national sport. We murder tens of thousands with our industrial killing machines in Afghanistan and Iraq. We murder thousands more from the skies over Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen with our pilotless drones. We murder each other with reckless abandon. And, as if we were not drenched in enough human blood, we murder prisoners."

² What MacGregor has described, in plain language, is a preparedness which no single person could have ever executed. Certainly not Martin Bryant, or anyone else. And this preparedness proves beyond all doubt that the incident at Port Arthur was **premeditated.** The State planned, prepared, and perpetrated the mass murder of the **35** victims and the wounding of **23** others at and near Port Arthur in April 1996. (Why this black van was at the historic site is not known with certainty. There could have been several reasons. Why a van with blacked out windows if it was only there for an SAS person to give directions to helicopter pilots? How many people arrived in the van? How many departed? Who were they? Did anyone from that van enter the café and do anything with the dead bodies therein? At least one of those killed [Anthony Nightingale] is believed to have had an ASIO connection. Was evidence removed from any of the seven crime scenes or planted at any of those scenes? Every question and concern should have been addressed and made public. But this never happened. **WHY?**)

3 Mencken said this in 1926.

4 First published in Spain in 1930:
La Rebelión de las Masas.

5 Prof. Dr. Gideon Polya published 130 works in a four-decade scientific career. In the cited article, he also states this: **"Australia has an over 2-century history of involvement in genocide.** However this appalling genocide history is kept hidden by a sustained process of Australian holocaust denial and genocide denial." (amended; added emphasis) In his article he details 20 genocides. Here are five related to this State-killing: **18-19th cent. Aboriginal Genocide:** The Indigenous Aboriginal population dropped from about 1 million to 0.1 million in the first century after invasion in 1788.

Tasmanian Aboriginal Genocide: The *full-blood* Indigenous population dropped from 6,000 to zero in 1803-1876; but there are several thousand *mixed race* descendants of Tasmanian and mainland Aborigines still living in Tasmania today.

Iraqi Genocide: 4.1 million excess deaths 1990-2009; 1.3 million post-invasion violent excess deaths and 1.0 million post-invasion non-violent excess deaths, *i.e.* 2.3 million post-invasion violent and non-violent excess deaths; 0.6 million post-invasion under-5 infant deaths; and 5-6 million refugees; Australia has been militarily involved since 1990.

Afghan Genocide: 3-7 million post-invasion violent and non-violent excess deaths, 2.3 million post-invasion under-5 infant deaths, and 4 million refugees; Australia was involved militarily in occupied Afghanistan from after the US invasion in 2001.

Ongoing Aboriginal Genocide: 9,000 excess deaths annually; 90,000 excess deaths in the last 11 years of Bushite Coalition rule; for details and documentation see "Aboriginal genocide. Racist White Australian child abuse and **passive mass murder.**" Polya says the Australian State has been **killing people as official policy** since the late 18th century. And Australia is killing people today – **inside the country and outside.** The widespread lack of critical thinking maintains a national naiveness toward this killing. It keeps the population complaisant and willingly manipulable by the media and politicians promoting **corrupt agendas.**

■ "It [the State] has taken on a vast mass of new duties and responsibilities; it has spread out its powers until they penetrate to every act of the citizen, however secret; it has begun to throw around its operations the high dignity and impeccability of a State religion; its agents become a separate and superior caste, with authority to bind and loose, and their thumbs in every pot. But it still remains, as it was in, the beginning, the common enemy of all well-disposed, industrious and decent men [people]."³

Henry Louis Mencken
1880-1956

■ "This is the **gravest danger** that today threatens civilization: **State intervention.**" (added emphasis)

José Ortega y Gasset
*The Revolt of the Masses*⁴
1993: p. 120

■ "Peace is the only way but silence kills and silence is complicity. Decent people are obliged to (a) inform others about these continuing atrocities and (b) ensure that they are not complicit in these crimes of genocide commission and genocide denial through avoidable dealings with the people, corporations and countries responsible for these outrages. Australians are trapped in a Mainstream media-imposed Orwellian dream and will only conceivably stop doing Genocide when they are informed that they are doing it. **Sanctions and boycotts are urgently required** because Australia is committing these crimes for money – and money is the only thing that amoral, wealth-obsessed Australia will understand." (*sic*; added emphasis)

Gideon Polya⁵
*Indigenous Genocide, Climate Genocide
and Holocaust Denial by White Australia*
treatyrepublic.net
12 May 2009

■ "The more power a government has, the more it can act arbitrarily according to the whims and desires of the elite, the more it will make war on others and **murder its foreign and domestic subjects.**" (added emphasis)

R.J. Rummel
Death by Government
2008: pp. 1-2

■ "The impact of State killing is, however, not limited to our political and legal lives. **It has a pervasive effect in constituting our culture as well.**" (added emphasis)

Austin Sarat
The Killing State
1999: p. 9

■ "Why did the Tasmanian Mortuary Service have a...Chevy Mortuary Truck capable of carrying 22 bodies made before Port Arthur?"
2010 Unlimited
50 Unanswered Questions About Port Arthur
2012.com.au/PA_questions.html

INTRODUCTION

EVERY crime has a history – no crime is delimited to the present. Historical antecedents can be malignant to various degrees and they can stretch back quite some way before their connection to a crime is no longer discernible. No act, which is criminal or which is considered criminal, can be thoroughly understood if the history specific to that perpetrated act is not considered and assessed by the investigator(s).

An investigator whose work is hurried, can find her/his analysis of the perpetrated act dangerously superficial. As those investigators with long practical experience will attest, criminal investigation at its best goes far beyond and assessment of the immediate past, and the here and now.⁶

To varying extents, every vocation has its *occupational hazards*. And without a doubt, those who investigate crimes become victims themselves to the pressures of time and performance. Rare would be the case where an investigator has unlimited resources (assistance, budget, time, etc.) to conduct what we might call a *perfect* investigation. Regardless of whether an investigator is engaged in the private or public sphere makes no difference. The pressure to perform and to produce definitive results can preclude any serious consideration of historical antecedents to the perpetrated act. The pressure is always on to produce – to produce sooner rather than later. It is this push to produce that can lead to and certainly accentuate a tunnel-vision investigation. An investigation where an *obvious* conclusion/solution⁷ is reached quickly before a thorough investigation is conducted. Thereafter, the only evidence considered useful is that which supports the conclusion, which is the light at the end of the tunnel. Other evidence being devalued, discarded, and/or denied.

What follows in this part of the book is a compilation of short and longer articles which detail historical facts – true facts which have a direct and indirect bearing on the case being considered. What the public was first confronted with were things which took place at or near Port Arthur on the Tasman Peninsula⁸ of Tasmania, on 28 and 29 of April 1996. But the revelation of those things was clearly managed by officials in such a way that the public could never have an unbiased perspective when considering the case. What readers will find in the following articles are many of the major facts which influenced the way officials handled the incident, which rightly concerned the public in 1996 and which rightly still concerns us to this day.

As readers will come to see more and more as they work their way through this book, events in and out of Australia prior to 1996 have influenced not only the facts of the Tasmanian tragedy, but also influenced how members of the public comprehended this tragedy. None of us are free of our past. None of us assess any act without historical antecedents having influence on us, be they minor or major. And it is only by considering those historical antecedents that we can comprehend **what really took place** that April in 1996, and **why it took place** (it was not a spontaneous incident), and **what it means** to all Australians today.

⁶ Good books on how criminal investigations should be conducted are: **Fisher** BAJ. *Techniques of Crime Scene Investigation*; 2004.

Gebberth, VJ. *Practical Homicide Investigation: Tactics, Procedures, and Forensic Techniques*; 1996.

Lee HC, **Palmbach** T, **Miller** MT. *Henry Lee's Crime Scene Handbook*; 2001.

The above works are from the US, the following is a UK compilation of 38 crime investigation related papers: **Newburn** T, **Williamson** T, **Wright** A. *Handbook of Criminal Investigation*; 2007.

(There seems to be no crime investigation books published in Australia, or even written by an Australian. What does this suggest to us about the general level of competence of cop investigators throughout that country? Big inflated attitudes, undercover actions, yet screw up after investigative screw up.)

⁷ The critic, journalist, and linguist Henry Louis Mencken (1880-1956) gave to us this insight: “For every problem there is an immediate and **obvious solution which is wrong.**” (added emphasis) Note there are several versions of this statement.

⁸ See Map at Part 4.

A SCEPTICAL REAPPRAISAL
Port Arthur Massacre

FOR Australians, establishing the truth about what happened – and what did not happen – at Port Arthur in eastern Tasmania, late April 1996, is arguably even more crucial than uncovering the truth about the 1978 Hilton [Hotel] bombings [in Sydney, 1978]. The Port Arthur massacre is a more recent event, a lot more people were killed at Port Arthur – and a man remains incarcerated because of his alleged role in the atrocity. As the documentary shows, there *are* compelling reasons for believing Martin Bryant's conviction and jailing were **a cruel miscarriage of justice**.

Most articles critical of the Port Arthur *official narrative* present anomalies and unexplained facts about the incident and aim to persuade readers that something is deeply amiss with the official story. For me, the most persuasive in the *genre* that's available online is *The Port Arthur Massacre – Was Martin Bryant Framed?* Written by the pseudonymous Carl Wernerhoff and published in Nexus Magazine in mid-2006, it sets out the sceptics' case with **reasonable clarity**. It's well-referenced and fairly up-to-date. There's more material available, but Wernerhoff's article is the best succinctly written demolition job of the official narrative that I've encountered. Read it – at the very least you're likely to have more questions about the worst massacre in recent Australian history. (Wernerhoff also has a lengthier book about the Port Arthur massacre – in draft form – titled *What's Going On? A Critical Analysis of the Port Arthur Massacre*.)

The Port Arthur saga is – in part – a story about the media. *En masse*, Australia's mass media quickly embraced the orthodoxy that Martin Bryant was guilty of committing the atrocity, that he acted alone – and that these *facts* are not in serious doubt. The media also promoted the view that anyone who doubts these *established facts* is likely to be a disgruntled shooting enthusiast, who may be deranged and dangerous. Needless to say, dissenters were branded with the silly label *conspiracy theorists*.

Mainstream politicians also fell into line behind the official narrative to a quite remarkable extent. Consequently, doubts and dissenting opinions about the Port Arthur massacre were relegated to an unrespectable *fringe*. I suspect it's no accident that the well-researched and documented article by Wernerhoff was (a) written under a pseudonym (we're told the author works as a teacher and I can well believe association with Port Arthur *conspiracy theories* might harm his career, and (b) published in Nexus Magazine. Nexus has been around a long time and over the years it has published interesting material. But it also has a reputation for carrying material that's not credible at all. It's a *New Age* publication. Many Australians – certainly most of the mainstream intelligentsia – would regard publication in Nexus as indicative in itself that there's something *flakey* about the material and the theory it promotes.

In any event, articles such as *The Port Arthur Massacre – was Martin Bryant Framed?* and audio-visual material such as *A Question of Guilt: The massacre at Port Arthur* marshal a compelling case that **at the very least** an inquest and/or honest public inquiry is long overdue and needed as a matter of urgency. I think it's clear to anyone who reviews this material with an open mind that the official story is far from proven. As that case has already been made – and made well – I don't intend to cover the same ground here. In this article, I aim to review the Port Arthur massacre in a broader historical context – based on the unorthodox premise that the massacre was indeed a conspiracy (not the work of a *lone nut*).

Before returning to that theme, I think it's important to emphasize what an *obvious* breach of due process has occurred. This massacre was the biggest mass murder in Australia in modern times in terms of the number of victims. Yet to date there has been:

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- no coronial inquiry or inquest;
- no trial at which the prosecution evidence was put to the test; and,
- no subsequent public inquiry of any kind.

In other words, the greatest of crimes has had the least imaginable investigative follow-up. That alone must be considered highly suspicious – although it has become alarmingly common since then in high profile cases in the post 2001 *War on Terror* era. There are parallels, for instance, with the mysterious death of Dr. David Kelly in 2003 (still no inquest) and the 7/7 London bombings (an inquest is taking place only now, after five years following an enormous sustained public campaign).

Martin Bryant's *trial* took place some six months after the atrocity. After his arrest, for months on end, he repeatedly insisted on his innocence. Then, following an unexplained change in defense barrister, Bryant was eventually persuaded to plead guilty to all charges. As a consequence, there was in effect **no trial at all** – merely sentencing. The sad story is explained in more detail in Wernerhoff's written accounts and in *A Question of guilt*. But I'll add a footnote here that may have some significance. Bryant's second [third actually] lawyer, **John Avery**, has since been utterly discredited – see *Eyes that shame Australian journalism*. John Avery remains in jail at the time of writing. He played a key role in the Port Arthur affair. His persuasive skills were deployed **to head off the need for a full trial** – a trial that could have been extremely embarrassing for the prosecution, to say the least. Avery's exposure as a fraudster is another **red flag suggesting all may not be well with the official tale**.

In retrospect, I think the Port Arthur massacre can be regarded as a magician's trick. The most obvious consequence was more stringent national gun laws. Similar *gun atrocities* were occurring elsewhere around that time such as the Dunblane massacre in Scotland and several shooting-sprees in the USA. There had already been a few gruesome (although considerably less lethal) shooting sprees within Australia in the previous decade). Taken together, the incidents created a clamour within the English-speaking world for much stronger restrictions on private gun ownership. Within Australia, the Port Arthur incident has always been viewed through the prism of a national debate over gun laws.

But I suspect more was at stake for the real planners of the horrific Port Arthur massacre and frame-up. Port Arthur took the attention of most Australians away from the Hilton bombings and associated concern about *State-sponsored* terrorism. After the Port Arthur massacre, the mainstream media responded with quite **extraordinary lack of curiosity**. There was almost no *breakout* from the official narrative. A few questions were raised around the time of the massacre – as snippets of the ABC's 1996 coverage documented in the video indicate. But although MediaWatch made probing inquiries on one occasion, the ABC did no systematic follow-up. Quite soon, it became normal for all the mass media **to ridicule** Port Arthur sceptics as extremist kooks. I recall Phillip Adams, presenter of Radio National's *Late Night Live*, frequently reassuring his listeners in the late 1990s that such views were *toxic* and best ignored entirely. At the time I believed him.

The bottom line is that – in all likelihood – **an innocent man remains incarcerated in a Tasmanian jail**. Reports of Martin Bryant's condition since 1996 suggest he's desperately unhappy – but what else could be expected? How would you feel if you'd been living a quiet, peaceful life until 1996 – at which time you were suddenly whisked away into incarceration, with apparently no prospect of release, for **a crime you didn't commit and can barely comprehend**. Depressed? I imagine so!

Syd Walker
SydWalker.info
17 December 2010
(amended; added emphasis)

People who are of the belief that no government would take part in the killing of its own citizenry need to consider the history of events in which governments have actively set about killing people. To say that the tragedy which was brought about in 1996 in Tasmania was the work of a single person defies the well-documented facts of that event, and defies historical truths. Officials in Australia have been involved with the killing of people for quite some time, and no better proof of this is the decimation of Tasmania's original inhabitants.

Immediately following this Introduction is a detailed description of a State murder in Victoria. Then there is a shocking article about how "200 mainly Australian combat troops" **were to be murdered** to meet the research needs of the American military. And hold no delusion that this nerve gas Sarin might not have killed those troops.⁹ All 200 of them could have taken their final inhalation in 1964 if those warmongering Americans had got all they wanted from officials in Australia. As the writer Coulthart explains, the last gasps of those 200 *grunts* came very close to happening.

⁹ "Sarin has a high volatility relative to similar nerve agents. Inhalation and absorption through the skin pose a great threat. Even vapor concentrations immediately penetrate the skin. People who absorb a non-lethal dose but do not receive immediate appropriate medical treatment may suffer permanent neurological damage. Even at very low concentrations, Sarin can be fatal. Death may follow in one minute after direct ingestion of a lethal dose.... Sarin is estimated to be over 500 times more toxic than cyanide." (wikipedia.org)

¹⁰ Robert Menzies (1894-1978) was a prime minister of Australia: 1939-1941, 1949-1966. He pushed Australia into the American-led war in Vietnam. This resulted in the killing of 500 Australians and there were also 3129 casualties – **all needless. Millions of Indochinese were murdered in that war**, how many to its shame Australia killed is not known. If you want a good insight into that American war in Vietnam, read the 2013 book by Nick Turse: *Kill Anything That Moves*. And when those killers returned to the USA, and to Australia, and to NZ, many killed themselves with drink, drugs, and/or other forms of self-abuse. Tragically, some killed others before they killed themselves. States glorify (**lie about**) *war heroes*, but ignore those whose minds are **marred** from involvement with military murder. Killing any human being is a depraved act, not a deed to praise, or to ever be proud of, or to receive a medal for.

But that was nothing compared to Maralinga in South Australia, which mushroomed out of Monte Bello in Western Australia. Black people were expendable (they still are in most parts of Australia), so they were expended. And mongrel Menzies¹⁰ bent over backwards to take the big one for his motherland wanting to develop nuclear bombs. His sycophant officials just went along with it.

Of course the local inhabitants were shuffled and sorted, as officials saw appropriate. No one wanted deaths on their hands. But really, what could officials do when those *bastards* kept wandering around Maralinga as if it was their ancestral homeland for 50,000 years or something like that. It was best to ignore them – so the Australian officials did. And they left those Blacks there a poisonous present which will still be there in half a million years or so. *No worries*.

As for all the Whites who worked there, and who too were misused then abused, they have all encountered the best of official denials. Their cancers, and illnesses, and pains, and deaths, and talk about radioactive dust clouds reaching all the way across to Cape York in Queensland were gripe. Real Aussies, good proud Aussies, did what they had to do for the Union Jack (*butcher's apron*) then soldiered on. If Arthur Tedder – that's 1st Baron Lord Tedder (see note 42) to insignificant little you – said Britain had to have nuclear bombs, then no prime minister of Australia was going to get in his way. None did. Nor did any official.

Bringing it all back to earth, you need to know about Agent Orange – that spray that takes foliage away then pollutes forever and a day. For this toxic substance, officials in Australia were pleased to offer Innisfail as a sacrificial place for the military to hose around a few hundred, or was it a few hundred thousand, litres of the stuff in the nearby rainforest. Given it was all for the American war in Vietnam, the one that would-be killers in Australia were all *gung-ho* about, then the inconvenience local residents said they experienced was not given any concern – how unpatriotic of them.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

That stuff is lethal. It goes straight to the gonads – so American killers loved it. They got Australian firms to produce this essential war commodity, which spread around the war profits and that was sure good for business. And if there were any concerns about spraying Agent Orange near Innisfail, there sure was none in Vietnam. The American war there was **mass murder on the grandest scale** – insanity in technicolour. According to an Australian army veteran now anti-war campaigner Hamish Chitts: “Between 1961 and 1971 the US and its allies sprayed and dumped around 80 million litres of Agent Orange and related chemicals on Vietnam.”¹¹ That word allies is a good one. It includes Australians who were told to get out there and start dispersing that poison. If they didn’t get the nogs with bullets, they sprayed their land and water and food with teratogens which deformed and crippled their little babies. *God Save the Queen*.

As for all those whining Aussies complaining about their cancer crap, officials have never had time for them. The Department of Defence, aka *Ministry of Murder*, has issued a statement saying the incidence of cancers and other fatal diseases is no higher in Innisfail than any other place in Australia. So of course we all should be reassured because military killers – never forget, **everyone in the military is a trained killer** – deny the deaths and deformities and despair. So all you afflicted Innisfailites, suck up your bleeding guts and soldier-on – officials don’t give a rat’s ringbit about you or your family.

Not chastened by the crime against humanity which the Australian military perpetrated in Vietnam, officials in Australia began to focus their attention on the Australian populace. Healthy questioning was interpreted as criticism – something had to be done to combat this failure to conform. In secretive backrooms, plans were being prepared and pushed to expand the powers and resources of the police and the security apparatus. The people had become the enemy.

Death and destruction associated with **false-flag**¹² operations was moved to the Hilton Hotel at George Street in Sydney, New South Wales. A big conference was going on there. So if officials made a big noise, they figured they would get big results. And they did. Later officials denied any involvement and the blame was placed on some alleged radical terrorist group.¹³ But this **was all lies**. Three innocent people were bombed to death. And subsequently, the powers and resources of the police and security apparatus were expanded. It was the death knell for dedicated police being public servants. Now, every state in Australia has a band/group/team of **heavily-armed paramilitary thugs** who can be let loose like rabid dogs on *domestic terrorists* (or you) whenever some official says the word. In fact, no official might have to say anything at all.

The Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) was born deathly cold with the help of murderous midwives. From 1978 on, every person in Australia was turned into a potential terrorist. Things happen. You are not to know about them. You are not to question – even if you do you will **not** get a truthful answer. Try getting the truth from officials about the 1996 Port Arthur incident in Tasmania. Ask why there has been **no** coronial inquest. Ask why there has

¹¹ *Australia’s role in agent orange crime*. Direct Action – no. 34, August; 2011.

¹² see *DEFINITIONS*

¹³ Officials in Australia attempted to blame the bombing on a Hindu-based religious movement founded in India in 1955. The followers practise a contemporary form of tantric yoga. Blaming the bombing on the *Ananda Marga* would have been acceptable to all racist and unthinking Australians. No members of that movement participated in the Hilton bombing and the more it was studied the more it became apparent that **the bombing was a planned covert act by Australian officials**.

been **no** public inquiry. Ask why a mentally-handicapped *boy-man* with an IQ of 66 has been imprisoned with **no** trial – imprisoned forever. Fifty-eight people were killed and wounded yet the official narrative is a total and obvious lie – **a proven documented lie**.

Stan Hanuszewicz can relate lots of details about the killing of Joe Gilewicz by **heavily-armed paramilitary thugs** (Special Operations Group) of Tasmania Police. Hanuszewicz the police ballistics officer was at Pelterata.¹⁴ He saw the deliberate destruction of the crime scene there. A man of moral strength who took on the corrupt State and who exposed it and beat it with the Truth. But big incriminating answers have still been withheld as author Paul Tapp notes in his book on this case of **official murder**.

In this compilation of articles, officials have been involved with the **planning of deaths** which were or would have been caused by: biological weapons; bombs; gas; nuclear weapons; poison; radio-activity; and, hanging ropes. Most readers do not normally think about such things, but they are there written indelibly right into the fabric of Australian society. To these truths, we must add all the terrible crimes (brutality and killing) committed by police and prison officials against singular victims – crimes committed again and again. These are all undeniable facts of life, past and present, in Australia.

It is these facts, stretching back over 200 years, which played a pronounced part in the incident at Port Arthur. It can be said that it is these historical antecedents which allowed that tragedy to occur. Another sickening element of officialdom, an element pervasive, perennial, and repugnant, is **secrecy**. In various ways to various degrees, **official secrecy is the international norm**. With every one of the articles compiled in this section, official secrecy is highly significant and problematic. The public cannot get answers because officials will not disseminate the requested information. The stupidity of this is that secrecy confirms or suggests a negative or an illegal act has taken place. It is only by ending the secrecy that an official can prove an act is positive or has been performed legally. On every occasion that **the truth is kept from you**, something is not right. When you sense something is wrong, it is highly likely something is being kept from you. In contexts such as those being discussed, the twin of Secrecy is Corruption – finding one confirms the other.

Returning to our investigator, if he/she does not comprehend that officials have been killing people in (and out) of Australia all the way back to the White settlement of Australia, then that investigator is unfit for purpose. Officials in Australia have approved, planned, and conducted a wide range of murderous acts and thereafter covered up their involvement with **deceit, lies, and secrecy**. Being involved with the planned killing and wounding of 58 people is nothing new to Australian officials. Nor is it negative to those corrupt officials there who accept THE END justifies THE MEANS.

Reader, the truth is **State killing**, which has many euphemistic names, is a well-documented part of Australian society and history. Thank you for your interest. Now read on, and please think. – **ed**.

¹⁴ A region c.25 kilometres south-west of Hobart the capital of Tasmania. See related section in Part 3: Paul Tapp. *Disquiet*; 2006. (available via bookfinder.com)

GUN ALLEY
Murder, Lies, and Failure of Justice
Kevin Morgan

Sydney: Simon & Schuster; 2005

*...botched police work, trial by media and
lynch-law hysteria spawned a staggering conspiracy
to convict and hang an innocent man....*¹⁵

IN the ideal hanging the condemned man drops, stopping with a jerk of sufficient force to snap the neck instantly. Thus the prisoner is rendered unconscious, and simultaneously the noose forcibly closes to a diameter of three inches (7.5 centimetres), compressing the neck. Stoppage of arterial blood to the head deprives the brain of oxygen, with total brain death in six to eight minutes. Compression of the windpipe means air cannot get into the lungs. The remainder of the body becomes starved of oxygen and its systems begin to shut down. Reflex muscular spasms occur, with erection of the penis and evacuation of the bowels and bladder.¹⁶ The heart continues beating until its own supply of oxygen is depleted. Finally there is fibrillation and eventual stoppage.

THE MYTH OF INSTANT DEATH

Such was the ideal, but in practice instantaneous death was not inevitable. The condemned might die only after a lengthy agony of shock and asphyxiation. Between 1894 and 1924 there were 19 hangings in the Melbourne Gaol. Of these, at least eight (**42 percent**) were botched.

In 1892, the British Home Office began developing some fundamental guidelines for hanging. The lighter the weight of the condemned, the further they had to fall in order to reach the neck-snapping force necessary for instantaneous death. Conversely, the heavier the condemned, the shorter the distance they had to fall. The force necessary for snapping the human vertebrae was, on average, 840 foot-pounds. The principle translated to a table of drops calculated by dividing 840 by the weight in pounds of the condemned person in their clothes.

The Home Office Table of Drops cautions that: "no drop should exceed 8 feet."¹⁷ Otherwise the condemned's head might be torn off. Instantaneous death would result, but with tremendous bloody mess. Neither hangmen nor the government medical officers necessarily had expertise. The executioners might be ignorant or inept. Their job was unpopular, and those willing to do it were otherwise undesirable. Robert Gibbon, Victoria's hangman from 1897 to 1907, was a mentally-deficient child-sex offender.

¹⁵ On back cover of Kevin Morgan's book *Gun Alley*.

¹⁶ This would have to be the only way that victims of State murder can tell the officials what they think. In the USA, victims of official murder (executions) in prisons there are forced to don absorbent underwear.

¹⁷ *The Western Mail* (Perth, Western Australia) newspaper reported on 28 January 1916 that a John Jackson was hanged "at the Melbourne Gaol at 10 o'clock this morning." It was reported: "He weighed 10st. 11lb, and was given a drop of 7ft 11½in, his death being instantaneous." (this is the official story; st = stone = 14 lbs)

The duty of the medical officer at a hanging in the Melbourne Gaol was to stand below the gallows trap, awaiting the fall of the condemned. The hangman, his assistant, the governor of the gaol, the sheriff and the chaplain all stood above, on the gallows platform. Journalists were permitted to see the body of the condemned fall, a split-second after which a green curtain was released, immediately screening the hanging body from view. The death throes were then observed by the medical witnesses only.¹⁸

Because government medical officers knew much could go wrong, it was required that the hanged person should remain suspended on the rope for one hour after dropping. Even in well-managed hangings the heart could take some time to cease beating, and it was essential that no chance whatever exist for the revival of the hanged man or woman.

From 1916 to 1918, the government medical officer required to attend executions at the Melbourne Gaol was Dr. O'Brien. He documented the four executions prior to [Colin Campbell] Ross, all of them bungled. His notes demonstrate: the **incompetence of the hangman; official indifference towards humanitarian concerns;** and the **bureaucratic intransigence preventing reform.**¹⁹

O'Brien knew the Home Office regulations and tried to introduce them, but was repeatedly thwarted. Not until 1939 and the execution of Thomas Johnson were some of the regulations applied, and even then the hanging was botched, Johnson dying of asphyxiation. Officially hanging was proffered as a humane form of execution, but O'Brien shows it was not. Three of the hangings witnessed by O'Brien involved near-decapitations; in the fourth the rope stretched.

Ross would be the 174th person executed [officially murdered] by hanging in Victoria. The Public was informed a new hangman had been appointed, but what was kept **secret** was the experiment planned, involving a kind of rope that had never before been tried, and for which there was certainly not [a] recommendation in the instructions of the Home Office. The experiment would fail – appallingly for Ross.

FAREWELL

[F]amily and friends of a condemned person were freely permitted to visit the prisoner until the morning of the day prior to execution, and the number of Ross' visitors was a record for the Melbourne Gaol. Since the execution was set for Monday morning, Anzac Day eve, visits would not be permitted after Sunday morning. Ross last saw a small group of his family, including his mother and sister. It was later said that Ross was the most composed, the consoler rather than the consoled.

Two warders watched outside the cell door. One visitor at a time was permitted to approach the door, to a distance not less than 3 feet, and from there speak with Ross. Everything took place within the sight and hearing of his guards and it was strictly forbidden to pass any article to the prisoner. The permitted length of the visit was generally half an hour.

¹⁸ Such things are kept hidden from witnesses. Having members of the public raising the fact that hanging is **horribly cruel**, in addition to being **utterly immoral**, is not what politicians want to deal with. Never forget, secrecy pervades officialdom.

¹⁹ These three undeniable facts tell us a lot about officials of that era. Just like today, officials then did not speak up because to do so would have cost them their livelihood. No. Officials look away and say nothing. They pretend it does not matter. They tell themselves and others it is not their responsibility to get involved: *There's nothing I can do about it.*

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

When it came time for Mrs. Ross to farewell her son, she stood before the bars of his cell. She could not at first speak.

Colin: "Mother, all I want you to do is not to watch the clock tomorrow. I thank God you and Ronald know me innocent. Hold your head up wherever you go. And tell the boys not to do anything rash. I want you to live, Mum. Until my innocence is proved. And then – "

Mrs. Ross: "What, Colin?"

"And then – continued Ross, stretching his arms through the bars, "I want to take my mother home."

Mrs. Ross: "Colin, you know, I will fight for you while I have breath." Time was creeping on and the interview would have to end. Mrs. Ross asked: "Can I embrace my boy once before his journey?"

The warder shook his head. He was sorry, but it could not be done. Nor was a parting kiss through the bars permitted; and so Mrs. Ross took leave of her son. It was said that, subsequent to this visit, a supreme calm fell upon Ross. Having said farewell to his family, Ross was returned to the exercise yard. At 6 pm he was taken into the condemned cell, where the Reverend Goble visited him.

It seems the purpose of the visit was to write a letter to Ross' mother. Presumably as a special favour Goble interceded to permit Ross the use of a pen. The letter would be delivered after the execution. During the writing, Ross occasionally appealed to Goble regarding the spelling, but otherwise the chaplain sat quietly by. Ross wrote:

Goodbye my darling mother and brothers. On this, the last night of my life, I want to tell you that I love you all more than ever. Do not fear for tomorrow, for I know God will be with me. Try to forgive my enemies – let God deal with them. I want you, dear mother, and [brother] Ronald, to thank all the friends who have been so kind to you and me during our trouble. I have received nothing but kindness since I have been in gaol. Say goodbye to Gladdie for me, and I wish for her a happy life. Dear ones, do not fret too much for me. The day is coming when my innocence will be proved.²⁰ Goodbye, all my dear ones. Some day you will meet again your loving son and brother.

Colin
X X X X X X X X

EXECUTION

The day before Anzac Day [25th April]: dark skies; rain drizzled down the slates and windows of the city, of the gaol. At 9:15 a.m. acting chief warder Matthew Ryan and three other warders stood outside Ross' cell. The prisoner was informed that he was to be taken to the death cell on the gallery above. Ross declared his readiness to go with the warders.

²⁰ In 1995, Kevin Morgan discovered evidence which proves Colin Campbell Ross was innocent. But it was 73 years too late to save Ross from the gallows. Yet another innocent person had been imprisoned then murdered by the State due to yet another (wilful?) **misinvestigation by police.**

***Murder
committed
by a State
mirrors
the immorality
of that State.***

There was absolute silence in the corridor. All the other prisoners had been brought in from the exercise yards and were in their cells. Ross walked without hesitation to the death cell. He was led inside and the door closed. At 9:20 a.m. the Reverend W.L. Fenton, the official Presbyterian chaplain to the prison, and the Reverend Goble entered the cell. To Goble, Ross said: "I am ready now to face the highest court of appeal, where there is no law – but justice."

A crowd of more than 1000 gathered outside the gaol. The opinion was freely expressed that the condemned man would confess his guilt at the last minute. Motor cars, jinkers [two-wheeled horse-drawn vehicles] and tradesmen's carts also pulled up. Out on the road traffic was practically blocked. The witnesses to the execution, some 30 people comprising policemen, officials and journalists, entered the gaol at about 9:30 a.m. and waited in the anteroom near the main entrance. At 9:55 a.m. they were led through the courtyard and up a short corridor where, passing through a barred door, they went into a space between two iron staircases running up to the gallery.

Looking up, they could see the gallows: a heavy beam let into the walls above the lintels of two cells, in one of which was the condemned man with his chaplains, in the other the hangman and his assistant. The floor space between the cells was mostly occupied by the trapdoor.

Just before 10 a.m. a procession headed by the governor of the gaol arrived. It included Dr Godfrey, the government medical officer, who took up his position under the scaffold. Governor Barclay led the way up the stairs and faced Sheriff Miller.

"I demand from you the body of Colin Campbell Ross," said the sheriff.


"Where is your warrant?" asked Barclay.

The sheriff gave the document to the governor, who knocked on the door of the death cell. Simultaneously, the masked executioner emerged with his assistant. The warders opened Ross's cell. Preceded by the governor, the executioners entered the cell and pinioned Ross' arms behind his back. A few minutes earlier Ross had farewelled Goble with a friendly pressure of the arm that was, the chaplain would later say, "more eloquent than words." Fenton would accompany Ross to the scaffold. He had earlier conferred with Ross over the biblical verses to be read at this point.

Ross's executioners led him to the centre of the trapdoor, only a few paces from the doorway of the cell. Fenton read: "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptance that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners of whom I am chief." (1 Timothy 1:15) Ross stood on the drop while his ankles were strapped together. Fenton: "He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he even liveth to make intercession for them." (Hebrews 7:25)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

STATE MURDER²¹
Years: Last State Murder & Abolition



STATE MURDER/IMPRISONMENT FOR HOMICIDE
Public Opinion Polls 1947–2009
(percentage of sample voting for)

YEAR	STATE MURDER %	IMPRISONMENT %	UNDECIDED %
1947 DEC	67	24	9
1953 FEB	68	24	8
1962 APR	53	37	10
1975 NOV	40	43	17
1980 OCT	43	40	17
1986 JUL	44	40	16
1987 JUL	49	37	14
1989 FEB	52	34	14
1990 FEB	53	35	12
1990 JUN	51	35	14
1992 MAY	46	39	15
1993 MAY	54	36	10
1995 AUG	53	36	11
2005 NOV	27	66	7
2005 DEC	25	69	6
2009 AUG	23	64	13

²¹ Maps like this answer where and when questions. But they do not tell us the horrible totals of official murders which have been perpetrated in each of the six states and in the Northern Territory of Australia.

Roy Morgan Market Research²²

²² see roymorgan.com

*Stop fooling
yourself
– the State does
not exist to served
and protect you
– the function of
the State is to
perpetuate itself
regardless of any
negative impacts
on the populace.*

The executioner adjusted the noose round Ross' neck, placed a white cap over his head, its peak lifted, and stood aside.

Fenton: "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind. Be sober and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." (1 Peter 1:15)

Miller: "Colin Campbell Ross, have you anything to say before sentence of death is carried out?"

Ross was silent. He then spoke clearly and slowly –

"I am now face to face with my Maker, and I swear by Almighty God that I am an innocent man. I never saw the child. I never committed the crime, and I don't know who did. I never confessed to anyone. I ask God to forgive those who have sworn my life away, and I pray God to have mercy on my poor darling mother, and my family."

Some would suggest Ross lied in this statement. He had freely admitted he had seen Alma. However, he could simply have meant that he had not seen the girl except as he had already admitted.

When Ross ceased speaking, the sheriff waited a few moments. He motioned to the executioner, who placed the flap of the cap over Ross' face. The lever was pulled, and Ross fell through the gallows trap. The green cloth attached to the side of the gallery was released, hiding Ross as he fell from the view of those below.

Less than two minutes had elapsed since the executioner entered Ross' cell. Fenton, who had been quietly reading aloud prayers from the burial service, continued until the lever was pulled.

Warders quickly escorted the guests back the way they had come. A cup of tea was available for those wanting it.

Behind the green curtain, Ross rebounded on the rope, his throat and neck taking the impact, his body revolving slowly. But the noose had closed to only 4 inches [10 centimetres]. The knot did not run freely. Ross had sustained a fracture to the second cervical vertebra with pressure on the spinal cord within. But the cord was not severed, the medullary centre not paralysed. His diaphragm contracted as he inhaled, with a wet guttural sucking. His windpipe was torn and obstructed by the fragments of his larynx.

Blood vessels haemorrhaged into the structures of his throat, and **Ross convulsed on the rope.** He struggled against the bonds, flexing his arms at the elbow, his knees bending. Three times he assumed this posture, before finally becoming limp. Although the length of time it took for Ross to die is not officially recorded, the physiological indications suggest a timeframe between **eight and 20 minutes.**

Ross' body hung from the beam until 11 o'clock, when it was removed to the gaol morgue to await inquest.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Outside the gaol a great silence had descended on the crowd. In Russell Street a police inspector told them it was all over. By 11 o'clock most had gone. They had neither seen nor heard anything of the execution. No flag was raised. No bell was tolled. Their curiosity had remained unsatisfied.

It is hard to imagine more going wrong with a hanging than that of Colin Campbell Ross. Much of the problem can be attributed to the experiment with a type of rope (4-stranded, rather than 3-stranded European hemp) not previously used in executions in Victoria. It was not prescribed for use by the Home Office.

In the Melbourne Gaol's *The Particulars of Executions*, red ink was used for the first time, so that it might never be forgotten. E.A. Hughes, senior hospital warder, wrote: "A four-stranded rope was used for the first time. Never use it again. Important." The red ink has smudged across the page, like blood. In his confidential report, Dr. Godfrey summarised the problems. The rope could be blamed in part, but so could the hangman: "The rope was less pliable than usual – the knot was unnecessarily large. The knot did not run freely."

Again, the drop was vastly in excess of that prescribed by the Home Office. Ross' weight on the day before his execution was 153.5 pounds, requiring, according to the Home Office calculations, a drop of 5 feet and 5 inches. He instead was dropped 8 feet 5 inches. Godfrey claimed, "the rope itself stretched approximately 9½ inches," thus contradicting his earlier statement that "The rope was less pliable than usual." So remarkable a stretching of the rope suggests the problem was more due to the hangman's inexperience.²³

The gaol's authorities, the community and its judicial system, all relied on Godfrey to certify that Ross' death was instantaneous. To do otherwise would incur some responsibility for error. As the presiding medical officer, he should ensure the execution was conducted humanely.

Godfrey would tender his post-mortem report to the coroner at an inquest at the gaol that afternoon. On this occasion the coroner, Dr Cole, could not be present, instead sending his deputy, Alexander Phillips, a man with no practical experience of judicial executions. Worse, newsmen would be attending. What if word got out about the botched execution?

Godfrey: "I have made a post-mortem examination of the body of Colin Campbell Ross with regard to the structures of the neck. I found the second cervical vertebra was fractured with pressure on the spinal cord. The cause of death was fracture of the spine. I was present at the execution of deceased. The arrangements were conducted with strict regard to humanity [*sic*] and **death was instantaneous.**"²⁴

This report, which Godfrey placed on the public record, is **very different from his notes made that same day** in *The Particulars of Executions*.

²³ Or sadistic indifference?

²⁴ This clearly was a lie. Based on his investigation, Morgan wrote this with reference to the death of Colin Campbell Ross: "Although the length of time it took for Ross to die is not officially recorded, the physiological indications suggest a timeframe between eight and 20 minutes." Even if those times are halved, death was **NOT INSTANTANEOUS**. But this Dr. Godfrey was a Victorian government employee. So he was not going to say anything to contradict the official narrative with which the State kept deceiving itself and the public: *Capital punishment deaths by hanging are instantaneous*. No State wants to be told capital punishment is inhuman and immoral, that just raises issues which officials do not want to deal with. It is always better for a State to continue pushing a lie to gullible employees and to members of the public rather than deal with the horrible true facts of the matter the impact of which can be dangerously unpredictable. This applies today, just as it did in 1922 when this mongrel Godfrey was lying about how Colin Campbell Ross died instantaneously even though he had convulsed at the end of rope for "eight to 20 minutes." Note that one of the roles which every government medical officer and every coroner has is the **covering up of irregularities** which will conflict with State policies, procedures, and publicized statements. (Thus, we must ask whether the coroner in the Port Arthur case, Ian Matterson, **covered up any irregularities?** Facts strongly suggest that he did. It was expected of him.)

SOME STATE MURDERS – AUSTRALIA

THOUGH it is always given another official name, when people are killed by the State they are **murdered**. As the State controls the entire legal process, all death-related decisions are worded to ensure the State is never guilty of murder and that it has the right to kill as defined by its laws and as decided by its arbiters.

■ **1951**

Jean Lee (1919-1951; originally Marjorie Jean Maude Wright)

The **last woman** to be executed in Australia, Lee was convicted of murder as were her two male companions. All were hanged at Pentridge prison. Her story is told by Paul Wilson, Don Treble, and Robyn Lincoln in *Jean Lee – The Last Woman Hanged in Australia* (1997) According to reviewer Peter Shelly: "The writers make the claim that the hangings occurred out of expedience for the resident state government, when doubts still remained concerning the case. It was never clear what part Jean Lee played in the murder [William Kent], and the police interrogation procedures of the accused three was later found to be **highly questionable**. The writers also believe that an example was made of Lee, because of her sex and working-class origins, as a **warning to other women** of conservative post-war Melbourne of the consequences of **deviating from the socially approved path of femininity.**" (amazon.co.uk)

■ **1967**

Ronald Joseph Ryan (1925–1967)

The **last man** to be executed in Australia, Ryan was convicted of shooting and killing George Hodson who was then a prison guard. Note that a conviction **does not** necessarily equate with guilt. That incident occurred in 1965 during a successful escape by Ryan and Peter Walker from Pentridge prison. Ryan's conviction was set up by officials. A kangaroo court relied upon: "unrecorded unsigned testimony that Ryan had, allegedly, verbally confessed to shooting Hodson." (wikipedia.org) Discrepancies were so substantial and wide-ranging, that none of the evidence from the 14 eyewitnesses could be relied upon. But it was. There was **no** ballistic forensic evidence: **no** cartridge case; **no** GSR²⁵; **no** projectile; etc. Ryan's lawyer Dr. Philip Opas has stated this: "I want to put the record straight. **I want the truth told** about Ronald Ryan – that an innocent man went to the gallows. I want the truth to be made available to everyone, for anyone young and old, who may want to do research into the Ronald Ryan's case or research on the issue of capital punishment. I will go to my grave firmly of the opinion that Ronald Ryan did not commit murder. I refuse to believe that at any time he told anyone that he did." (ronaldryan.info)

²⁵ Abbreviation of gunshot residue. In addition to the evidence, which was **not** presented at the trial of Ronald Ryan, is the fact one expert witness clearly demonstrated the impossibility of Ryan having fired a rifle the bullet from which killed the prison warder: "Monash University mathematics professor Terry Speed, testified that Ryan, 5 feet 8 inches (1.73 m) tall, would have had to have been 8 feet 3 inches (2.55 m) tall to have fired the fatal shot at that downward trajectory angle." (ronaldryan.info) Again and again, reasonable doubt was raised but the State was **determined to kill Ryan**. And it did, regardless of all the evidence that suggested or confirmed he was innocent. A State does not care for truth, it cares about itself first. The problem was a warder had been shot and killed. If Ryan had been found innocent, that meant the dead warder had been shot and killed by another warder at that prison. That would have meant the government had to either ignore the killing or initiate legal action against a government employee. Neither of those two options was acceptable to the State. It was far easier to set up Ryan who had the gall to escape from prison. Ryan had a negative profile as he had already committed criminal acts. So the State used that to its advantage to get him onto the end of a rope.

OFFICIAL murder in Australia was abolished in 1985. (The last person sentenced was Brenda Hodge in 1984 in W.A. Her sentence was commuted.) During the 20th century, 184 people were officially murdered in the six states and the NT. Every one of those hangings is a crime. If Tasmania was still killing people to prove killing people is wrong, then (innocent) Martin Bryant would have been hung long ago. – ed.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Dropping such a distance, Ross would almost certainly have been decapitated – if the knot had fully tightened. The noose did not close to the requisite 7.5 centimetres [3 inches] around his throat, but only 10 centimetres [4 inches], which ensured air could still enter his trachea. Ross suffered a prolonged and agonising asphyxiation, and Godfrey noted the classical physiological responses of death by throttling.

Shortly after 6 o'clock that night, Ross' body was buried in the unconsecrated ground of the gaol's cemetery. Quicklime was scattered over his remains to hasten decomposition. Persons executed had no claim to memory and by an Act of Parliament their remains were forfeited to the State. Mrs. Ross made concerted efforts to have her son's body returned for interment in the family's burial ground in the Footscray Cemetery, but she was continuously rejected.

Before he left the death cell, Ross gave Fenton a Bible inscribed: "This Bible is the kind gift to me from my chaplain, Rev. W. Fenton. Thanking him for all his help and kindness to me." Ross intended the Bible to be passed on "To my Darling Mother." It survives in the care of the Ross family.

Colin marked off and annotated certain verses, underlining particular words and phrases. He thus reshaped the text into a commentary on his recent life. Some idea of the annotations is shown in the following extracts. Where a marked passage bears some commentary, by Ross or he has replaced an existing word with one of his own, the annotation is shown in italics.

"False witnesses rose up against me; they laid to my charge things that I knew not." *Time will tell* (Psalms 35:11, 12)

"...for I have seen violence and strife in the city. *Melbourne*. Day and night they go about it upon the walls thereof: mischief also and sorrow are in the midst of it. *The Police*. Wickedness is in the midst thereof: deceit and guile depart not from her streets. *Melbourne*." (Psalms 55:9-11)

"Gather not my soul ... with bloody men: In whose hands is mischief, and their right hand is full of bribes. *This is our Police force which our people think so much of.*" (Psalms 26:9, 10; original underlining)

Among the verses Colin marked were several clearly intended as a farewell to his mother.

"Let not your heart be troubled...I go and prepare a place for you... I will not leave you comfortless..." (John 14: 1, 18)

"If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Romans 8: 31)

"Who shall separate us...? For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us...." (Romans 8: 35, 38, 39)

***Judges
base their
witless words
on the findings of
incompetent and
criminal cops
– this is the farce
you are expected
to accept as
truth & justice.***

BRENNAN'S BOOK

In October 1922, Alma's [Alma Tirtschke] uncle, John Murdoch, wrote to the Attorney-General asking him to prevent the imminent publication of *The Gun Alley Tragedy* by T.C. Brennan: "I...with the other relatives of the family feel somewhat distressed to think that a book is to be published which may be once again bringing forward all the harrowing details.... [I]t is to be a criticism of the verdict and...this is not a desirable procedure...without taking into consideration the feeling of the relatives."

Robinson regretted he had no power to prevent the book being published, though he told Murdoch he regarded the publication as "a reprehensible and even dangerous precedent."²⁶

Brennan noted in his introduction: "...for a generation to come the name of a Ross will never be mentioned without recalling that particular bearer of it who died an ignominious death for a revolting murder. If all the truth has not come out, the community owes it to those of his blood left behind him that it shall be brought out. It is largely at the solicitation of those bearers of the name that this review is being written."

In the book Brennan demonstrated that the Harding and Matthews confessions agreed on almost all the points that were already known to the police. These were: that Alma Tirtschke was in the vicinity of the Eastern Arcade at about 3 o'clock; that Ross had been speaking to Gladys Wain both outside and, for an hour after 4 o'clock, inside the saloon; that he went home to Footscray for tea; he met with Gladys again in the saloon for over an hour after 9.15 p.m.; and that he went home late by train and tram. All this information came from Colin's and Stanley's statements of 5 January, and Gladys Wain's statement of 12 January. They also knew that the body was not in the alley at 1 o'clock, that Ellis had said that he had seen a man going in and out of the arcade near that time, and that Ross suffered from a venereal disease.

But on the five aspects about which nothing was known to the police, the two confessions are absolutely at variance: **1.** How did the girl actually get into the saloon? **2.** How did Gladys Wain fail to see anything of the girl when she was there in the afternoon? **3.** What was the exact manner of the girl's death? **4.** How was Gladys Wain prevented from seeing the body when she came in at 9 o'clock? **5.** How did Ross get back from Footscray late at night to dispose of the body? These five points had to be somehow answered if Ross were to be made responsible for the crime.

Brennan concluded that Matthews and Harding were provided with certain facts about Ross by the police, but were compelled to fill in the gaps themselves. They could not have been drawing from the one alleged source (Ross) when they differed so absolutely as to the essential circumstances of the crime. Indeed, by the time of publication, Brennan knew the source of Harding's information: Det. Walshe. Brennan observed that had the defence known of this at the time of the trial, it would "have given the jury something to consider...."

²⁶ The truth to any State is always a "dangerous precedent." Start telling the truth and no one knows with certainty what will happen. The legal system, it is **not a system of justice**, would certainly collapse because the truth is not what the law is about. (Read Evan Whitton. *Our Corrupt Legal System*; 2009. You will quickly see courts and judges do not work in realms of truth.

LETTER TO COLIN CAMPBELL ROSS

THE night before Ross was hanged [24 April 1922], Sonenberg received a letter. The original text is lost, but it is quoted in Brennan's [book] *The Gun Alley Tragedy*.²⁷

Colin C. Ross
Melbourne Gaol

You have been condemned for a crime which you have never committed, and are to suffer for another's fault. Since your conviction you have, no doubt, wondered what manner of man the real murderer is who could not only encompass the girl's death, but allow you to suffer in his stead.

My dear Ross, if it is any satisfaction for you to know it, believe me that you die but once, but he will continue to die for the rest of his life. Honoured and fawned upon by those who know him, the smile upon his lips but hides the canker eating into his soul. Day and night his life is a hell without the hope of reprieve. Gladly would he take your place on Monday next if he had himself alone to consider. His reason, then, briefly stated, is this: A devoted and loving mother is ill – a shock would be fatal. Three loving married sisters, whose whole life would be wrecked, to say nothing of brothers, who have been accustomed to take him as a pattern. He cannot sacrifice these. Himself he will sacrifice when his mother passes away. He will do it by his own hand. He will board the ferry across the Styx with a lie on his lips, with the only hope that religion is a myth and earth annihilation.

It is too painful for him to go into the details of the crime. It is simply a Jekyll and Hyde existence. By a freak of nature, he was not made as other men.... This girl was not the first.... With a procuress all things are possible.... In this case there was no intention of murder – the victim unexpectedly collapsed. The hands of the woman, in her frenzy, did the rest.

May it be some satisfaction to yourself, your devoted mother, and the members of your family to know that at least one of the legion of the damned, who is the cause of your death, is suffering the pangs of hell. He may not ask your forgiveness or sympathy, but he asks your understanding. [end]

It is not possible to prove whether or not this letter was a fake. The author was certainly literate and educated. Brennan stated that the letter "bore on its face some suggestion of genuineness."

Kevin Morgan
Gun Alley
2005: pp. 290-291

*THIS letter suggests the person responsible for the death of Alma Tirtschke was a paedophile. This seems to rule out Ross. In 1995, the author Kevin Morgan found forgotten hair samples. Subsequent analysis conclusively proves **Ross did not kill the young girl**. He was innocent. But regardless, the State murdered Ross. – ed.*

²⁷ In November 2013, a 1922 edition of this book was on sale in South Australia. (see bookfinder.com)

Regarding the philosophy behind the police methods used to convict Ross, Brennan quoted two passages from [John Pitt Taylor's book]. The first concerns the caution necessary in considering all police evidence:

"With respect to policemen, constables and others employed in the detection of crime, their testimony against a prisoner should usually be watched with care not because they intentionally pervert the truth but because their professional zeal, fed as it is by an habitual intercourse with the vicious, and by the frequent contemplation of human nature in its most revolting form, almost necessarily leads them to ascribe actions to the worst motives, and to give a colouring of guilt to facts and conversations which are, perhaps, in themselves, consistent with perfect rectitude. 'That all men are guilty till they are proved to be innocent' is naturally the creed of the police, but it is a creed which finds no sanction in a court of law."²⁸

The other passage deals with the dangers of circumstantial evidence:

"It must be remembered that, in a case of circumstantial evidence, the facts are collected by degrees. Something occurs to raise a suspicion against a particular party. Constables and police officers are immediately on the alert, and, with professional zeal, ransack every place and paper, and examine into every circumstance which can tend to establish, not his innocence, but his guilt. Presuming him guilty from the first, they...determine, if possible, to bag their game. Innocent actions may thus be misinterpreted, innocent words misunderstood, and as men readily believe what they anxiously desire, facts the most harmless may be construed into strong confirmation of preconceived opinions. It is not here asserted that this is commonly the case, nor is it intended to disparage the police. The feelings by which they are actuated are common to all persons who first assume a fact or system is true, and then seek for argument to support and prove its truth."²⁹

Nobody took Brennan to court over his book. To do so might not only have confirmed his allegations, but also **exposed the tainted methods of the police**. In fact Brennan anticipated the damning observations of Sir Frederick Mann, Chief [Judge] of the Victorian Supreme Court. In 1936, Mann denounced the criminal investigation work of Victorian detectives as: "**[T]he crude and unbridled doings of untrained investigators, who depended too much on informers and...coercion....**"²⁹ ■

(amended; added emphasis)

²⁸ John Pitt Taylor. *A Treatise on the Law of Evidence as Administered in England and Ireland with Illustrations from Scotch, India, American and Other Legal Systems (sic)*. London: Sweet and Marshall; 1906.

²⁹ Similar words by Frederick Mann are quoted in a book by Clive Emsley & Haia Shpayer-Makov. *Police Detectives in History 1750-1950*; 2006: "In 1936, he denounced Victorian police criminal investigation methods of the time as 'crude, untrained and overly reliant upon informers and physical coercion'." Here, coercion means to assault, bash, intimidate, threaten, torture, etc.

AMERICANS TO NERVE GAS AUSSIES

Ross Coulthart

SUNDAY; ninemsn.com.au; 6 July 2008

*Top secret US military plans to test deadly nerve gas by dropping it on soldiers in a remote Queensland rainforest during the Cold War have been uncovered in Australian Government archives.*³⁰

NEWLY declassified Australian Defence Department and Prime Minister's office files show that **the United States was strongly pushing the Government for tests on Australian soil of two of the most deadly chemical weapons ever developed, VX and GB – better known as Sarin – nerve gas.**

The plan...called for **200 mainly Australian combat troops** to be aerially bombed and sprayed with the chemical weapons — with all but a handful of the soldiers **to be kept in the dark** about the "full details" of the tests. Peter Bailey, a former senior official with then prime minister Harold Holt, told the program that as far as he knew the tests never went ahead but the planning was very advanced.

He admitted **the whole operation was to be kept secret**³¹ because use of such weapons was almost certainly illegal under international law at the time: "The idea that we could actually – that Australians could countenance such an activity is – unacceptable," University of NSW toxicologist professor Chris Winder said. He says even a fraction of a drop of either chemical on exposed skin could have been fatal and Cold War fears that communist Chinese or Russian attackers might have used such weapons in a third world war "doesn't justify it now and I don't think it justified it then."

The files show that in **July 1962** the then US defense secretary Robert McNamara³² wrote in secret to the Australian Defence Department suggesting joint testing of chemical weapons: "on a classified basis without a public release by either country."

In early 1963, a survey team of Australian and US scientists reviewed sites in Australia for chemical warfare tests, suggesting the remote Iron Range rainforest near **Lockhart River** in far north Queensland as one such location. The request caused consternation in Canberra, with senior Defence bureaucrats clearly opposed to the use of nerve gas, but, as former senior prime ministerial policy advisor Peter Bailey recalls: "I heard that many times in Cabinet meetings that if they weren't pretty good and pretty faithful to the Americans we would be dumped."³³

³⁰ Opening words of this article by Ross Coulthart, an Australian investigative journalist.

³¹ Never forget on subjects like this, the twin of Secrecy is Corruption – find one, there will be the other.

³² Robert Strange (sic) McNamara was, as secretary of defense/death, responsible for escalating the insane American war in Vietnam.

³³ Becoming a non-aligned nation would be better for all Australians. But the US will never allow this to happen. Australia will always remain a puppet state of Washington. It will take a big shift in thinking by Australians to close down the satellite tracking base* the US has there, and to rid Australia of all the murderers the US has now based at Darwin: "The first contingent of a deployment of 2,500 US troops has arrived in Australia to boost **America's power** in the Asia Pacific." (added emphasis; more killing) thenational.ae; 5 April 2012 (* These are the facilities that set up Drone strikes which the US uses to murder anyone it likes anywhere in the world. If the US wants anyone dead, then there is no trial. Drones do it – **hi-tech homicide** at its very best. Unthinking Aussies believe this is a good thing, especially if those suckers are Moslems. In their schools every morning, brainwashed brats of Uncle Sam express loyalty to a **rotting republic** and its flag: "...one nation under God." Given all the killing that America does around the world, ask yourself what god do they worship? With certainty, a god of hate popular within the military. Here is a wish from a Aussie of the Townsville 3rd Brigade who follows that US religion: "Mate, what I would give to drop the legs on a MAG 58, slap on a 500 round belt, adopt a stable firing position in the middle of the street and lay waste to every single one of those cancerous fucks." smh.com.au 29 October 2012. Those "cancerous fucks" are Moslem people. Such is brute Aussie cruelty.)

"We had already been dumped with the British east of Suez pullout so ministers were pretty aware this was our one main support and **the red peril**³⁴ thing was still in people's minds."

In October 1964, the Americans pushed the request again, this time **insisting that the public should be fed a "cover story"**³⁵ **to conceal the real nature of the tests**: the documents show the public was to be told the tests were to test equipment or land reclamation in a jungle environment.

Low-flying military aircraft and spraying was to be explained away with the false claim that low-risk herbicides and insecticides were to be used in the testing but **the cover stories were clearly untrue** – the real chemicals to be used were two of the most deadly man-made substances, VX and GB nerve gas.

MORE MURDERS, MORE TERROR

"THE Washington Post [25 October 2012; Karen DeYoung] has just laid out, in horrifying, soul-slaughtering detail, the Obama Administration's ongoing effort to expand, entrench and *codify* the practice of murder and terrorism by the United States government. The avowed, deliberate intent of these sinister machinations is to embed the use of **death squads** and **drone terror attacks** into the policy apparatus of future administrations, so that **the killing of human beings outside all pretense of legal process will go on, year after year after year**, even when the Nobel Peace Laureate has left office." (added emphasis)

Chris Floyd

*Welcome to the age of hell:
Entrenching murder as the American way*
informationclearinghouse.info
27 October 2012

³⁴ The so-called **Red peril** was the propaganda which Australian governments fed and scared the populace with after World War II. This concocted and hyped fear of communism has aided the Australian State with its own war (killing) efforts and the curtailment of civil liberties in that country.

³⁵ And there is the source of the lie which that scumbag prime minister Robert Menzies pushed in Australia. In that same year: "The Menzies government refuses to ratify the International Labor Organisation convention on equal pay for women" and it announced the "reintroduction of National Service." (wikipedia; 19 November 2012) It was a slap in the face for **equal rights for women** – *get down you bloody bitches* – and it was conscription of 20-year old men – who by law could not vote until they were 21 – to take up murdering for the Australian military.

Former democrat senator Lyn Allison, who became aware of the existence of references to secret chemical weapons tests in Australia during her support of sick former veterans of the Maralinga nuclear bomb tests, told *SUNDAY* [8 May 2008] that her own attempts to get the full story on what went on with proposed testing were rebuffed several years ago.

She said government files on the issue were still classified even now and the revelations in the new documents obtained by *SUNDAY* underlined the need for the defence department to finally disclose all that went on during the Cold War.

"To understand that Australia was still prepared to consider this proposal because of its relationship with the US I think needs proper examination," Allison told the program: "So all those documents should be released, there shouldn't be any pussy footing around – it's time for us to know **what went on.**" ■

(amended; added emphasis)

MARALINGA'S AFTERLIFE

John Keane³⁶

The Age; 11 May 2003

At Maralinga,³⁷ the British Government treated Aborigines, Australian servicemen and even its own troops as scientific guinea pigs.

John Keane, whose father was there, looks at the dirty games that were played in the desert of South Australia.³⁸

LEN Beadell stood among the stunted scrub and cast his eyes over the vast limestone and saltbush plain below, stretching northwards to infinity, and thought of England. The parched piece of Australia at which he was staring reminded him of the windswept granite wilderness of Devon, 13,000 kilometres away. It was exactly what he and his men had been looking for. They raised their bush hats and gave three triumphant cheers. "We all knew immediately that this was going to be the place," Beadell later wrote. "The saltbush undulations rolled away as far as we could see, even through our binoculars. We solemnly wrung each other's hands and just gazed about us in all directions for half an hour."

Beadell...had been sent *scrub bashing* in southern Australia 50 years ago, in search of a permanent place to **test Britain's atomic weapons**. The site he found and recommended was initially code-named X300, but soon became known as Maralinga. **The land belonged to the Tjarutja people,**³⁹ though the name did not. Supplied by anthropologists working with Aboriginal people in eastern Australia, it meant *thunder fields*.

Beadell's men set to work. Dragging lengths of railway line behind their Land Rovers, they carved a makeshift airstrip out of the desert in days. A week later, Bristol freighters began arriving from the UK, four days' flying time away. They were flying in an instant town, designed to house 2000 servicemen and destined to sit in the midst of a fenced-off area the size of England.⁴⁰

The main streets of the town sported signs such as London Road, Belfast Street and Durham Crescent. There was a post office, a swimming pool, a chapel, a hospital, even a cinema that screened the latest films from home. There were no women, but there were barbers, a football pitch, beer gardens, repair garages, laboratories, workshops, a parade ground and a VIP dining room boasting a grand piano. On hot nights, it was wheeled outside, and **fine claret and cigars and Chopin soothed tired officers** under the light of the Southern Cross [constellation of stars].

³⁶ Professor of Politics, Centre for the Study of Democracy, University of Westminster, London, UK.

³⁷ Located approximately 800 kilometres northwest of Adelaide, capital of South Australia. It is just 50 kilometres north of Ooldea on the Trans-Australian Railway line, which was completed in 1917. How many passengers have been and are being exposed to radioactive material whilst train travelling across Australia is not recorded in the literature. Crews on the trains have been repeatedly exposed. Officials will be quick to declare there is no radioactive material in that area. Believe them if you want to.

³⁸ Opening words of this article by John Keane.

³⁹ Original inhabitants who the British, with Australian government consent, drove out. Those who did not go, were murdered (burnt alive). Of course that was kept an official secret.

⁴⁰ The area of England is c.130,400 square kilometres.

41 The official narrative; or in plain English, the **BIG LIE**.

42 This mongrel Tedder was big on **bombing people to death**. Have a look at his CV: "Air Marshal Sir Ian Tedder, KCB OBE DFC CRAP...flew sorties against nationalist insurgents in Indonesia in 1945, communist rebels during the Malayan Emergency in 1948, Laotian incursions into Thailand in 1962 and again against Indonesian troops during the Sukarno regime's confrontation with Malaysia in Borneo in 1964. DFC in 1949 for flying sorties over the jungle canopy to photograph the positions of communist insurgents' encampments. When a crisis developed on the Thai-Laos frontier, Tedder took his squadron up to Thailand, where its ground-attack Hunters were soon involved in action against Communist incursions from neighbouring Laos. For his part in these operations, carried out in difficult circumstances, with a ready supply of fuel always a major problem, Tedder was appointed OBE in 1963 and KCB in 1982." (jeanpaulleblanc.com 17 November 2012) And this decorated killer of "communist insurgents" aka peasants trying to claim back their own land from another colonizer – is put forth as a man of substance, someone for youth to emulate. What despicableness. This year, his war-pig followers bombed no one knows how many people to death in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, etc. They are now polishing up their bombs to incinerate innocent Iranians because they will not do as the West commands them. Tedder would have loved it.

43 And who approved all of this in Australia? Again it was that scumbag prime minister Robert Menzies. For allowing the British to inflict death and disease on these innocent service personnel, Menzies no doubt got praise from some mongrel at Whitehall. These are the awards Menzies received for his crawling: KT, AK, CH, FAA, FRS, CRAP; and yes, he was a lawyer. But there is no record of him being given anything by the **Tjarutja people**.

The hub of communications with the outside world was the 3.5 kilometre [two **imperial** miles] long bitumen airstrip that doubled as a cricket pitch, the world's largest. The entrance to the terminal was planted with pink and white oleanders, compliments of the gardens of southern England.

But Maralinga was no holiday camp. New arrivals were greeted with talk of the need for caution and briefed to steer clear of the huge dumping pit on the edge of town, called the Graveyard. There was also the Dirty Road, trailing 16 kilometres north from the town to ground zero.

There, at the edge of the Great Victoria Desert, **all sorts of nuclear experiments went on for a decade**. Seven big bombs were exploded there, together with a top-secret program of 550 experiments known as the Minor Trials. It was here that Britain and Australia lost their nuclear innocence.

The basic details of Maralinga are now pretty well known. Fifty years ago, Britain won membership in the exclusive club of nuclear powers by firing off A-bombs on the **Monte Bello Islands**, off the north-western coast of Australia. Shortly afterwards, the top-secret quest to keep up with the United States and the Soviet Union moved to Maralinga.

The official story⁴¹ is that the site was uninhabited and blessed with good weather and near-perfect security conditions. Unhindered by man or nature, the British and their **loyal Australian** partners reckoned it an excellent location for putting into practice the fantastic vision first defined **in secret** by Clement Attlee's Labour Government in 1946.

"We have got to have this thing over here whatever it costs, and with a bloody Union Jack flying on top of it," foreign secretary Ernest Bevin told Whitehall officials after the Americans refused to proceed with a joint nuclear project.

The Labour Cabinet decreed that 15 nuclear weapons a year should be built. The target was a massive arsenal; since 25 bombs would be needed to "knock out" Britain, air marshal Tedder explained in 1947, the Soviet Union, which was 40 times the size of Britain, could only suffer knock out with 1000 bombs. This was the impetus behind Maralinga.⁴²

The stakes were high, the game plan was grand, the results mixed, sometimes macabre. Official versions of events, past and present, consistently gloss over the dirty ironies. The truth is that Britain and Australia's joint nuclear coming of age was fraught. And it is by no means over. It was a time when things much worse than accidental "friendly fire" happened. **British, Australian and New Zealand servicemen were deliberately and repeatedly exposed to nuclear hazard.**⁴³ Dressed only in boots and shorts and using scrubbing brushes and buckets filled with detergent, they were instructed to strip and service and clean radioactive aircraft and other equipment.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Wearing gumboots and suits made variously of rubber, wool and cotton, they were ordered to walk, crawl or drive through places where Hiroshima-size bombs had hours before roasted the saltbush and red desert sand into three-inch thick glass, called "bomb glaze."

The dead were subject to experimentation as well. After a cloud of strontium-90 drifted towards Adelaide following a detonation in 1958, the bodies of deceased Australians,⁴⁴ especially of young children and still-born babies, **were secretly harvested.**

Their ashed bones were analysed in laboratories in Adelaide, Melbourne and, in Britain, Aberdeen, Liverpool and London. The body snatching was done in the name of public safety and **without the consent of parents**, in violation of the code of ethics drawn up at Nuremberg after the Second World War.

According to new findings by Dundee researcher Sue Rabbitt Roff, who specialises in nuclear health issues, there were in fact at least two overlapping programs of this sort. Project Sunshine was initially championed by the Atomic Energy Commission in the US and coordinated by the UN before being handed over to the Commonwealth X-Ray and Radium Laboratory and the Australian Atomic Energy Commission.

The second was larger and Australian-directed. It lasted from 1957 to around 1980 and again involved analysing the ashes of many thousands of hearts and thyroid glands and limbs. **The families of the deceased were never informed.**

Five decades after entering service, the thousands of British and Australian men who have survived Maralinga (more than a quarter of them are now dead) feel hurt and humiliated. They have no medals to pass on to their grandchildren, no letters of praise or apology from Tony Blair or John Howard, no war-time veterans' privileges.

What they do have are anecdotes about unusual clusters of multiple myelomas. Hip and spine deformities. Teeth that are falling out. Poor eyesight. Bleeding bowels. Post-traumatic anxiety and depression. And perhaps up to a quarter of them, according to preliminary data collected by the New Zealand government, have disabled offspring. It is harsh reward for the loyalty shown by the men who served at Maralinga. They sang songs such as *Pining for the Mushroom Cloud*. They appeared willing to do whatever their officers commanded – fly a bomber through a deadly nuclear cloud, even – which perhaps explains why there were no whistleblowers at the time.

But records show that the servicemen's quiet loyalty was artificially produced. **Maralinga was a secret military state within a state.** Officers and administrators and scientists **were sworn to secrecy.** Things were not called by their proper names. Dangerous tools were given innocuous names, such as "featherbeds" and "water lilies." **Deadly experiments** were described as "assessment tests" and "experimental programs."

⁴⁴ Here, John Keane uses the word Australian to be polite. He is referring to **Tjarutja** deaths. In 1958, the demographics of Black people in that part of Australia were not an official concern. So, to harvest a few dead bodies here, and harvest a few dead bodies there, would not have caused any concern to White officials.

BRITAIN BOMBS WESTERN AUSTRALIA

ON 3 October 1952, the United Kingdom became the third country to test nuclear weapons after the United States and the Soviet Union. The first British test, code-named *Hurricane*, was conducted at the **Monte Bello Islands in West Australia**.

The United Kingdom had embarked on its own atomic weapons programme in 1947. As the British mainland was considered unsuitable for nuclear testing due to its small size and high population density, the British government requested Australia to provide a permanent nuclear test site, to which the latter agreed. This decision by Australian Prime Minister Robert Menzies was later questioned increasingly.

Between 1952 and 1957, the UK conducted a total of 12 atmospheric nuclear tests on Australian territories at the Monte Bello Islands, Maralinga and Emu Field. Following a 1958 agreement with the United States, both countries subsequently cooperated closely in the development of nuclear weapons and all British tests were conducted at the Nevada Test Site in the USA.

[A] 25-kiloton plutonium implosion bomb was detonated inside the hull of the frigate *HMS Plym*, anchored in a lagoon between the Monte Bello Islands.... The explosion left a crater 6 metres deep and 300 metres wide on the ocean floor. The mushroom cloud from the detonation rose up to 4.5 kilometres into the sky.

The impact of British testing in Australia remains a matter of contention until today. Although the Monte Bello Islands were uninhabited, the atmospheric nuclear tests spread radioactivity across large parts of the Australian mainland.⁴⁵ Fallout from the testing at the Aborigine territories in Emu Field and Maralinga contaminated large parts of South Australia.

In a time when **indigenous people had no citizenship rights**, officials paid little if any attention to their particular vulnerability to the effects of nuclear testing. Aboriginal people were not only the most exposed to radioactive fallout but also lacked protection measures available to the rest of the Australian population.⁴⁶

The royal commission established by the Australian government in 1984 to study the health and environmental impacts of British nuclear testing concluded that the Monte Bello Islands were a particularly unsafe and inappropriate location for nuclear testing and that the **"presence of Aborigines on the mainland near Monte Bello Islands and their extra vulnerability to the effect of fallout was not recognized."**

British and Australian servicemen who participated in the testing claimed they had been **used as guinea pigs**. Their legal battle for compensation continues until today.

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

Famous Anniversaries – 3 October 1952

ctbto.org⁴⁷

28 October 2012

(amended; original & added italics; added emphasis)

⁴⁵ According to the author Roger Cross in his book *Fallout*; 2001: p. 179: "Queensland towns such as Mount Isa, Julia Creek, Longreach & Rockhampton were contaminated by the fallout." (see Map at Part 2)

⁴⁶ The following is stated by the social scientist Peter N. Grabowsky: "In addition to British...personnel, thousands of Australians were exposed to radiation produced by the tests...also Aboriginal people living downwind of the test sites, and other Australians more distant who came into contact with airborne radioactivity." A toxic legacy. See British nuclear weapons testing in Australia in *Wayward Governance: Illegality and Its Control in the Public Sector*; Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology; 1989: pp. 235-253.

⁴⁷ Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty Organization.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Officers were kept deliberately distant from other ranks. Mateship was actively discouraged, which is why many servicemen couldn't wait to get shot of the place. Those who saw worrying things were threatened with court martial if they spoke about them. Plainclothes intelligence officers, eavesdropping in the coffee shops of Adelaide, warned those on leave to keep their traps shut. **There was much spin**, too. Documentaries such as the Ministry of Supply's *Operation Hurricane* (1954) spoke about the bomb program as "another triumph for Britain." Press releases were issued even when their wording was starkly at odds with the facts. A small **handful of journalists were fed favourable stories**, but most were kept well clear of the whole operation.

The non-reporting of the dumping of radioactive sludge into urban sewerage systems was minor compared with the **organised silence** about the most bizarre experiments, such as Operation Lighthouse, details of which are described in a **top-secret** document unearthed only two years ago in a garden shed in Perth. Conceived in early October 1958, it was a British plan to place around 800 troops, upwind from four different nuclear explosions. This was fantasy, luckily. Under pressure from test-ban negotiations in Geneva, the plan was dropped.

Other events that would today bring governments down went unreported. Maralinga, like all cutting-edge experiments in technical modernisation, was plagued by what are today called *normal accidents*. The huge nuclear plume that sheared off unexpectedly from the third Maralinga bomb was an example. Code-named Kite, it was a three-kiloton drop on the afternoon of 11 October 1958. Part of its strontium-90 cloud drifted out of control, southwards, over the sleeping city of Adelaide, with its population of 518,000. The only word on the matter reported in the media came from chief scientist professor E.W. Titterton. "Weather conditions were satisfactory for firing," he said, "and there was complete agreement between the Australian Safety Committee and the trials director. There is no danger of significant fall-out outside the immediate target area."

About 20,000 British and Australian servicemen participated in the tests at Maralinga. Tens of thousands more women and men (my father was among them) provided various services in support. Those who entered Maralinga knew little of the risks that awaited them there. The little bridge they crossed on the oleander-lined path leading from the airfield to the terminal was called the Bridge of Sighs. Last rites – a sigh of trepidation by those arriving; a sigh of relief by those departing – were often performed on that spot. Many still remember it well, but they now have different sighs, this time caused by the illnesses that cripple their bodies.

In Australia, the *Report of the Review of Veterans' Entitlements* has just been released. A victory for decency and common sense, the report acknowledges that what took place at Maralinga was historically unprecedented. Although noting that these were not combat conditions, it goes on to admit that there was indeed "potential" hazardous exposure of the veterans in general, and that no doubt many individuals were so exposed.

*The military,
the police,
murderers,
and the
State
have something
in common
– secrecy.*

It recommends that veterans be liberated from having to prove in a court of law that their service made them sick; henceforth, the state should have to prove that it did not expose its soldiers to unusual dangers. All Australian atomic test veterans who are ill with cancer, the review concludes, should be entitled as of right to a disability pension and to fast-track treatment through the state healthcare system for the remainder of their shortening lives.

Meanwhile, in Britain, the Blair Government continues a long habit of denial.⁴⁸ "There is no – I repeat, no – evidence that servicemen were exposed to radiation," Minister for Veterans, Dr. Lewis Mooney, said recently. "We've looked very carefully at their complaints. We don't think they're justified. **If disagreeing with them is callous, then so be it.**"

As the site where seven large bombs were exploded – from towers, by air drop and balloon – Maralinga enabled Britain's then prime minister Harold Macmillan to seize what he called "the great prize" that three prime ministers before him had striven for. Britain was finally in the nuclear club, just in the nick of time before the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty.

But if membership had its privileges, it also had its costs: Britain became hostage to the nuclear geopolitics of the Cold War, and more recently to the *nuclear anarchy* that now threatens the world. More than 40 states and untold numbers of non-state groups now potentially or actually have access to nuclear weapons. In other words, Britain's weapons of mass destruction have spawned; so much for deterrence. British defence secretary Geoff Hoon last year confirmed that he is: "absolutely confident, in the right conditions, we would be willing to use our nuclear weapons."

The Blair government is meanwhile spending £2 billion (**\$A5 billion**) *modernising* the atomic weapons establishment at Aldermaston, [southeast England] where nuclear warheads are designed. The Pentagon has flagged a forthcoming "nuclear posture review," a process that will undoubtedly have repercussions for its good-buddy allies Australia and Britain.

The technique of developing "low-yield," "tactical" or "battlefield" nuclear weapons – in effect, their miniaturisation – was first dreamt up at Maralinga in what were known as the "Minor Trials." In these experiments, the *accidents* and *dirty* effects that might be expected to follow the more flexible use of low-yield weapons were carefully recorded. These trials were top-secret. **Journalists and the public knew nothing of them.** The Australian Government grew nervous, but continued to play the tune it was paid to play.

The trials were not detectable by recording acoustic waves or radio or seismic signals, which was lucky because they were contrary to a memorandum of agreement: on 31 October 1958, at the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests in Geneva, the US and the UK began a one-year testing moratorium. The Soviet Union joined on 3 November [1958], after firing off its last bomb.

⁴⁸ As used here, the word denial means lying. If you would like to study a recent (2003) death around which there has been much official denial, study the David Kelly case. About that case, the British lawyer and physician Michael Powers: "has expressed scathing criticism of the lack of rigor of the Hutton enquiry, and asserted that the **officially stated cause of death was highly implausible.**" (wikipedia; 17 November 2012)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Documents cited by Lorna Arnold, official historian of the major minor [sic] trials, show that instructions were sent to Maralinga that "all firings involving radioactive materials must cease by midnight on October 31." The instructions were ignored. "We are changing the name," chief scientist Sir William Penney informed Britain's Foreign Office: "in order to prevent the possible interpretation that they are very small nuclear explosions." The minor trials thus became "assessment tests"; by late 1959 they had become "the Maralinga Experimental Program."

Under top-secret conditions, and bearing weird names like Kittens, Tims, Rats and Vixens, 550 experiments were carried out. Many servicemen were affected. "In 550 events," wrote Lorna Arnold, "1120 were exposed to radiation: no one received more than 5r (roentgens, a measurement of radioactivity), and only five of them exceeded 3r; for nearly 800, exposures were at or below the threshold of detection." (Arnold's report drew upon blood tests and Maralinga hospital records that have since been destroyed.)

The trials continued until May 1963, and **consumed several tonnes of uranium and more than 20 kilograms of plutonium**. They also vomited plumes of contamination across the desert landscape.

There were methods in the madness. Some of the experiments (the Kittens) were designed to develop and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of "initiators," the device within a nuclear weapon that produces a flood of neutrons that in turn sparks an almighty chain reaction within the fissile material. Anticipating the rise of mini-nukes technology now under consideration by the Bush⁴⁹ administration, the aim was to produce better (more controllable and cost-efficient) bangs. The experiments used advanced-level sensors and various lethal materials, including radioactive polonium, and the firings in the desert were said to be so "safe for certain" that at one point before Maralinga active consideration was given to an alternative site near Wick, in northern Scotland.

It's a good thing the Scots were spared. The initiator experiments were mixed up with another set of trials ("Tims" and "Rats") that were higher up the scale of recklessness. They involved detonating explosions inside the shells of mock nuclear weapons stuffed full of what has been described (by Lorna Arnold) as natural uranium that was "slightly radioactive" but "too low to be hazardous."

The purpose was to track (using sophisticated high-speed photography and gamma-ray detectors that took inside-out X-rays) both the shockwaves within the shells and the **subsequent scattering of uranium materials across the desert**.

But it was the Vixen minor trials that had the major long-term consequences. Later described as "safety experiments," they involved the controlled fooling around with nuclear materials under risky conditions. Nuclear weapons had to be both transportable and capable of being stockpiled, which implied some probability of accidental damage to warheads.

⁴⁹ War criminal, George W. Bush, 1946-; aka: *Dubya*.

BRITAIN TESTS NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN AUSTRALIA

[K]EEN to begin their testing program and lacking the complete confidence of the United States, Britain began to explore other venues for testing its new weaponry. The remoteness and sparse population of Australia made it an attractive alternative; sites considered by the British in the course of an initial geographic perusal included Groote Eylandt in the Gulf of Carpentaria, and an island in the Bass Strait off Tasmania.

In 1950, Labour prime minister Clement Atlee sent a **top secret personal message** to Australian prime minister Menzies asking if the Australian government might agree to the testing of a British nuclear weapon at the Monte Bello Islands off Western Australia. Menzies agreed in principle, immediately; there is no record of his having consulted any of his Cabinet colleagues on the matter. A preliminary assessment of the suitability of the proposed test site was conducted in October-November 1950.

The Monte Bello site was deemed suitable by British authorities and in a message to Menzies dated 26 March 1951 Atlee sought formal agreement to conduct the test. Atlee's letter did not discuss the nature of the proposed test in minute detail. He did, however, see fit to mention the risk of radiation hazards: "There is one further aspect which I should mention. The effect of exploding an atomic weapon in the Monte Bello Islands will be to contaminate with radio activity the north-east group and this contamination may spread to others of the islands. The area is not likely to be entirely free from contamination for about three years and we would hope for continuing Australian help in investigating the decay of contamination. During this time the area will be unsafe for human occupation or even for visits by e.g. pearl fishermen who, we understand, at present go there from time to time and suitable measures will need to be taken to keep them away. We should not like the Australian Government to take a decision on the matter without having this aspect of it in their minds."⁵⁰

Menzies was only too pleased to assist the *motherland*, but deferred a response until after the 1951 federal elections. With the return of his government, preparations for the test, code-named "Hurricane," proceeded. Yet it was not until 19 February 1952 that the Australian public was informed that atomic weapons were to be tested on Australian soil. On 3 October 1952 the British successfully detonated a nuclear device of about 25 kilotons in the Monte Bello Islands....

In December 1952, the new British prime minister, Churchill, asked Menzies for agreement in principle to a series of tests at Emu Field, some 1,200 kilometres northwest of Adelaide in the Great Victoria Desert. Menzies replied promptly, in the affirmative. On 15 October 1953, Totem I, a device with a yield of approximately 10 kilotons was detonated; two days later, Totem II was exploded with an approximate yield of 8 kilotons....

(cont.)

⁵⁰ Jim McClelland. *The Report of the Royal Commission into British Nuclear Tests in Australia*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service; 1985: p. 13.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Following the *Mosaic* tests in mid-1956, which involved the detonation of two weapons at the Monte Bello site, the British testing program in Australia was confined to the mainland. Four *Buffalo* tests were conducted at Maralinga in September and October 1956, and three *Antler* explosions were detonated there the following year.

Each of these explosions generated considerable radioactivity, by means of the initial nuclear reaction and the through dispersion of radioactive particulate colloquially known as *fallout*. **In addition to British scientific and military personnel, thousands of Australians were exposed to radiation produced by the tests.** These included not only those involved in supporting the British testing program, but also Aboriginal people living downwind of the test sites, and other Australians more distant who came into contact with airborne radioactivity....

As a result of the nearly 600 minor trials, some 830 tons of debris contaminated by about **20 kilograms of plutonium** were deposited in pits which graced the South Australian landscape. An additional **2 kilograms of plutonium** was dispersed over the area. Such an outcome was unfortunate indeed, as plutonium is one of the most toxic substances known; it dissipates more slowly than most radioactive elements. The half-life of plutonium is 24,000 years. At this rate of decay, **Maralinga lands would be contaminated for the next half-million years.**

Thus, Australia's hospitality, largesse and loyalty to Britain were not without their costs. Moreover, the sacrifices made by Australians on behalf of the *motherland* were not equally borne. Whilst low population density and remoteness from major population centres were among the criteria for the selection of the testing sites, the Emu and Maralinga sites in particular were not uninhabited. Indeed, they had been familiar to generations of Aboriginal Australians for thousands of years and had a great spiritual significance for the Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people....

A variety of factors underlay the harm to public health, Aboriginal culture and the natural environment which the British tests entailed. Perhaps most significant was **the secrecy surrounding the testing program.**

The decision to make the Monte Bello Islands available to the British for their first nuclear test appears to have been made by the prime minister alone, without reference to Cabinet, much less parliament or the Australian public. During the entire course of the testing program, **public debate on the costs and risks borne by the Australian public was discouraged through official secrecy, censorship, misinformation, and attempts to denigrate critics.**

P.N. Grabosky

Wayward governance:

Chapter 16 extracts – pp. 235-253

1989

(amended; added italics; added emphasis)

*Colonists who
invaded Australia
murdered
the original people
for their land,
which now has been
poisoned
by the making
of bombs to
murder
more people.*

The researchers wanted to know how and when they would catch fire, and what would happen when they did. Would radioactive and toxic materials remain mainly within the debris, or instead be carried downwind? How far? Providing answers to such questions was the preoccupation of the Vixen A trials.

The Vixen B trials fiddled around with the explosive materials within actual nuclear warheads. What would happen if something caused an explosion within the warhead during its manufacture, storage or transportation? Needless to say, answering this question by setting off explosions within a loaded warhead produced chain reactions – and the deliberate **scattering of dozens of plumes of plutonium debris across hundreds of kilometres of the desert.**

All this organised recklessness was quietly monitored by the Australian Weapons Tests Safety Committee (AWTSC). Being a pushover, it did nothing.

Half a century after the experiments at Maralinga began, and 40 years after they ended, the site still has not been cleaned up to the satisfaction of the key stakeholders, the Tjarutja people. There have been eight clean-up attempts, all of them botched or bungled. Among the first was Operation Brumby in 1967, a quick brooms-around-the-toilet-floor effort by British army engineers that scattered and left behind a great deal of radioactive material. The most recent [clean-up attempt] has just finished.

The Federal Government appointed Australian Construction Services (soon taken over by the firm Gutteridge Haskins and Davey) as project manager on the \$107 million contract to restore the site. According to Science Minister Peter McGauran, the company's work has been a resounding success. A recent report from the Maralinga Rehabilitation Technical Advisory Committee (MARTAC) talks of "world's-best practice."

Visitors to Maralinga are now greeted with striking images of burial trenches the size of the MCG [Melbourne Cricket Ground], five storeys deep, and of the modified street sweeper used to brush clean 50 acres of the limestone plain. Peter Burns, director of the Environmental Protection and Health branch of Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA), summed up the mood in Canberra by saying he'd now be happy to host a barbecue in what was once the Maralinga forward zone.

But not everyone is convinced. The present Maralinga site manager, Steve Sheppard, says he'd not go kicking a football around ground zero. Alan Parkinson, an experienced nuclear engineer who was the Government's representative responsible for overseeing the bulk of the clean-up, is most unhappy. He was stood down in 1998 after questioning the clean-up contract (which contained no clear statement of what had to be achieved) and disagreeing with the decision to abandon the vitrification method of clean-up, which would have melted nuclear rubbish, sand and rock safely in a hard, black, glass-like case designed to last well beyond the half-life of plutonium.⁵¹

⁵¹ Alan Parkinson was stood down. That is what States do to all those in their employ who rightfully ask troubling questions. They are: stood down; fired; transferred to horrible places; *etc.* And if they are in the military, critics and questioners can be imprisoned then tortured. (Note this is what the US military did to Bradley Manning.) States do not reveal the whole truth, or any truth if it is perceived to be dangerous. They just keep repeating the official narratives and denying anything is wrong.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The vitrification method was abandoned by MARTAC three-quarters of the way through the project, in favour of the much cheaper trench-method. Most of the waste – including broken-up vitrified material – was then buried in unlined pits covered with just three metres of clean soil. The rest was left on the desert surface. As a result, an area the size of *metropolitan* London – 300 square kilometres – **remains infected with lethal plutonium that will stay active for a quarter of a million years.**

The Maralinga area is Tjarutja land, or was before **it was snatched from them and poisoned.** It is likely that sometime this year the land will be formally offered back to them. But the Tjarutja have concerns of their own. The whole area, many of them say, is “mamu country” – a gravesite frequented by a lot of living-dead spirits that have the appearance of grotesquely shaped humans with long, sharp front teeth.

POISONED FOREVER



When Maralinga was first proposed for atomic weapons testing, chief scientist Sir William Penney described it as “a first-class site” that would present the British with “no difficulty in testing 20 or more weapons.” His colleague in the Commonwealth Ministry of Supply, A.S. Butement, agreed: “There is no need whatever for Aborigines to use any part of this country around the proposed area.”

In fact, the area was far from vacant. A labyrinth of criss-crossing dreamtime tracks connected the Tjarutja to their ancestors, their stories, their living community. The Tjarutja showed no signs of deprivation in an environment in which Europeans couldn’t last longer than a few days without help. Early Europeans who encountered them noted their nomadic qualities, their love of walking great distances through a magical garden of spirits, to meet relatives, to sample new food, to visit their favourite rock holes, to attend corroborees.

Little or none of this seems to have been understood by the bomb testers. Quizzed in depth at the 1984 Australian Royal Commission hearings about why aerial checks upon the movements of Aborigines had been carried out only every three or four days, Air Vice-Marshal *Paddy* Menaul, the Air Task Force Commander at Maralinga, replied: “They were not necessary to carry out every day. Aborigines do not travel 100 miles a day, I am afraid. They sleep most afternoons. If you had searched the area on Wednesday, you would not really expect to search it on Thursday.”⁵²

52 This Air Task Force Commander (whoopdeedoo) was doing his best to prop up the official narrative/lies. It seems that Stewart William Blacker Menaul, CB CBE DFC AFC CRAP, was a bomb-killer par excellence: “between 1936-1943 he served with Bomber Command Squadrons, including No 14 Squadron, 1941-1942. In 1943 he joined the Air Staff of No 3 Group but before the end of the year was posted to Pathfinder Force with which he served until 1945.... In 1954 he was attached to the US Nevada Nuclear test site and in 1955-1956 commanded the British nuclear tests at Monte Bello and Maralinga, in Australia. His last service postings were as Commanding Officer, Bombing School, Lindholme, 1957-1958, Air Staff Officer, Aden, 1959-1960, Senior Air Staff Officer Bomber Command, 1961-1965 and finally Commandant, Joint Services Staff College, 1965-1967.” (kcl.ac.uk) **Murdering innocent people** seems to have been in *Paddy’s* genes.

Menaul said "we never saw any" Aborigines in the area. But some servicemen did. **Two hundred of them were threatened with court martial or EXECUTION after taking photographs of an Aboriginal family they spotted camping in a radioactive crater.**

There were some conscience-driven civil servants in both Australia and Britain who reminded the Maralinga authorities to care for the welfare of the Aborigines, all the while worrying about what journalists might say if they got their hands on the story (they didn't). And there was a single patrol officer, Walter MacDougall, whose impossible job of monitoring the movements of the Aborigines and quarantining them in settlements, sometimes against their will, led him to conclude, in an unpublished letter, that this was "a first-class scandal. **We might as well declare war on them.**"⁵³

Despite claims to the contrary, Aboriginal people did wander through radiated lands. They camped in fresh craters, to keep warm and to trap rabbits blinded by cobalt pellets. When discovered, they were compulsorily showered, their fingernails scrubbed with soap. The women suffered miscarriages. They were herded in trucks or pushed onto trains, expelled from a sacred site at Ooldea, a day's walk from Maralinga airport. Alice Cox – at 87, the oldest survivor of the tests – recalls it well: "Soldiers everywhere. Guns. We all cry, cry, cryin'. Men, women and children, all afraid."

53 It does seem that Paddy – Air-Vice Marshal Menaul to lowly you – really had, for his Queen and her blood-streaked Union Jack, declared war on Blacks. He showed those *bastards* what bombs are all about – British nuclear bombs.

54 John Major was the British prime minister after *battle-axe* Thatcher. He agreed with bombing during the first modern war in the Persian Gulf (1991). It is unknown how many victims there were murdered by Britain. Here is just one example of killing at Fallujah: "The first bombing occurred early in the Gulf War. A British jet intending to bomb the bridge dropped two laser-guided bombs on the city's main market. Between **50 and 150 civilians died** and many more were injured." (wikipedia.org; 18 November 2012) All that killing during the 1st Gulf War, and the 2nd Gulf War, well it was all for the oil. This is what was reported about British Petroleum on guardian.co.uk; 31 July 2011: "BP has been accused of taking a 'stranglehold' on the Iraqi economy after the Baghdad government agreed to pay the British firm even when oil is not being produced by the Rumaila field, confidential documents reveal." So, there we have it. State murder in Iraq has led to big profits.

Australia, of course, **agreed to do Britain's dirty work.** Its troops suffered, felt humiliation, and died. Those injustices and defeats will not be forgotten, and the fact that it all seemed worthless, that **Australia got little or nothing out of the unequal relationship,** suggests that Maralinga is a second Gallipoli in Anglo-Australian relations.

The analogy stretches far, but it has one limit: this time a dogged people with immense patience, a people who are not interested in finding their identity in a medal, have the power to keep the Maralinga story alive – even to convince those who have wronged them to say sorry.

Dr Archie Barton, a senior member of the Tjarutja people, is a fine man of few words. Twenty years ago, he helped found a new and viable community called Oak Valley, 110 kilometres north-west of ground zero, as close as his people want to be. Ten years ago, he was part of a delegation that travelled to London to seek compensation from the government of John Major,⁵⁴ and to pop a carefully wrapped gift from Maralinga upon the table of a parliamentary committee: a little bag of plutonium soil.

Barton was taken from Maralinga and from his parents 60 years ago. Recently, he met John Howard. "What are you after?" the Prime Minister asked. "Not much," replied Barton. "I just want back my mother. I want back my land, too. Clean." ■

(amended; added emphasis)

AUSTRALIA'S AGENT ORANGE CRIME⁵⁵

Hamish Chitts⁵⁶

Article No. 34, Direct Action; August 2011

*I was affected by a bone tumour as a child,
and discovered that a disproportionate number
of children of Vietnam Veterans have
also been diagnosed with bone tumours.⁵⁷*

FIFTY years ago [1961] this month [August], the US began its spraying of Agent Orange and similar chemicals containing large amounts of deadly cancer-causing dioxin over southern Vietnam. **This murderous campaign lasted 10 years, poisoning uncounted Vietnamese civilians and liberation fighters and members of the US military and its allies.** Dioxin also attacks sperm or egg DNA, deforming victims' children and grandchildren.

Parts of southern Vietnam are still heavily contaminated with dioxin that continues to claim new victims. The US responsibility for devising and ordering this crime is well known. Less known is Australia's role in testing, producing, and spraying Agent Orange.

After 10 years of scouring the Australian War Memorial museum archives, one of the leading experts on the effects of chemicals on Australian veterans of the US war on Vietnam, Jean Williams,⁵⁸ found reports of **secret testing of Agent Orange**. Williams discovered that Australian military scientists had sprayed Agent Orange on rainforest in the catchment area of the town of Innisfail in far north Queensland between 1964 and 1966.

On 18 May 2008, Williams told Fairfax media that one of the files on the testing was marked "considered sensitive" and showed that the chemicals **2,4-D, Diquat, Tordon** and **dimethylsulphoxide** had been sprayed on the rainforest. "It was considered sensitive because they were mixing together all the bad chemicals, which just made them worse", she said. "Those chemicals stay in the soil for years, and every time there is a storm they are stirred up and go into the water supply."

Williams' revelations were backed by former soldier Ted Bosworth, who drove the scientists to the site in the 60s. "There was an English scientist and an Australian. I heard they both later died of cancer. They sprayed the trees by hand and then in the next couple of weeks I took them back up and they put ladders up against the trees and took photos of them as the foliage was dying," he said. "They called it some other funny name – I hadn't heard of Agent Orange then." Williams also said that a file that could indicate much wider testing

⁵⁵ This extremely toxic chemical was manufactured in Australia and it was test-sprayed in the mid 1960s near Innisfail in northern Queensland by the Australian army. John Pilger, the Australian award-winning journalist, writer, and documentary film maker said this about its use during the American-led war in Vietnam: "The use of Agent Orange in Vietnam was by any measure one of the great crimes of the twentieth century. In village after village, I have seen the result: young people born with terrible deformities."

⁵⁶ An Australian former soldier now anti-war activist.

⁵⁷ Statement by Kelly Manning, an artist of Melbourne, Victoria. She has exhibited paintings focusing on the effects of Agent Orange. See *A crime yesterday, an unfolding tragedy today*; agentorangejustice.org.au; 3 June 2012.

⁵⁸ Jean Williams was awarded the Order of Australia (AO) for her work on the crime of Agent Orange use. Of course military murderers denied her findings.

AUSTRALIA'S CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRITISH and Australian governments **used Australian volunteers as guinea pigs** in the test of British chemical weapons during and since the Second World War. Many received severe injuries. Reports of these tests are surfacing in the Australian press as an Australian Royal Commission begins hearings in Britain into British nuclear tests in the 1950s.

The British began testing lethal gasses in the wake of the First World War, even though both States were party to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the use of such weapons. During the Second World War, Australia became a storage base as well as a testing ground for lethal chemicals. Stocks of phosgene and mustard gas were stored at several sites in Queensland, including Miles, Helidon, and Darra and in the Northern Territory, 150 kilometres south of Darwin. But the main base was at an air force base at Lithgow near Sydney.

To test the effects of mustard gas in tropical conditions, four tonnes of the gas were dropped on Brook Islands off the coast of Queensland in 1944.⁵⁹ According to one of the aircrew involved, aircraft made four runs over the islands in April, dropping the gas from containers under their wings.

Volunteers were landed on the islands soon afterwards. Many of them soon developed severe blisters and burns. The effects were studied at a research institute in **nearby Innisfail**. The US later used these same facilities to test defoliants for use in the Pacific as the war drew to a close.

Australia also helped with the British-American research efforts during the war. A secret chemical and biological warfare research group, known as the Gorrill Team, was set up in 1942 at Melbourne University to look into the effects of nitrogen mustard. The results were passed to Britain and the US.

When the Second World War ended, stocks of chemical weapons were destroyed. Volunteers who worked on the disposal were rewarded with extra holidays. It was poor compensation. Many were injured, some reported effects that lasted 12 years.

After the war, Australian cooperation with Britain and the US continued. In 1948 Australia set up a *chemical and biological warfare committee* under the Department of Supply. It had, as one of its main terms of reference, "liaison with overseas counterparts."

As well as representatives of the army, navy and air force, the committee also had as a member the director of the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute in Melbourne, which had taken in many members of the Gorrill Team after the war. Other members included the director of the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories.

During the 1950s Australia, with its tropical testing facilities, became increasingly important to Britain, as it became embroiled in the conflict in Malaya, and to the US, as it was sucked into

(cont.)

⁵⁹ Actually a group of small islands located at c.100 kilometres south-south-east of Innisfail. The largest in the group is North Island.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

[American-led] wars in Korea and Vietnam. It was an Australian subsidiary of the British firm ICI (Wickham, Cooper, Nephews) which supplied the defoliant **Trioxone** (a mixture of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-D) which the British sprayed on Malaya (New Scientist; 19 January 1984: p. 6).

In 1963, Australia joined with Britain the US and Canada, in a formal agreement in technical cooperation in the research, development and testing of chemical and biological weapons. [In 1962], the Innisfail Institute in Queensland had become the Joint Tropical Research Unit, administered jointly by Britain and Australia.

By 1966, defoliants were being tested at Innisfail. One product was a laboratory report *Defoliation of Tropical Rainforest* in the Innisfail area. It was at this time that Australia sent troops to help the US in the Vietnam War.

The Quadripartite Agreement continues to act as the framework for close cooperation over chemical and biological weapons between the four countries. As well as the research unit at Innisfail, Australia has a Material Research Laboratory in Melbourne, with branches in Adelaide and elsewhere, which is involved in weapons research, development and testing. Recent work has included the synthesis of organophosphorous compounds and development of antidotes and nerve gases, analysis of CS gas, and the development of new irritant gases.

But most effort has been expended on an extremely unpleasant toxin extracted from the seawasp (box jellyfish) found in coastal waters of Australia. The toxin is being studied at the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories, which is looking for an antidote. A sting from the seawasp is usually fatal. The toxin is also the subject of a research project at Queensland University, being paid for by the US Navy.

Development of this toxin as a biological weapon would contravene the 1972 Biological Weapons Treaty – which bans offensive weapon research – and to which all members of the Quadripartite are party.

Judith Perera

Australia's chemical war tests

New Scientist

10 January 1985

(amended; added emphasis)

*The ultimate
function of
every military
is to
murder people
– acknowledge
this fact
and your outlook on
those killers
will change.*

*THIS editor was stunned and incensed when he read this revealing article. He was born and grew up in northern Queensland, not far from Innisfail. That this was going on there since the 1940s, and is, most probably, still going on, is **pure evil**. The average Australian has no idea that her/his taxes are being used to develop weapons to kill other human beings. Killing people is immoral. Given Australian politicians are willing to commit murder with biological and chemical weapons, then the shooting and wounding of a few dozen people at Port Arthur in Tasmania means nothing. Be it by biological, chemical, or ballistic methods (the MEANS), control of the populace (the END) is what evil politicians and their handlers seek. – ed.*

in a project called Operation Desert had gone missing from the archives. It was marked "**too disturbing to ever be released.**" To this day, the half-acre site at Gregory Falls remains deforested despite thick jungle surrounding it.

Innisfail Returned Services League president Reg Hamann told the *Herald Sun* on 28 May 2008, of the terrible effects he suffers from Agent Orange he was exposed to during the war. "A lot of my unit have died of cancer. I've got cancer of the oesophagus and stomach. I have to sleep on a special bed that raises me 17 degrees or everything in my stomach rises up. I've had a subdural haemorrhage, a heart attack and a quadruple bypass. It passes on to the next generation. My son was born with a deformed lung. My daughter has got the same skin problem I have from Agent Orange. Now my grandkids are going to get it."

Unknown to Hamann at the time, while he was being poisoned in Vietnam, the army was poisoning what would become his home town. "I believe it must have something to do with the high cancer rates in Innisfail. The amount of young people in this area who die of leukaemia and similar cancers to what I got from Agent Orange is scary. The authorities are scared of digging into it as there would be lots of lawsuits. The sad part is the number of kids who get cancer here. It's been that way at least since I came here in 1970. That means it can't be chemical spraying on the bananas as they only came here 15 years ago."

Queensland Health claimed in 2008 that Innisfail did not have an above average cancer rate, based on figures from 1991 to 2005. Locals counter this saying that in 2007 about **one person aged in their 40s was dying from cancer every month**, a high number for a small town. The age of these cancer victims would also make them babies at the time of the testing. When the story of the testing hit the media in 2008, the Queensland and federal governments both promised investigations. **To date no findings have been released.**⁶⁰

Between 1961 and 1971 the US and its allies sprayed and dumped around 80 million litres of Agent Orange and related chemicals on Vietnam. Demand for this poison was high, and **Australian chemical manufacturers helped meet the demand and got their share of the profits.**

Union Carbide (now owned by Dow Chemical) produced Agent Orange at Homebush in Sydney, leaving a terrible legacy. The factory is gone now, but in June 1997 Greenpeace investigations revealed an orphaned stockpile of thirty-six 200-litre drums and fifteen 50-litre drums of waste highly contaminated with dioxin next to Homebush Bay and the site of the 2000 Olympic Games.

Greenpeace sampling of fish from Homebush Bay found high levels of dioxin in the food chain. Two sea mullet were found to have levels of the most toxic form of dioxin, 2378 TCDD, 10-15 times higher than US and Canadian standards for concentrations in edible fish.

⁶⁰ Australians were lied to repeatedly about the American-led war in Vietnam. And for military personnel, those lies continued while they were there, and when they got home – if they got home.

AGENT ORANGE

AGENT Orange is the combination of the code names for Herbicide Orange (HO) and Agent LNX, one of the herbicides and defoliants used by the US military as part of its herbicidal warfare program, Operation Ranch Hand, during the Vietnam War from 1961-1971. Vietnam estimates **400,000 people were killed or maimed**, and **500,000 children born with birth defects** as a result of its use. Red Cross of Vietnam estimates that up to **1 million people are disabled or have health problems** due to Agent Orange.⁶¹

A 50:50 mixture of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D, it was manufactured for the US Department of Defense primarily by Monsanto Corporation and Dow Chemical. The 2,4,5-T used to produce Agent Orange was later found to be contaminated with 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-dioxin (TCDD), an extremely toxic dioxin compound. It was given its name from the color of the orange-striped 55 US gallon (208 litre) barrels in which it was shipped, and was by far the most widely used of the so-called "Rainbow Herbicides."

[B]etween 1962-1971, the US military sprayed about 20,000,000 US gallons (**76,000,000 litres**) of material containing chemical herbicides and defoliants mixed with jet fuel in Vietnam, eastern Laos and parts of Cambodia. The program's goal was to defoliate forested and rural land, depriving guerrillas of cover; another goal was to induce forced draft urbanization, destroying the ability of peasants to support themselves in the countryside, and forcing them to flee to the US dominated cities, thus depriving the guerrillas of their rural support base and food supply.

In 1965, 42 percent of all herbicide spraying was dedicated to **food crops**.... By 1971, **12 percent of South Vietnam** had been sprayed with defoliating chemicals, at an average concentration of 13 times the recommended USDA application rate for domestic use. In South Vietnam alone, an estimated 10 million hectares (25 million acres, 39 thousand square miles) of agricultural land were ultimately destroyed. In some areas TCDD concentrations in soil and water were **hundreds of times greater** than the levels considered *safe* by the US Environmental Protection Agency. Overall, more than 20 percent of South Vietnam's forests were sprayed at least once over a nine-year period.

Wikipedia

en.wikipedia.org

1 November 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

THE Sydney Morning Herald reported on 30 October 2010 that carcinogenic chemicals from the former Union Carbide factory are spreading throughout Sydney Harbour. According to government authorities, the contamination covers an area too large to be remediated, and the only answer is to wait until sediments cover the contaminated layer, so the poison cannot be absorbed by fish and small invertebrates. The high levels of dioxins in areas where fish feed mean that the official warnings not to eat fish caught west of the Harbour Bridge, and to eat only 150 grams a month of fish caught east of the bridge, will likely remain for decades. – ed.

⁶¹ Australia's defence department is guilty of poisoning people in Vietnam as well as people in northern Queensland. But military psychopaths are not upset by such things, so introducing depleted uranium (DU) was not anything they worried over. Australia's military killers deny Australia has DU munitions – believe them if you wish. Their so-called allies do and you will never hear any military person in Australia speaking out against the use of DU munitions: "Governments have often initially denied using DU **because of public health concerns**. It is now clear that DU was used on a large scale by the US and the UK in the Gulf War in 1991, then in Bosnia, Serbia and Kosovo, and again in the war in Iraq by the US and the UK in 2003. It is suspected that the US also used DU in Afghanistan in 2001, although both the US and UK governments have denied using it there. However, leaked transport documents suggest that US forces in Afghanistan have DU weapons. The continued use of A10 'Warthog' aircraft in support of NATO ground troops indicates that DU may be being used there." See bandepleteduranium.org; 17 November 2012. This is what Australia's Lynn Stanfield said about the film *Blowin' in the Wind*: "The cleverly produced documentary is a wake-up call to Australians, exposing the dreadful, horrible, inhuman use of ...Depleted Uranium (DU), as a projectile warhead, on all manner of arsenal and weaponry, being used to annihilate nations around the world. DU is the weapons material of choice for all of the guided missiles and Bunker-Buster, bombs being rained onto the Afghanistan and Iraqi citizens in the senseless, unlawful invasion of these Middle-East countries. Tank shells, heavy calibre machine guns, ship-to-shore rockets & heavy guns...producing a wasteland of radioactively contaminated earth, water and air.... So, not only the poor sods who are murdered by the blast or are left dismembered and crippled for the rest of their lives, suffering the effects of the blasted DU, those who survive are also affected. The contamination lingers in their food, drinking water and the air they breathe, **causing grotesque deformities and diseases**, especially in new-born children." (clubconspiracy.com; 11 February 2005)

*If you are an
Australian,
think about
Aussie Diggers
being sent to
invade another
country and
while there to
murder
more innocent
people
– in your name.*

Agent Orange was also produced in the outer Perth suburb of Kwinana by Chemical Industries Kwinana. The National Toxics Network noted in 2009 that quality control at the Perth factory was often poor, and “bad batches” were disposed of in pits on site and from time to time were burned. The open burning of these chemicals would have added to dioxin contamination. State government agencies have identified a plume of dioxin contamination beneath the site that has migrated to other nearby industrial sites.

The Nine MSN website reported on 12 December 2008, that Queensland’s Environmental Protection Agency had revealed the presence of dioxin in soil at an industrial site at Pinkenba, on the banks of a drain leading into the Brisbane River. Again the site was once a chemical factory that made Agent Orange in the 1960s and ’70s. Dow Chemical, a global producer of Agent Orange, is currently cleaning up dioxin contamination on some of its sites in Victoria.

The Australian government and the military leadership during the war were directly involved in the poisoning of Vietnam’s people and their environment. They ordered the widespread spraying of Agent Orange by Australian troops in Phuoc Tuy province, particularly around the Australian base at Nui Dat.

Royal Australian Air Force helicopters from No. 9 Squadron had spray booms attached for aerial spraying. Australian army trucks with spray rigs carried 300 gallon (about 1135 litres) tanks of Agent Orange. Soldiers were also assigned to spray by hand. Immediately the hand-spraying teams manifested **medical problems** including the breakdown of mucus membranes, ulceration of lips, profuse nose-bleeding and severe conjunctivitis. So what did the army do? Instead of stopping the spraying, it rotated the job through different units at the base.

There is also strong evidence that **the Australian military brass knew from the start at least some of the long-term effects of Agent Orange.** In an affidavit filed on 1 May 1980, Lt. Craig Steele (a hygiene officer in Vietnam) stated: “I had in my possession written guidelines on Agents Orange, Blue, and Hyvar. These guidelines carried the explicit warnings in bold print that **the misuse of these chemicals may result in sterility and/or congenital abnormalities in humans.**” These guidelines were in place from day one.

August 10 [2011] marks 50 years since Agent Orange was first sprayed by US forces in Vietnam. For the Vietnamese it will be a day of remembrance for those killed by Agent Orange as well as a day of action, rallying for all those **still suffering** in Vietnam today. In Australia, we can help these victims and our fellow workers in Vietnam by demanding that the **Australian government** take its share of responsibility for this war crime along with the **US government** and the **chemical companies that profited from it.** ■

(amended; added emphasis)

HILTON HOTEL BOMBING
Sydney, NSW, Australia

ultimate-research-assistant.com; 28 October 2012

*Many people, including policemen and army men,
believe ASIO and Special Branch were
the most likely to be responsible for the bombing.⁶²*

1. THE incident occurred on 13 February 1978, when a bomb exploded outside the Hilton Hotel in Sydney, NSW, Australia. At the time the hotel was the site of the first Commonwealth Heads of Government Regional Meeting (CHOGRM), a regional off-shoot of the biennial meetings of the heads of government from across the Commonwealth of Nations. Two garbage men [Alex Carter, William Favell] and one copper [Paul Birmistriw] were killed, with several others injured. (en.wikipedia.org)

2. Over the following 18 months, [prime minister Malcolm] Fraser's right-wing government, with Labor's support, used the Hilton bombing as the **pretext to carry through a far-reaching expansion in the powers and resources of the police and security apparatus.** The changes included vast surveillance powers for the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO), the formation of the Australian Federal Police (AFP), the creation of para-military units in state police forces and domestic Special Air Service (SAS) units in the Australian Defence Forces (ADF) and the establishment of Crisis Policy Centres to take control over parts of the country in times of [**alleged**] emergency. (www.wsws.org)

3. Shortly before the Ananda Marga Three⁶³ were released, when it was obvious that [Judge] Wood's inquiry would find that **they had been framed by NSW police,** (not for the Hilton bombing but for **another fabricated charge** which will become clear later in this summary), Tim Anderson was allowed out of jail occasionally to attend university classes. It was on such an occasion that I [Pip Wilson] met this quiet, apparently gentle and obviously highly intelligent man. (www.wilsonsalmanac.com/hilton.html)

4. It is open to any royal commissioner to take that analysis on board without the necessity for a long and expensive inquiry. The object of the inquiry will be to ascertain the truth, which can be ascertained in a short time. The inquiry should be restricted to one or two points. First, is there any credible evidence that a member of the security forces – Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, the New South Wales Special Branch, the military, police force or other agencies – was in any way responsible for or had prior knowledge of the Hilton bombing? Second, why were sniffer dogs not used

⁶² See *Behind the Hilton Bombing*; members.tripod.com.

⁶³ Hindu-based religious movement, founded in India in 1955, in which followers involve themselves with a contemporary form of tantric yoga. Alleged to have been involved with a number of terrorist attacks in the 1970s.

*To ensure the
production and
placement of the
Hilton Hotel
bomb*

*did not become
public knowledge,
officials made
the unbelievable
claim that
forensic tests
did not produce
any results.*

and why was the fatal bin neither checked nor emptied? Third, why was the material found at the University of New South Wales and suspected of being connected to the bombing not used at the 1982 inquest, and why were parts of it later destroyed? Fourth, were all matters properly investigated or was there any evidence of negligence or irresponsibility in the security precautions at the time of the CHOGRM conference? (forum.prisonplanet.com)

AFTERMATH OF OFFICIAL BOMB



Hilton Hotel, Sydney, NSW 13 Feb 1978.

5. Someone very high up in the security forces decided that the political police could rescue their position with a publicity stunt. A bomb was going to be found in a rubbish bin outside the CHOGRM conference at the Hilton Hotel. It was to be planted Saturday morning before the heads of state arrived. It would be discovered after a warning phone call on Monday [13 February 1978] morning. The press was to be alerted too. A blaze of pro-political police publicity would follow. All that had to be done was to keep people away from the garbage bin. (members.iimetro.com.au)

6. As things stand, anyone who studies the case with an open mind is likely to conclude that **powerful elements in the Australian Security services, at the time of the Hilton bombings and for years afterwards, conspired (perhaps with outside parties) to carry out the bombings and pervert the course of justice** thereafter. In modern parlance, the Sydney Hilton bombings were most likely an **inside job** of some type. That's important. Way too important to gloss over. (SydWalker.info)

7. Despite a 1994 conclusion by the ASIO watchdog – the inspector-general of intelligence and security, Roger Holdich – that the security agency was “genuinely shocked” by the Hilton bombing, having “received no clear warning” from its infiltration of Ananda Marga or phone tapping, **the investigatory roles of ASIO and the then NSW Police special branch into the bombing have been questioned.** (www.smh.com.au)

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS NO ANSWERS

[T]HE question of who carried out the Hilton bombing [on 13 February 1978] remains unresolved to this day. Twice, the police and spy agencies **framed-up and jailed people** accused of involvement in the explosion, only to have those frame-ups fall apart. Then came a series of judicial and political cover-ups designed to prevent any serious probing of the Hilton affair. A careful review of the evidence, the unanswered questions and the political background points to the crime having been committed by the security agencies themselves. [the MEANS]

In the lead-up to the blast, police and security officials inexplicably prevented council garbage trucks from emptying the bin. It appears that Favell and Carter arrived ahead of schedule, just after 12:30, and proceeded to pick up the bin before the police could intervene.

Other unanswered questions include: Why did the agencies responsible for CHOGRM security – ASIO, the Commonwealth Police, the ADF and the NSW state police – fail to detect the explosive material earlier? Why were established security protocols, which require the searching of rubbish bins, breached? Why were military sniffer dogs, whose services were previously requested, not used?

In 1982, **a coronial inquest into the Hilton deaths was shut down⁶⁴** after Seary testified once more. His evidence was used to lay murder charges against the trio (requiring the coroner to terminate the inquest)... All the charges were dropped two years later, but the inquest was **never re-opened**.

Three weeks after the explosion, an ASIO Bill was introduced into federal parliament.... [T]he legislation authorised ASIO to intercept mail and telecommunications, use bugging devices, and carry out searches and seizures. Disclosure of the identity of ASIO agents became a criminal offence. Within two months of the bombing, former British police chief Sir Robert Mark completed a report to the Fraser government calling for the establishment of the Australian Federal Police and the creation of police paramilitary units.... [the END] These measures, the greatest expansion of the powers and resources of the police-intelligence apparatus since World War II, helped lay the foundations for the even more draconian police-state provisions introduced since 2001 on the **pretext of combating terrorism**.

[Q]uestions left by the Hilton affair, and the subsequent cover-up by the last federal Labor government, underscore the necessity of opposing the **deep assault on civil liberties and basic democratic rights** being carried out in the name of the fraudulent "war on terror."

Mike Head

30 years since Sydney's Hilton Hotel bombing: the unanswered questions

wsws.org

13 February 2008

(amended; added emphasis)

⁶⁴ Australian journalist and lawyer Tom Molomby asked this related and pointed question: "It is timely to ask – though the media have not done so – what is going on? How is it that an inquest can be terminated, and enormous prejudicial publicity generated against three people on the basis of evidence which the police themselves clearly regard as worthless? It is not surprising that no answer to this has been provided, but it is profoundly disturbing that the Australian media are not interested in the question." See Prison Planet Forum: *The 1978 Sydney Hilton Bombing – Official Story*. **The inquest into the Port Arthur case was also stopped**. This is how the State covers up its involvement in a crime. See the article *WAS MARTIN BRYANT FRAMED?* at Part 5, especially the *LETTER OF MATTERSON – BRYANT NOT GUILTY* Insert.

8. Five months later three members of Ananda Marga, Ross Dunn, Tim Anderson, and Paul Alister were in jail charged with conspiracy to blow up a Neo-Nazi group leader, Robert Cameron. In court, [police informant John Richard] Seary also claimed they confessed to doing the Hilton bombing. Although **never charged** with the Hilton bombing, they were convicted of the Cameron charge and sentenced to **16 years without parole**. (members.tripod.com)

9. Terry Griffiths, a policeman injured in the bombing, later claimed he had been told by other police it was **an event staged by people within various Australian security forces**. The bomb was to have been "found" by police in a sweep of the area, but the garbage truck arrived unexpectedly. (articles.cnn.com)

10. "A member of the Special Branch who had come there sees me in a room as he's walking past and comes back and says 'Terry Griffiths, victim of the Hilton bombing?' I said yeah. He said, 'I've got something to tell you,' and he told me that **the person who made the bomb warning phone call was a member of the Special Branch**. He was in a motor vehicle in George Street with other security force members'." (www.greenleft.org.au)

11. At 12:40 a.m. [00:40] on February 13, 1978, a bomb exploded outside the Hilton Hotel on George Street in Sydney, Australia. The explosion occurred during a prime ministers' conference attended by 12 prime ministers of Asian and Pacific British Commonwealth countries. All were staying at the hotel. The bomb had been placed in a trash bin in front of the hotel and exploded after it was emptied into a trash truck. **It killed two trash collectors and a policeman who was standing in front of the hotel. It also injured 11 others.** (victimsofthestate.org)

12. Although it had known sporadic acts through its history, and examples of modern terrorism for almost a decade, Australia did not introduce terrorism specific laws into Parliament until the late 1970s. In 1977, after a three-year inquiry into Australia's intelligence services, [Judge] Robert Hope delivered his Royal Commission on Intelligence and Security (RCIS) [report]. The RCIS recommended amongst other things that the **Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO) areas of investigation be widened** to include terrorism. A further Protective Security Review by [Judge] Hope in 1978 following the Sydney Hilton bombing designated ASIO as the government agency responsible for producing national threat assessments in the field of terrorism and politically motivated violence. (en.wikipedia.org)

13. The Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO)⁶⁵ is Australia's national security service, which is responsible for the protection of the country and its citizens from espionage, sabotage, acts of foreign interference, politically-motivated violence, attacks on the Australian defence system, and terrorism. (en.wikipedia.org) ■

(amended; added emphasis)

⁶⁵ Significant parts and true facts in this case point in the direction of a premeditated, planned, inside-job by some person/group in the Australian intelligence community. A bomb was acquired (either produced in-house or obtained from outside), then placed (either by officials or someone outside) near the hotel with or without the consent of the most senior intelligence official. No person was ever convicted of a criminal act related to this crime, and the only benefit from it flowed to the so-called intelligence community.

DISQUIET

Paul Tapp

Orford, TAS: pta06217@bigpond.net.au; 2007

*...based on interview by the author or by formal affidavit,
tendered as evidence to the 1992 inquest into the death
[State murder] of Joseph Gilewicz.⁶⁶*

TASMANIAN police are still in the diplomatic dark-ages and have made little progress in humility since early the previous century when the force was made up of convicts drilled in the style of the often brutal Royal Irish Constabulary, and let loose as Field Officers, against runaway convicts, bushrangers and aborigines⁶⁷ in a colony which was regarded as no more than a large gaol anyway. (pp. 51, 52)

Renshaw's next radio transmission adds to his dilemma. Gilewicz has come outside. Renshaw hears Joe bellowing his anger, with fear-borne clarity. I then heard a loud voice yelling: "I'm coming hunting and none of you cunts are going to stop me!"⁶⁸ (p. 159)

Joe Gilewicz is down.⁶⁹ The impact of the bullet which **has destroyed his heart, his liver and smashed his ribs from his sternum** has, according to testimony, also [allegedly] catapulted the man off the balcony. His shotgun [allegedly] flails across the balcony rail and falls to the ground, breaks and separates. A spent cartridge [allegedly] within its breech, will testify to Joe's [allegedly] sinister intentions ...and [allegedly] his clumsy finale to a momentous all-night siege at Pelverata.⁷⁰ (p. 184)

Still perched on the balcony rail, miraculously surviving the violent moment, a half-empty beer stubby [bottle]. Struggling below it [allegedly], a mortally wounded Joe Gilewicz. He is heavily-clothed against the winter's bite. His face presses into the mud below his balcony. His hands, protected from the cold by thick motorcycle mittens are tucked below him. Joe Gilewicz may have in his final moments been stupid enough to [allegedly] have brought on a shoot-out with a **misfiring single-barrel shotgun** with motorcycle gloves. But give him his dues – he's a tough bastard. He has no heart, no liver, perforated lungs, a smashed rib cage and he's [allegedly] doing his best to get back up. (p. 184)

Some 60 metres away, one man is on his back. Blood has drained from his face and he has been rendered speechless by the shock of the reality. He has inflicted a mortal wound on a fellow human being. He has dispatched a soul to eternity. But is it more than shock? Has sniper Michael Colin Fogarty⁷¹ taken some pellets from Gilewicz' shotgun?⁷² (p. 184)

⁶⁶ Paul Tapp. *Disquiet*; 2007: p. 3. In the foothills of Tasmania's Mount Wellington, Vietnam vet Joe Gilewicz (GILLAVITCH) was killed at his home on 16 July 1991 by the Special Operations Group (SOG) of Tasmania Police. The official version of the incident was – *he shot at us, we shot back*. But it was **a lie** conspired to by SOG members. The cop responsible for the ballistic investigation, Stan Hanuszewicz* (HANSA.VITCH), arrived at the crime scene. SOGs expected him to cover up the killing. He relented to peer pressure, but being a moral man he took a stand. Hanuszewicz blew the whistle for his *brother Joe* – for Truth and Justice. (* sometimes spelt Hanuszcewicz)

⁶⁷ In his book *A Land Half Won*; 1980: p.75, the Australian historian Geoffrey Blainey writes that by 1830 the original people of Tasmania were near extinction: "Disease had killed most of them but warfare and private violence had also been devastating."

⁶⁸ There is no proof Gilewicz said the word cunts. Similar language was put into the mouth of Bryant by the official responsible for the preparation of the transcript of the negotiation tape(s) recorded when Terry McCarthy was speaking with one of the *Jamies* at Seascape. In that transcript, *Jamie* allegedly says: "I don't wana use a firearm I want jus use this cuntin' knife." (*sic*) Innocent people are easily demonized by such (alleged) language. **Decent people are fooled into feeling revulsion.**

⁶⁹ Tuesday, 16 July 1991.

⁷⁰ A small region (pop. c.300) 33 kilometres southwest of Hobart.

⁷¹ Remember the name Fogarty.

⁷² Fogarty had blood spots on his jacket. Hanuszewicz (wrongly) concluded Fogarty had been shot. That blood was most probably from Joe Gilewicz. It means Fogarty was very close to Joe when he killed him.

It is as though the sniper's single round is a signal to begin the final act of a well-rehearsed scenario. The SOG⁷³ team springs into immediate reaction. (p. 184)

[Inspector Tony] Priest appears to be surprised at the lack of blood present, for he will testify that: "There was very little bleeding associated with the wound." Perhaps he [Priest] may have been told that Joe was trying to get up, indicating that with such a massive wound to his vital organs, that indeed, large quantities of blood might be expected to be expended as the valiant and defiant heart pumped to give Joe the strength to get up and continue the fight. Priest, of course, does not know that Joe's heart was **virtually blown away**,⁷⁴ and perhaps not pumping. No blood on the ground. No blood on Joe's face. Perhaps Joe died in the instant that the hollow-point [bullet] fragmented inside his chest. But, no, he has [allegedly] made three attempts to get up. In fact he was [allegedly] warned three times not to get up. In fact after it was determined by [Mick] Dyson⁷⁵ that he was dead, Joe's body was handcuffed and [allegedly] pulled away, to doubly ensure that he could not get up. (pp. 196-197)

And so, Priest makes further observations at the scene, so as to ensure that the inevitable inquest is given all the facts: "I also observed a single-barrelled 12-gauge shotgun, with the breech open and an expanded (*sic*; Tapp) cartridge therein, laying on the porch." And so the gun is **on the porch**. Not near the porch on the ground as testified by all SOG officers, but on the porch...Priest will testify. And yet this major observation by the SOG commander at the scene...will not be an issue in the forthcoming inquest. (p. 197)

The siege is Tasmanian Ambulance Service report file number S128/525. Clinical instructor, Michael McCall, is the Tasmanian SOGs' permanent ambulance officer when required. He has attended other SOG incidents. But this one has kept him up the longest. He's been on the job since his pager was activated at 20:45 p.m. the previous evening. He arrived at the SOG Holding Area at the junction of Halls Track Road and Vince's Saddle Road at 12:30 p.m. The Command Post is the SOG truck and he remained in it all night. About an hour after his arrival he heard a shot. No one else heard it. He also heard a volley of shots, up to six, between 6 and 6:30 a.m. **No one else heard them.**⁷⁶ (p. 198)

Bill Eldridge, [who lives] on the hill, tells police that there may have been shots, but he did doze off, although he was up all night, ready to flee with his wife. McCall did not hear the five shots between 7 and 7:30 a.m. **All SOG officers at the siege site heard them.**⁷⁷ Bill Eldridge went outside at 7:20 a.m. to look down into the valley to see if police cars were still about. But it was too dark to see anything in the thickly-wooded, steeply-hilled valley. (p. 198)

But he did hear a single shot down at Joe's. And it wasn't a shotgun. More a high-powered rifle. Eldridge is a country man. He knows his guns. Any country kid can differentiate between the two. Only Bill Eldridge heard that shot. He had heard a lot of shots the night before and two in the morning: "The shots fired between 6 p.m.-10 p.m.

73 Special Operations Group, Tasmania Police - preceded by Armed Offender Squad. (At times it might have been difficult to say who really were the offenders - the cops or the crims.)

74 Don't believe for one second the police lie that Joe Gilewicz attempted to get up - several times. He died instantly from a bullet fired by a **killer cop**. Euphemistically, officials like to call these cops *marksmen* - it helps to stop them and the public from thinking about what they do: **kill people**.

75 Remember the name Dyson.

76 McCall was very close by and he had no need to lie. No SOG member would have admitted hearing those shots.

77 Of course to bolster their lies, all the SOG members heard the shots they said were fired by Gilewicz the night before. All the SOGs said one thing or the other - it just depended on what suited their corrupt stories. And they all would have said it was the local residents who had hearing problems.

COP SHOOTING COVER-UP

A new investigation into the police shooting of Joe Gilewicz in 1991 has been ordered by the Tasmanian government, after new evidence and allegations of a police cover-up were presented in the manuscript of a forthcoming book.... The book, by former journalist Paul Tapp, is based on extensive examination of the evidence and on allegations by former ballistics expert Stan Hanuszewicz. Hanuszewicz told *Green Left Weekly* that a royal commission was needed and that the inquiry by the director of public prosecutions is not enough.... The shooting took place after a siege at Gilewicz' house on 16 July 1991. Police claim Gilewicz threatened police... that he fired a rifle and a shotgun at police who killed him in self-defence. Hanuszewicz was called to the scene to investigate, but found **no evidence** Gilewicz fired a rifle or shotgun. Hanuszewicz also told *Green Left Weekly* that, based on the evidence he found, it was unlikely Gilewicz had been holding the rifle. Hanuszewicz also claims he was asked by a superior to **falsify evidence**.... Following Gilewicz' death, there was a coronial inquiry...which found that the slaying was justified but unnecessary. Hanuszewicz said the inquest was a **cover-up**.... He maintains that the large number of inconsistencies, violations of police procedure and other suspicious aspects can be explained only by describing the investigation as a **cover-up**. These included: inconsistencies in the affidavits taken during the investigation; the absence of any evidence that Gilewicz had fired a gun and other examples of forensic evidence contradicting official police claims; the violation of "basic crime scene procedures"; and the exclusion of Hanuszewicz and other independent witnesses from the autopsy, which was conducted **in secret**. Former ALP parliamentarian John White...says that community concern remains and that "any way you view those facts, something is wrong" in that police killed Gilewicz at his home while there was no hostage. The Police Association of Tasmania said a further inquiry into the incident is unnecessary since it has already been investigated.... Hanuszewicz told *Green Left Weekly*: If they're stressed about what comes out, so be it. They are the ones who perjured themselves in court." Hanuszewicz believes the reasons for the cover-up involve **police connection with drugs**.⁷⁸ Gilewicz was a drug grower. Hanuszewicz claims that Gilewicz had been threatened by police and had told his wife and others "something is going to happen to me" prior his shooting. Hanuszewicz has called for a royal commission into **police corruption in Tasmania**. He reiterated a call he had previously made for a national register of corrupt police. The register should include police who have been found guilty of criminal offences and been sacked, or police who have resigned after corruption allegations are raised against them, he argued. At the moment, police found guilty of corruption sometimes get jobs in the police forces of other states, other areas of the criminal justice system, or as security guards.

Alex Bainbridge
greenleft.org.au
24 Nov 1999

(amended; added emphasis)

78 Wherever there are drugs, there is money. Wherever there is money, there are criminal cops who want it. It's that simple. Corrupt cops bust drug growers, dealers, makers, shippers, etc. to steal their merchandise (which is then used or sold), and to take their cash (which is not traceable and is tax free). This is the way it is. Never wonder where some cop got all his money from to pay for his fancy new car, and new house, and big-label clothes. No cop in on the action ever wants to see drugs decriminalized. For every big drug raid recorded by the media for public show purposes (*Hey, look what we did.*), there are uncountable numbers of kick-backs, rip-offs, shake-downs, and pay-offs. Read the literature on cops and drugs. Nothing has corrupted cops and courts and possibly entire countries more than making drugs illegal. The money involved is staggering. It creates dynamics which draw in players regardless of what laws exist.

the previous evening were from a **heavy calibre automatic rifle**. The shots I heard in the morning sounded as if they were also from a heavy calibre rifle. To me all the shots sounded the same. **I don't believe I heard a .22 or shotgun shots.** (p. 198)

It is now 7:55 a.m. A single shot is fired from the Gilewicz residence. Bill Eldridge hears it. Michael McCall hears it. Reacts to it. Launceston SOG officers Morrison and Crowling escort McCall immediately to the scene, driving past three SOG officers at the bottom of a drive. One is Michael Fogarty, looking pale, suffering from shock, **with blood on his jacket.**⁷⁹ McCall is driven straight to the house. He sees the mortally wounded Gilewicz in what others will describe as a foetal position. (p. 199)

And so it is reasonable to ask if the ambulance officer saw the cuffs go on at all. Did he see them go on? Or were they on when he arrived. But no, Joe was in a foetal with his hands beneath his body. They couldn't have been put on then. Not in that position. They couldn't have been put on before the search, because it appears as though Joe is being searched while still in the foetal position. And it's a quick search too. **McCall doesn't recall seeing shotgun cartridges and keys fall from Joe's jacket either.** Doesn't see anybody pick them up either. (pp. 199-200)

But the handcuffs aren't really handcuffs. Not the shiny chromium easy to use, quick-as-a-flash snap-on "gotcha" cuffs. They're only ties. Plastic ties. As good as the real thing. Light to carry. Mandatory SOG equipment. Perfect for SOG rapid entry, surprise, **kick in the door**, gotcha stuff. Ties take a little longer to put on. And would you see these inconspicuous, thin, strips of plastic, that must have been very awkward to apply with a man with large motorcycle mittens on. So when were they applied? (p. 200)

McCall thinks it's significant enough to mention in his formal under-oath testimony, but simply cannot recall seeing them put on. If...it was a quick search, would the handcuffing segment of the search be noticeable. Were Joe's hands together when he was pulled onto his back. Is that when McCall sees the hands tied? (p. 200)

But no, others [all SOG personnel] will testify that they were applied by Dyson before he searches Joe's body. And no, to suggest that the hands are tied prior to Joe being turned over from the foetal position, would raise the dreadful and fearful spectre of **Joe being handcuffed before he was shot.** And that just does not fit in with the official police version of the Gilewicz siege. It just doesn't fit in with corroborated police statements. (p. 200)

But it might explain a hypothesis **boot mark on the back door.** Police photographers will soon take a photo of it, but it will never be explained as a vital part of evidence in an inquest.⁸⁰ As an aside it will be speculated that Joe booted in his own door, as part of his [allegedly] psychotic rampage. **But Joe is wearing Blundstones and the boot-mark does not have a Blundstone tread pattern.** (p. 200)

⁷⁹ It was the blood of **murdered** Joe Gilewicz.

⁸⁰ At a coronial inquest, cops can pick and choose what evidence gets presented – or concocted. There is no law stating every bit of evidence must be presented to the coroner. In fact, no coroner wants to see all the evidence as her/his function is to shut down the case thereby ensuring there will be no trial. Good coroners do not launch trials, they prevent them. Truth and Justice are **not** core concerns of a coroner.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The cyanosed condition of Joe's body, as noted by McCall, is to become an issue with the inquest. It will be contended that the body **should not be cyanosed so soon after death** – several minutes. For the Gilewicz family, lawyer David Porter will suggest that Gilewicz has died much earlier and the cyanosed condition of the body will be proof. But the coroner will accept the view of two witnesses. (p. 201)

Dr. Brain, who performed the autopsy on Gilewicz will also respond likewise, when asked by Porter if cyanosis could be expected on a body which had been dead for five minutes. Dr. Brain will respond that the best way to check time of death is to take core temperatures of the body. But this was not done by McCall, because Gilewicz had too many clothes on. Dr. Brain will generalise and suggest that the blueness can even occur on live bodies.... But Dr. Brain too will contend that apart from general observations of the effects of the cold on living people, it would be expected that in the case of death that cyanosis would be expected to occur after **30 minutes or more from the time of death**. (p. 202; added emphasis)

But at no time during the inquest with either Mr Porter, Dr. Brain, Mr. McCall, or even the Coroner, Mr. Matterson, consider that Joe was alive and trying to get up only a few moments prior to being examined by the ambulance officer. And so the question of a cyanosed Joe Gilewicz, actively trudging the bush [recall the police alleged Gilewicz said he was going hunting] only moments before being shot, may be a more contentious factor at the inquest, if all the factors had been taken into account. (p. 202)

The Gilewicz incident in the context of the death of a citizen at the hands of police is being viewed as a major crime scene. That is the way it has to be. Any police officer who is at Ploverata, reprehensible as it may seem to the police, are, in the eyes of the Law, deemed to be under suspicion. One man is dead. Not accidental. Not suicide. Homicide. **Shot and killed by a police officer** sworn to keep the democratic peace. And so the people will want to know. What happened? Why it happened? Where it happened? How it happened? When it happened? (p. 203)

There will be an official police account of the incident. This must synchronise with the scientific evidence. The ballistics, forensic and medical facts. In the eyes of the law, police witnesses have no privileged standing over a public witness.⁸¹ But in the case of Joe Gilewicz **there are no public witnesses to his killing**. (p. 203)

Detective senior constable Raffaele Gaetano Di Monda, a police officer for 15 years, arrives at the death scene at 9 a.m. He is the rostered exhibits officer, the keeper of the menu of justice, the Major Incidents Exhibit Register Index. It is Di Monda's job to ensure that all the exhibits of the shooting are noted and placed before the people's court, the inquest.⁸² This index in fact is a factsheet.⁸³ It is an assembly of circumstances, for where witnesses may lie, circumstances cannot.⁸⁴ It would be reasonable for the public to believe that a crime scene is taped off to prevent any interference with evidence. And reasonable to believe that a crime scene may

⁸¹ This is the theoretical position – the position pushed by officials – but it is not reality. The following has been declared by Portia Trust: “The police service is well aware of these constraints placed on the defence, and exploits that knowledge to the full. It is very easy for an investigating officer to take a suspect and a set of circumstances and fit those circumstances around the suspect. It is much more difficult to be faced with a crime and find the person who definitely did it, without there being any doubt. This is the heart of all miscarriages of justice and police corruption.... The defence has enormous difficulty in disproving what [a suspect] is alleged to have said to [a] police officer. **Courts usually believe the police version of events....**” (for additional details see: Keith Allan Noble. *FIND! FALCONIO – Dead or Alive*; 2012: p. 290)

⁸² Given his life and professional experience, the author Paul Tapp used “people's court” facetiously. In cases where the manner of death is accidental or suicidal, coroners can and probably most often do arrive at reasonable and helpful decisions. But in all questionable death cases, no legal system wants its coroner to push for expensive and resource-hungry trials which can backfire on the State. Coroners, commissioners, and any other person or party appointed by any State to conduct any form of investigation are gatekeepers whose (real but never-acknowledged) role is to stop further legal action.

⁸³ Note that a fact is not necessarily a truth. A factsheet is just paper listing what cops want listed on it.

⁸⁴ That circumstances cannot lie is only true when those circumstances have occurred without any human involvement. Note the interpretation/description of any circumstance can be inaccurate and inaccuracies can arise advertently or inadvertently.

be compared to a game of chess. The game dictates its own agenda. It has no allegiance to time. It is not the case at Pelverata.⁸⁵ Di Monda arrives 30 minutes before his colleague Stan Hanuszewicz from the ballistics section. Hanuszewicz is having a longer-than-normal wait for transport and by the time he gets to his crime scene it will seem as though the fact-finding mission has already started. (pp. 203-204)

There are so many exhibits to be noted that many helpers have come to Di Monda's aid, to locate and help him add to his factsheet. Even Senior Sergeant Gyselman, the man appointed to be in charge of the investigation, lends a hand. He finds the first item to be recorded: Exhibit description – small plastic bag of cannabis; Where located – below stairs of front door⁸⁶; By whom – S/S Gyselman; Date – 16/7/91; Exhibit number – 1. (p. 204)

⁸⁵ A reading of all the text on this point strongly suggests Hanuszewicz was deliberately delayed to ensure so-called evidence could be attended to at Pelverata. More bluntly, corrupt cops delayed Hanuszewicz so other corrupt cops could set up evidence to make it appear Joe Gilewicz had pinned down those brave SOGs with a high-powered rifle.

⁸⁶ Do you really believe Joe Gilewicz, who was a grower of marijuana, kept a small plastic bag of cannabis outside in the rain and dew below the front steps? But of course the judge would have believed it because it was noted on the factsheet as being found out there by none other than senior sergeant Gyselman – and, *everyone knows cops never lie*.

⁸⁷ Here, author Paul Tapp makes the point that the cops want all of us to believe Joe Gilewicz had pinned down the SOGs with his high-powered SKS rifle. But then, at some time during the siege, Gilewicz took that rifle and placed it in his shed and went back to the siege with his **old, misfiring, single-barrel shotgun**. Well reader, if you believe that then you will believe anything. Everything described by Tapp suggests the SKS rifle was deliberately planted in the shed belonging to Gilewicz by some SOG member – before the delayed Hanuszewicz arrived at the scene – so it would become evidence supporting the concocted story that Joe Gilewicz was dangerous, that he had been firing at the SOG with a high-powered rifle, and that he had to be shot in self-defence.

At the end of the day of the shooting, a total of 47 exhibits will be found and recorded and will be presented as evidence to the inquest. Eleven police officers will have their names etched into police history, as contributors to the exhibit sheet, which **will not synchronise with the testimonies of some police officers**. Item number 5, located by...First Class Constable Huxley, is the single-barrel shotgun, the Boito that Gilewicz has allegedly fired at police [SOG] officers, pinning them down. Di Monda records that it is found lying near the body of the deceased: Exhibit description – 1 x single barrel shotgun; Where located – **lying beside deceased**; By whom – 1/C Huxley; Date 16/7/91; Exhibit number 5. But when Hanuszewicz arrives and draws a diagram of the layout of the crime scene, he notes **the gun is well away from the body**. (p. 204)

And so in the very early stages of the site examination, the exhibits sheet and sworn police testimony are falling out of sync. Not just with the location of the gun, but also the location of the body. Hanuszewicz will study and sketch the body *in situ* at the southern end of the landing, with the gun near the steps at the northern end of the landing. Di Monda will become flustered at the inquest, because he has the gun and the body together – but near the steps. But it is what he recalls as seeing when he first arrives, and not necessarily what was formally photographed, or noted on the Exhibits Register. **Because what he saw and what was recorded are not one and the same**. (p. 205; added italics)

And then they [allegedly] find an automatic weapon.... It is presumed that this is the same SKS that [allegedly] the SOGs have seen Joe with in the doorway in the early hours of the morning. The same SKS that has filled the SOG with fear.... It is presumed [by naive people] that it is the same SKS that Joe is believed to have had in his possession, just a few minutes before he is shot. The SKS being [allegedly] found in the jumbled shed, and protected from the damp by newspapers, **is not to be an issue in the forthcoming inquest**. It is perhaps naturally assumed that Joe Gilewicz at some stage just prior to his being shot, somehow, while pinning down the SOG team with a single-barrel malfunctioning shotgun, **had returned the SKS to the shed**.⁸⁷ (pp. 211, 212)

POLICE CORRUPTION
Cops, Drugs, Laws

■ THE WAR ON DRUGS has a powerful corrupting influence on police forces across the country because police officers know that they can rob drug dealers with impunity. No dealers or buyers are going to report a police officer stealing from them because they know that they themselves will be arrested. The corruption of police officers begins gradually with the officers finding rationalizations for stealing the drug money. Then the corruption is perpetuated by the **code of silence**, an unwritten rule that prohibits police officers from informing on one another's misconduct. As long as the War of Drugs continues, honest and innocent young officers will be **transformed into corrupt gangsters**.

Joseph D. McNamara

Police corruption is fueled by the war on drugs
Police Corruption; 2003: pp. 33-37
McNamara then had 35 years police experience
(added emphasis)

■ DRUG-RELATED corruption differs from other types of police corruption. Drug-related corruption includes officers stealing drugs or money from drug dealers, selling drugs, or lying under oath about illegal searches. Officers involved in this type of corruption are actively committing crimes, as opposed to other types of police corruption where the police are either protecting criminals or ignoring their behavior. Several factors are consistently associated with drug-related police corruption: the police culture, characterized by a **code of silence**; the maturity and education levels of the police officers; ineffective management that does little to promote integrity or supervise officers; opportunity to commit corruption; inadequate training; police brutality; and personal ties to an officer's neighborhood. **The primary motive for drug-related police corruption is money**, although other factors such as the police culture and ineffective supervision are also identified.

Richard M. Stana

Drug-related police corruption differs from other forms of police corruption
Police Corruption; 2003: pp. 38-52
Stana then director of justice issues, US General Accounting
(added emphasis)

*It seems
the real reason
Joe Gilewicz
was executed
is because
he refused to pay
Ronald Jarvis,
said to have been
a bag-man
for corrupt cops
in Tasmania.*

*THOUGH these two authors are from the United States, what they declare is entirely applicable to Australia. As McNamara and Stana reveal, the impetus for cops to become involved with drugs is money. The sums can be substantial and in most cases are untraceable. Money and greed are universal human weaknesses. It does not matter in what country police operate, the temptation – big money – is too great for many (most?) cops to resist. The result of this is the corrupting of police. Criminalizing suppliers and users has not solved and can never solve national or local drug problems. Until drugs are seen as a health issue and are decriminalized, the inevitable and on-going today **corruption of cops in Australia will continue**. – ed.*

⁸⁸ Medical people who know about such things concurred with instant death. Not some slow death which allowed Gilewicz to try and get up – **three times** according to the SOGs. Not a slow death which would cause the SOGs to have fear Gilewicz would reload his **misfiring single-barrel shotgun** and pin down the SOGs yet again. But it wasn't an instant death to the SOGs because they all said Gilewicz was trying to get up – **after his heart was blown away** – so for everyone's safety, he just had to be handcuffed then dragged away from his old Boito shotgun, then.....

⁸⁹ This is what ex-cop Michael W. Quinn states, in *Walking With The Devil*; 2005: p. xii, about this behaviour: "The [police] Code of Silence is about lies and deception." And on p. 26, he adds: "The Code is based on lies and deception, it eats away at the honor and integrity of the cops who use it, it destroys the trust people have in cops, and it frustrates the community-policing efforts in our neighborhood." The silence of the Tasmania Police SOGs who were at Peverata when **Joe Gilewicz was murdered**, condemned them all in a way far louder than any physical evidence could have. (But of course the Tasmania Police SOGs had the last laugh. **None of them was charged, tried, and convicted**. No doubt they still say Joe Gilewicz was the problem, that he really deserved to have his heart blown away – *'cause we're the SOG, the Sons of God.*)

⁹⁰ Ssssh. Don't say anything about this case. Don't mention anything about the victim Wilkinson. Or about the highly-armed squad of offenders from Tasmania Police who sent him to his maker one day at quiet little Scottsdale (pop. c.2,500) located c.50 kilometres north-east of Launceston. You see, the killing of Wilkinson has **been covered up – it's not official**. And the government did repair the house that the cops blasted to bits. If you're a journalist, ask Tasmania Police about that killing.

Hanuszewicz is incredulous that Sergeant Gyselman, the man appointed to take charge of the crime scene, is permitting so much activity. Standing orders for crime scene management and examination have been totally abandoned. Hanusezewicz begins his task. Notebook at the ready, he moves to the body to make observations and take measurements. He is curious. Joe's eyes are open, staring beyond the sky to eternity. Indicative of instant death. Or so, Stan's intuition tells him. So convinced that the man's death is instant, that Stan will over the next few days undertake his own covert investigation. He will ask his contacts in the medical profession. Pathologists. They all concur. A high probability of instant death.⁸⁸ (p. 217)

If death has been instant, then what is the body doing so far from the balcony? Instant death. Gravity claims the body. If he was shot on the balcony, the body should be on the balcony. And the gun. Broken, as though its user was in an act of reloading. And the gun. So far away from the body. The gun should be with the body. Perhaps even clasped in the hands of the victim. *What's the gun doing open. What's it doing over here?* It is a reasonable question to ask of your mates, who normally lend a conjectural hand. Stan gets no answers. He asks again. As though struck dumb, there are no answers. Just a wall of silence.⁸⁹ (p. 217)

"If the body fell from the balcony, what's it doing over here?" Stan is really thinking aloud. He is mild-mannered, easy-going. And it's a reasonable question for a ballistics officer to ask at a crime scene. But this time there is an answer. It's unexpected – *"That's for you to fucking find out,"* the detective replies smirking. (pp. 217, 218)

His colleagues have never seen it before. The unknown quantity is letting itself be known. Beneath the conservative shirt, there's a big "S" on the chest of the mild-mannered Stan. He's cracked a shitty. How would it look for the ballistics officer to walk off the job? How would that look in a formal report on the first SOG killing of a citizen? **The first official killing of a citizen, for a citizen was killed by the SOG at Scottsdale in the State's north,**⁹⁰ but that's another story. (p. 218; original italics)

And so Stan gets on with it. Stan and his colleagues are standing over the body of the suspect. They confer, as usual, as to what the requirements of the ballistics officer are. But there is a detectable estrangement between he and they. An atmosphere. Stilted conversation. Mind games. And he goes about his work amidst what the ballistics officer now believes to be a purposeful rabble of police officers, some very senior, **trampling potential evidence into the morning Peverata mud**. And as he works, Stan Hanuszewicz knows that he is a man alone. (p. 218)

The Gilewicz property is littered with spent cases. Mainly high-calibre .222. There are hundreds.... Mostly old ones from *hippy shoots*. They punctuate Joe's untidy nature. They are of little interest to the ballistics officer. But he notes the position of shotgun cartridges. All Winchester Super Range, number-four shot. (p. 218; original italics)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

He searches the yard, collecting empty shotgun cases that look freshly fired. He looks for 7.62 mm cases that may have been fired from a military weapon, to corroborate anecdotal evidence that a powerful weapon was fired repeatedly the previous night. He finds none. But there are many empty shotgun cases. And some unfired cartridges. As he picks them and places them in plastic bags, he notes their position in his notebook. (pp. 218, 219)

His search of the yard is completed. Next he will collect evidence from the out-buildings. The back shed. "One 7.62 mm SKS rifle. Empty magazine." Stan notes that the weapon has been fired, but in his opinion, **not on the day of the siege**. It [the SKS rifle seemingly planted there by corrupt cops wanting to set up Gilewicz] plays no significant part in the incident in the ballistics officer's mind. (p. 219)


Hanuszewicz is incredulous at what is happening inside the house. He cannot believe it. It is the antithesis of all known ballistics gathering procedure. Hanuszewicz has hundreds of filled notebooks which reflect the tragedy of mankind's inability to be at peace with himself. Suicides and murder sites have a common graphic mental image to a ballistics officer, when he arrives on the scene. The black and white police tape, which screams "keep out, this site is being investigated." He has not seen it since his arrival here. Not even the sniper's position, where cars have driven through, and where shortly after, the media will gather, to view the house with powerful long-range lenses. To Stan Hanuszewicz, **the site is being contaminated**. It has not been sealed off. The scene which must be preserved is not being treated as an official crime-scene site. But a crime is being committed on the site. The crime of non-professionalism. Perhaps too, **the crime of conspiracy to pervert the course of justice**. To Stan Hanuszewicz, it is blatant and unbelievable. (pp. 219, 220)

Why are there so many people in the house trampling potential evidence? Why have detectives handed Stan weapons found inside the house? Several twenty-two calibre weapons are handed to him. "Found in the bedroom, Stan." Why are they doing this? Stan doesn't want help. He wants evidence. There's no rush. The crime site isn't going to be swept away in the next high tide.... It is reasonable to wonder why such a scene is occurring. Stan Hanuszewicz has his beliefs. It happens a lot. **They are searching for money**. Drug money. Gilewicz has a legendary reputation as a drug dealer. He cohabits with drug dealers. He is a suspected associate of Ronald Jarvis. Known police nark. Drug dealer. Joe is a suspected associate of Stephen Standage, suspected drug-dealer. It is also suspected that Jarvis has links with Tasmanian police officers. That Jarvis is the **bag-man**, the courier, for several police officers. (p. 225)

Stan Hanuszewicz has left Pelverata and is back in the ballistics office. His mind has put the whole Gilewicz matter into perspective. Given the extraordinary actions of his colleagues on his arrival at the death scene...the guided tour of the evidence; the blatant corruption of the scientific points; the suggestions; the attitudes; the overall atmosphere of silence and intimidation; the expectation of compliance; the planting of evidence – Stan is of two minds (p. 242)

PART 3 State Killing

DISQUIET



bookfinder.com

91 Situated c.80 kilometres west of Canberra, the national capital.

92 Andrew Barton Paterson (1864-1941; nicknamed *Banjo*), the famous Australian poet and journalist.

93 "Inside Seascapes cottage at the siege, there were three participants: **1.** Martin Bryant – *acting out a role & not firing a shot*; **2.** The shooter, who on exiting was wearing Auscam camouflage fatigues, and who was spirited away from Seascapes in the passenger seat of the Tasmanian ambulance, which transported Martin Bryant, suffering category #1 burns to the Royal Hobart Hospital burns unit; and **3.** Michael Dyson, who in 1995 was posted from the SOG to a Tasmania Police special section which involved him directly in, '**counter terrorist exercises.**' This, Dyson has told us, saw him involved in the development of the violent incident management plan (or VIMP), activated at Port Arthur. When promoted to this more strategic level, he became involved in the overall command of violent incidents which, he bragged under oath, 'is my passion.' So is this the reason **why the name Michael Charles Dyson does not appear in any document pertaining to the Port Arthur massacre?** Also, there were only remains of two persons found inside the cottage – David and Sally Martin. As flames engulfed the upper floor, Acting-Sergeant Craig Harwood of Victoria Police, stated that he observed a person 'suddenly appear from the south western corner of the cottage...dressed in blue jeans, a blue jumper and a red, white and blue striped shirt or similar...[with] long blonde hair and no weapons.' This was Martin Bryant. But, one of the other two participants was captured on video by Nine Network's television crew (who'd breached the police cordon) and were filming the siege from the eastern shore of Long Bay opposite Seascapes, when a person exited from the NE corner of the fiery cottage, wearing black apparel. It had to be **Michael Charles Dyson** (aka *Mick* or *Rick*). Or was it the shooter? And almost surely one and the same person observed by Timothy Michael James of Victoria Police. James said the person 'fired several rounds from what appeared to be a handgun.' It was never recovered. **(cont. over)**

ANOTHER STATE MURDER

IN February 2001, or 10 years after Joe Gilewicz was shot dead by police [SOG in Tasmania], an incident occurred which in many instances, emulated that sad affair. Near Tumut⁹¹ in NSW, 90 State Protection Group (SPG) police were flown in from up to 400 kilometres away to besiege the humble abode of a 57-year-old bushie, James *Hank* Hallinan. Region commander Eric Gollan oversaw this unwarranted force assembled to besiege Hank for 33 hours, in his bush hut and caravan where he had lived quietly for eight years. At one stage, SPG incendiary devices ignited a bush-fire that threatened the district. But before the light had begun to fade, and on the afternoon of February 24, 2001, clutching his .22 pea-rifle, and drenched in tear-gas powder, Jimmy Hallinan was deliberately shot in the neck and killed, **on the second attempt**, while he stood, shaking with fear inside his simple home. Among the gum trees in the countryside of Adjungbilly – near Kiley's Run of *Banjo* Paterson⁹² fame. This callous shooting so angered the district's entire community, to protect the State's *sacred cow* and escape the local fury, authorities moved the inquest 178km away, to Temora in March 2002. Hank's family was then forced to travel, daily, for eight weeks, the two and a half hour journey morning and night. In this instance, retired court judge Jim Staples was quoted as saying, "no order was given to drop the gun (a .22 bolt-action rifle)." Instead an SPG sniper was simply ordered to, "shoot the offender." Jim Staples was further reported as stating **the Hallinan Inquest was a farce**, "I have no doubt Mr. Hallinan was killed in a manner that constitutes an indictable offence," he said. At Pelverata, and witnessed by the police SOGs Renshaw, Johnstone, Caulfield, and Dyson,⁹³ Sgt. Nigel Paul ordered Gilewicz twice, to "drop the weapon" – but the required *drill* – "or we will shoot" **does not appear** in the Gilewicz Inquiry transcript: like Hank, Joe was shot dead. The Hallinan coronial inquest for NSW was, "...only the third to be held before a jury, and heard evidence from 74 witnesses." But acting on instructions from the bench, as could only be expected, the jury found the police marksman acted in accordance with the "execution of his duty." That was an irresponsible decision: Hank Hallinan's death had all to do with the police 6 p.m. deadline, and little to do with the two shots discharged allegedly toward police, so Hank died at 6:03 p.m. Like Joe Gilewicz, Hank did not die as a result of sticking his finger in an electric jug! Both were shot dead quite deliberately, each by a trained marksman of the State. This outcome flies in the face of the popularly held myth that the State's ultimate morality is directed towards *preservation of life and for the safety of all its citizens*. Joe Gilewicz, **the people at Seascapes**, and James Hallinan all attest to that notion being a deception. In the case of James Hallinan, we are expected to believe it all came about because, "he spoke impolitely to a policeman in the main street of Tumut?" – What baloney! So what parallels can be drawn between actions at Pelverata, Tumut, and Seascapes? At Port Arthur, 32 people had already been shot by the gunman.

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

He was also observed to retreat into Seascap. Two sober requests from uniformed police at the scene for permission to use lethal force against the gunman were flatly denied by the senior officer, who must have been sergeant Andrew M. Fogarty, then an SOG team leader, who inexplicably had already arrived from Hobart and was in close proximity. Permission was twice denied, as **"this must happen,"**⁹⁴ even although the blond-headed gunman was pursuing the naked, screaming, hostage Sally Martin, about the yard of her home! Was it Sally Martin? If not Sally Martin, then who? When questions were raised by the media, Richard McCreadie defended what he presented as police protocols of long standing when he stated: "From time to time the question's been raised, well, why didn't police shoot Bryant? Well it's not our role, ah, to simply shoot. There are very strict rules of engagement." But, if shot dead, would the gunman at Seascap be proved embarrassingly **someone other than Martin Bryant?**... McCreadie's position was amplified by assistant commissioner Prins, who was reported in *The Mercury* at the time explaining: "Seriously speaking, we only shoot if our life is in immediate danger...the rules of engagement are clear, and we maintain that throughout the event. We don't assassinate people. That's not what we're about. We cannot be judge, jury, and executioner. We are accountable for our actions the same as everyone else, and if he had been shot by a police sniper **there would have been a coronial inquiry**⁹⁵ and we would have had to satisfy the coroner it was justifiable." **Not quite correct Mr. Prins!** Members of the constabulary are drawn from the public, obliged by solemn oath, to protect their community's people, not just their own life or that of their mates! However, these three events confirm a different reality. It is clear police are **not accountable** for their actions, "the same as everybody else," and at Port Arthur especially so! They deliberately denied Sally Martin a chance to live because, **"this must happen."** A police officer fired the incendiary device into the BMW, from which early media reports said **"a hostage was heard calling for help."** Why did it take police six hours to secure the Historic Site and offer anything approaching appropriate protection to the hundreds of traumatized people held there. **Also, why was an entire nation's people denied the coronial inquest required by law....** Returning to the Gilewicz killing, it is clear this incident remained of such a threat to the *status quo* in Tasmania, that no less than nine legal counsels exercised leave to appear for nine of the police called to account....

The Jasher Team

*Lies, Dignity, and Political Instruments
The Template for Terrorism at Port Arthur*
2012

(amended; added & original emphasis; added italics)

POLICE in Australia are trained killers protected by the State. They are over armed and under educated and kill people with impunity. Deaths in custody and deaths from beating, taser, etc. are not uncommon – see pages following. And never forget this, those cases are only the ones that the cops have not been able to keep covered up. – ed.

93 (cont.) All of which goes some way to explaining the importance of the statement exposed by the Police Training Video, with superintendent Bob Fielding, O.C. PFCP, Taranna, on 29th April 1996, stating: 'At the end of the day, I'm satisfied that we made the right decision in fact waiting and forcing him [the offender] to come to us as opposed to vice versa.' Please note: the body of a third deceased person at Seascap, that of kidnapped Glenn Pears, was **not** observed in the cottage ruins by the Coroner, Mr. Ian Matterson LL.B., but, the burnt out and bogged BMW used to transport Mr. Pears to Seascap in its luggage compartment, was removed off the site even before the media attended the precincts of Seascap after 9:00 hrs on Monday 29 April 1996." (The Jasher Team; amended; added emphasis)

94 This phrase is an absolute confirmation that what took place at Seascap cottage, and thus what took place before at Port Arthur Historic Site, were premeditated and planned acts – acts which officials wanted to occur: **THIS MUST HAPPEN!**

95 In Tasmania, **it is mandatory**, when a possible cause of death is fire, a Coronial Inquest must be held. But no such process was conducted, in line with the expressed wish of the prime minister, John Howard, who had no authority to overrule legislation of any Australian state or territory. Corruption associated with the shooting at Port Arthur went all the way to the top.

Joe has either been shot accidentally...or **he has been executed**. The SOG has either fucked up and has attempted a cover-up. Or worse. The very worst. **He has been murdered**. Already, soon after his arrival back at Headquarters, where the incident is on many minds, the whispering has started. The words "put down" are being whispered in the hallways. **Joe has been put down**. But whatever it is being called, Stan is not going to be part of it. He feels a criminal. As a Catholic sinner. He will now act to cleanse himself. With the fixed eyes of the dead Joe Gilewicz stamped on his every thought, Stan set out to confess. To a balls-up. To a conspiracy to "put down" the troublesome Joe. To his part in that conspiracy. To the compliance. **To plant evidence**. (p. 242)

Stan's first stop is a senior officer. It is confirmation that the word is out: "Get out. Get out of the office." But he will try another superior. Good bloke. His door is always open and Stan walks into the office and fumbles through a confession: "Oh, **he should have been shot years ago**,"⁹⁶ he [the superior] says of Gilewicz. (pp. 242, 243)

Stan immediately recalls **the Scottsdale incident in which the SOG killed a man in a siege**. His house was wrecked by the SOG when it stormed the man's residence. But a deal was done. The public purse paid for the damage to the house and that was the end of the matter. But Stan will not deal his way out of the Gilewicz case. So far he has had three unlucky strikes at confessing the sin of **tampering with evidence**. He cannot find a senior policeman's ear to lodge his formal complaint and so he will try another track. He will confess to a lawyer and do it legally, formally. (p. 243)

It is therefore natural for Stan Hanuszewicz, in the early part of his working day on the first day after the death[/killing] of Joe Gilewicz, to conclude that the death of the citizen at the hands of the police has moved beyond the realms of suspicion and into the frightening arena of conspiracy. And it is now that Stan resolves to spend the rest of his life proving it. (p. 254)

At this point of the cross-examination Dr Brain will appear to exhibit the symptoms of a malady that Mr Porter will describe as "endemic amnesia"⁹⁷ in his address to the court where he will suggest SOG officer Michael Colin Fogarty *aka* Sierra Four, be indicted for **murdering Joseph Gilewicz**. (p. 258)

Dr Brain...has great trouble with his memory.... Joe Gilewicz has been on a mortuary slab less than 24 hours after his death before the commencement of the autopsy and it is reasonable for the public, through the coronial process to want to know many things about the death of a citizen at the hands of its police force. (p. 258)

Mr Porter will ask many questions pertinent to the satisfaction of the public interest. But alas, Dr Brain, suffers the malady of endemic amnesia and **to this day, the questions remain unanswered**. Satisfactory to the coroner, who will accept evidence for the police case,⁹⁸ but the answers will not satisfy the Gilewicz family or Stan Hanuszewicz. (p. 258)

⁹⁶ Kevin M. McConkey, Gail F. Huon, and Mark Frank state in their book *Practical Ethics in the Police Service*; 1996: p. 1: "The exceptionally strong unwritten code, that police must stick together at all times, encourages police to **cover up** the misconduct, even the **criminal activities**, of other officers." (added emphasis) This is exactly what the senior officer did by refusing to speak with Hanuszewicz. This inhuman senior officer spoke as if Joe Gilewicz was a rabid dog to be put down with a bullet.

⁹⁷ In a summary on liars and lying in *Dissecting Pinocchio*; 2008: p. 43, author Christopher Dillingham says: "I don't recall' and 'I don't know' are sentences Pinocchio uses to avoid commitment to a specific lie." That good Dr. Brain played the cover-up game and just couldn't remember. In the New Zealand related book, *Bain and Beyond*; 2000: p. 263, Colin Withnall states the following: "Former police officers, from one end of the country to the other, have confirmed that not only do practices such as suppression of evidence and, indeed, **its tailoring to fit the charge** go on, but these are an accepted and **expected part of the police culture**. Officers are expected to be loyal to other officers in the sense that **they will cover up for them and for the organisation**. I have spoken to former officers who have informed me that they left the force [farce] because their personal integrity would not allow them to co-operate in or condone such practices." (added emphasis)

⁹⁸ Never forget – all coroners work for the State **not the public** – even though they are all paid with public money. Coroners give allegiance to the State, **not** to Truth and Justice.

POLICE & TRUTH ILL-ASSORTED

■ THE general public go about their business unaware that the police officers they have so much faith in, regularly and routinely **abuse their powers**. The public perception is that the police get it right most of the time, and that any failure is merely a blip, a tragic mistake that does not happen often. **The truth is that police officers often get it wrong....**

■ Not all police officers are bad, they are not, that goes without saying, but the problem arises in that some believe that in order to achieve their objectives they often have to bend the law to get a result. Obviously, officers who adopt this approach do so from a very early stage and as their career progresses they tend to deal with cases of a more serious nature. **The corruption becomes more serious and the consequences for the victims of that corruption ever more devastating.**

■ Truth is **not** an essential part of an investigation. All the investigating officer is interested in is getting a conviction. His [Her] skill is measured by his [/her] superiors on the basis of results. In any investigation, the police have the **upper hand** from the outset. They have access to all the initial evidence either from witnesses or documents. They have access to vast resources, such as expert witnesses and manpower [workforce].

■ The defence, on the other hand, is constrained by receiving the evidence second hand from the police and only in documentary form. They have no access, prior to trial, of the police witnesses. What a witness says in a statement is all the defence gets, and from that, they have to try and establish the truth. **Statements taken from witnesses will only contain those points relevant to the police case.** The defence is also heavily constrained by the cost and resources they have available.

■ The police service is well aware of these constraints placed on the defence, and exploits that knowledge to the full. **It is very easy for an investigating officer to take a suspect and a set of circumstances and fit those circumstances around the suspect.** It is much more difficult to be faced with a crime and find the person who definitely did it, without there being any doubt. This is the heart of all miscarriages of justice and police corruption.... The defence has enormous difficulty in disproving what [a suspect] is alleged to have said to [a] police officer. Courts usually believe the police version of events....

■ The police service is given enormous powers and is, on the whole, unaccountable for its actions...odds are heavily weighted against those accused by the police and prosecuted by the state. The old maxim that you are *innocent until proven guilty*⁹⁹ is **entirely redundant in practice.**

ex-Police Officer (UK)
The Police and Corruption
portia.org
c.2000

(added & original emphasis; added italics)

⁹⁹ This is an old and hairy saying which is **highly misleading**. When cops initiate action against some person, they do it because they want the person to be prosecuted. When any case is picked up by a State prosecutor, he or she does not do it believing that person is innocent. Police and prosecutors act, and only act, when they want some individual to be officially declared guilty. In their statements, they say the person to be prosecuted should be punished because he/she is guilty. If the defendant can engage a clever and glib lawyer, he or she might elude the State's clutches. To legal officials of the State, every person sent to trial is guilty. These officials must believe this, otherwise they would not initiate legal charges. If they do not believe a person is guilty and go ahead with a prosecution regardless, they are corrupt. Such prosecutions are those of kangaroo courts and show trials: for example, the trial of Bradley Murdoch in the Northern Territory, 2005. (see *FIND! FALCONIO: Concealing Crimes in Northern Territory, Australia*; 2012)

There is no *Report for Pathologist* from the Tasmania Police, giving the circumstances of Joe's death.¹⁰⁰ (p. 259; original italics)

Perhaps Anna Semmens, Joe's sister, who visited the body of Joe in the mortuary just before it was handed over to the funeral parlour, could have satisfied the question of whether the material was mud or faeces or otherwise, for she left the mortuary with the clothing ...allegedly at the behest of a mortuary attendant who had a funny name like Milo. Anna left the mortuary with the plastic bag and in the company of Greg Buck, went straight to the Elizabeth Mall and went through Joe's clothes. For no scientific reason. For a sister reason. She wanted to touch Joe's clothing. As she had touched Joe on the slab caressing his pallid face.... (p. 262)

She described the clothes as clean, except for mud, a type of clay-like mud and lots of it. But only on the front, bottom part of his trouser legs. From his knees down. As though he had been dragged in an upright position through the mud on his knees. (p. 263)

Of course **this is not consistent with the police version** that Joe is rolled over and dragged a short distance from the balcony and Anna's recollection is only anecdotal and not to be considered as evidence...because she was never called to give evidence. And the clothing is never examined scientifically for evidence because it has been contaminated by Anna and [she] is told so, when police arrive at the house to pick up the clothing, within two hours of her being given it by the attendant at the mortuary. (p. 263)

And if, as stated by Stan Hanuszewicz, Nino [Mele] has given him the bullet fragments shortly after 8 a.m., on the Wednesday [17 July], it raises more questions as to when the autopsy really got underway.... But if ballistics officer Stan Hanuszewicz was handed the fragments by Mele at about 8 a.m. and after the post-mortem was completed, it raises questions as to when the post-mortem was in fact carried out. Either very early on that Wednesday, or sometime on the previous day. The day of the shooting. Was the pathologist also forgetful of this? Was he in fact summonsed to do an immediate post-mortem on Joe Gilewicz? In that case, would Joe Gilewicz' body have been put into deep freeze as Dr Brain will testify? (p. 263)

He will tell the inquest that because the body had been in deep freeze that it was not possible to take a core sample to determine Joe's body temperature, to improve the chances of guesstimating an accurate time of death. And time of death is a time-honoured way in most murder cases of providing vital evidence as to the how, why, when, what and why of a murder mystery. But not in Joe's case. The only evidence they have to assist them with Joe's death is the coolness of the skin, the cyanosis factor. Even so, Dr Brain's assessment raises major questions as to when Joe actually died. For he was examined [allegedly] by ambulance officer McCall within two minutes of being shot and found to be cool. **Yet Dyson and other SOG officers say that Joe is trying to get up when they reach his body**, which suggests that Joe is dead only moments before examination. (pp. 263-264)

¹⁰⁰ No *Report for Pathologist* from the Tasmania Police – **WHY?** The killing took place at Peverata, Tasmania, and Joseph Gilewicz was murdered by Tasmania Police SOG members. Study the alternate independent media as the mainstream media does not reveal the true story. (search youtube.com: *Police Violence in Australia & Police Violence*) for videos on criminal police. People (includes children & the handicapped) are being assaulted, bashed, electrocuted (tasered), pepper-sprayed, killed or injured by speeding cop cars, lied to, set up, shot, tortured, etc., every day. You deceive yourself if you think it does not happen. The only difference between cops and the mafia is that **you pay for the cops**. It is first-class foolishness to think elected officials control the cops – **they don't, they won't, they can't**. Cop unions spend millions of dollars protecting **corrupt members**. Police can kill someone in your family and all you will most probably get are insincere and meaningless words of regret. **Police are your enemies.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

And so, this fact-finding mission, the coroner's inquest, the grim prospect of **a big police lie is emerging** with the revelation that cyanosis is hardly present for at least 30 minutes after death. This puts Joe's death more at 7:20 a.m., rather than at 7:53 a.m. as testified by SOG officers present and senior officers in the Main Incident Room. (p. 264)

This manuscript was to play a pivotal role in the Government's decision to establish a Commission of Inquiry into the killing of Joe Gilewicz. Commissioner Dennis Mahoney found that two officers had lied to Coroner Ian Matterson¹⁰¹ in denying their trip to the range. Commissioner Mahoney's recommendation that the matter be further investigated with the possibility of charges being laid against the officers. Police conclude that there was insufficient evidence and the matter [was] never pursued. Commissioner Mahoney in October 2000 was to also direct the State Government to apologise to Hanuszewicz ...an apology yet to be forthcoming. (p. 269; original italics)

Acting is an impossible task for a soldier trained to spot bullshit on a starless night without a night scope. It's not working. Stan is obsessed with the conviction that his colleagues know that he is going to **blow the whistle**. The casual, methodical, humming Hanuszewicz is now nervous and awkward on the job. Preparing the Gilewicz material for the biggest coronial inquest in State history is a major undertaking. Not like any other. His notebook is his guide. (p. 273)

Forty-three exhibits in his notebook. So many unnecessary exhibits. Over the bloody top.¹⁰² So many spent cases. Twenty-twos. Shotgun. High-powered brass. Scores of the bastards, in plastic bags, cluttering his work-space like it was garbage collection day. And that's what most of it is. Garbage. Joe's house is going to look like a war zone. **The inquest is being prepared for a lie.** It's all bullshit. (p. 273)

Stan is now convinced that **Gilewicz did not fire a single shot**. No fresh spent cases. No wads. No tell-tale torn vegetation. Just old spent shotgun and brass shells, fired over a period of weeks. *Hippy shoots*. Tins. Whatever. But not police. Not police. Jesus Christ. Had they been pinned down, they'd have been bragging their heads off. Christ Stan has seen them doing it. Stan is a veteran of the special squad. Was with it in the early days. Then called the Armed Offender Squad. (p. 273; added italics)

What happened at Scottsdale? They stormed the house as a police negotiator was actually sitting on the steps with the offender. The poor bastard leapt back in the house like a terrified rabbit and that was that. They found his body within the rubble of rapid fire through the walls of the house. Jesus, even the [negotiator] Hosneg was lucky to stay alive. Five thousand bucks and nobody complains. (p. 274)

Stan is afraid for the people. He has seen it all before. The blood lust. The unknown that comes from unskilled in possession of an unlimited supply of the best weapons that money can buy.¹⁰³ Jesus Christ, what really happened to Joe Gilewicz? It goes over and over in Stan's head. The possible scenarios. (p. 274)

¹⁰¹ Remember the name Matterson.

¹⁰² The same thing was done in the case of Martin Bryant. A collection of exhibits that was ridiculously excessive, which were never presented at a trial, and which the cops never proved and could never prove were acquired by Bryant. It was garbage. But it sure looked impressive and it did fool the media and the public.

¹⁰³ German dramatist, poet, and scientist Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) warned us about such things as the Tasmania Police SOG: *There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action.*

Did they have him early? And threw their simulated grenades, their distraction grenades to go “crump” in the night? What really happened to Joe? The boot-mark on the door. Not explained. Circumstances cannot lie. Was Joe snapped into custody very early that night, while sleeping? Snapped into handcuffs. Was Joe mouthing off? Did he really take those phone calls all through the night? Was it Joe who took them? Who knows Joe’s voice?¹⁰⁴ His mother. His wife. His friends. But they weren’t there. Nobody was invited to the siege. **Just police.**¹⁰⁵ Stan’s mind is racing. For sure, **the official version is a lie.** It just didn’t happen the way they tell it. All this evidence is bullshit. It’s not evidence. It’s a prop for the play. (p. 275)

Did someone stand over Joe, as he knelt, handcuffed before them and give him the big one, at pointblank? For he has heard it twice now. Twice he has heard it, almost whispered in the ballistics room, where since the shooting, Stan is finding it impossible to act. The word is getting about. **“Put him down.”** The word came from up high. **“Put him down.”** (p. 275; original italics)

Hanuszewicz sighs a silent relief. It is frustrating that Priest won’t say the magic words, that they were looking for shot[gun pellets] to plant. But this is an equally important mission. It corroborates the scientific view that no “pinned down” shots were fired at the SOG. One times zero is zero. No pinned down shots. No soggies pinned down. No scared rabbits cowering. Just pork pies **running from their lies.** Just **one long lying stitch-up.** (p. 299)

No shotgun at the front door, therefore no SOG sniper down the lane-way, it all fits, just like that SOG boot at the back door. Gotcha Joe! Gotcha smart-arse! How many times has Stan played with the story. He is convinced that Joe was in custody. Did he give them lip? Mouthing off. Did a soggy lose it and **give Joe a close-up?** Safety-catch off and a fuck-up? How many men have died in wars like that? Whatever happened that night, the story has to be good. Okay boys gather ‘round. This is the story...we stick to it like shit to a blanket! There’ll be an inquest. **Here’s what you say. No! No! No! No!** (p. 299)

To a gallery as silent as the moon, the question is put about the piece of number four lead shot that the Hanuszewicz affidavit swears was found there by him ... and the answer is given, **“I put it there.”** (p. 317; original italics)

Stan Hanuszewicz is okay now. He is basking in the glory of the company of men and in the glory of **one man’s strength.** (p. 325) ■

(amended; added emphasis)

¹⁰⁴ The same argument has rightly been raised by Carleen Bryant, the mother of Martin Bryant. In her book *My Story*; 2010: p. 130, she states: “I later learned that whilst I was being questioned by the police, a man who had not spoken to Martin since he was 12 years old had ‘assisted’ the police by identifying my son’s voice during a telephone conversation between police negotiators and the Seascope cottage. This made no sense to me as **the man could not possibly know what Martin’s mature voice sounded like.**” (added emphasis)

¹⁰⁵ Police do not have to be amongst their own kind to kill people. They do it in broad daylight in front of millions of people who watch the killings on TV news. If you have the stomach for it, just google *unlawful killing by police*, then go on from there.

IMPORTANT Joe Gilewicz must not be confused with Joe Vialls, aka *Otho Jewell Vialls and Ari Ben-Menashe. The latter, now said to be deceased, once lived in Western Australia. With an abnormal long list of activities, qualifications, and reports on the Internet together with his names/aliases, his writing lacks credibility. Evidence strongly suggests that this Vialls was/is an evil professional deceiver. – ed.*

OFFICIAL BRUTALITY & KILLING
Bassi, Georgatos, Hope, Marrett, McKenna,
Morri, Morton-Thomas, Toohey, Wikipedia
25 December 2012

*THEY SAY ACCIDENT, WE SAY MURDER*¹⁰⁶

FORTY years ago, this editor was in South Australia where he worked briefly at a lonely servo on the horrible highway that crossed the Nullarbor: Ivy Tanks, long since abandoned. On a couple of occasions he spoke with the local copper from Penong, a couple of hours drive to the east. One of the problems cops had, he said, was *black-fellas* who got themselves to Penong and there got wasted on *piss* (beer) or whatever it was they drank there then. The cops couldn't stop it – but what they did, he said matter-of-factly, was put the stone-drunk ones in the back of the (Land) Rover, take them down to the (Great Australian) Bight, then drop 'em over the cliffs there in '68, he said. No IDs. No witnesses. No problems.

Surf the Internet. You'll find a heap of websites and videos on official brutality and death in Australia. Smiley fresh-faced 20-weeks trained cops turned out in that country today have limitless access to excess. Kids, Lebs, nutters, poofers, protestors, rag-heads, tourists, they do the lot. And all the while the corrupt State aids and abets them.

Here's an example. Eddie Murray, he liked playing footy (league) and having a few drinks. At the age of 21 and healthy, he thought it was time to hang himself in a New South Wales police cell where the cops put him. They couldn't allow a *disorderly drunk*, especially a Black one, in Wee Waa.¹⁰⁷ So he just tore up a blanket, fashioned a slip-knot, and, with his feet firmly on the ground, hung himself. Just like that. They had two commissions on it, plus an investigation (anti-discrimination board). It went on and on as it always does – evasively. Then, 16 years later, the truth surfaced: "Murray's body was exhumed and re-autopsied, revealing a previously undetected **smashed sternum**, and a forensic pathologist determined that the injury had **most likely occurred immediately prior to his death**. Despite this, the details of his death remain a mystery, and still no one has been officially implicated in his death."¹⁰⁸ So, do you think that maybe one of those White coppers in Wee Waa decided to give Eddie a good drop kick in the chest to shut him up? *Take this you....*

And if you think things must have improved since 1981 when Eddie was drop-kicked to death – sorry, accidentally hanged himself, you are seriously mistaken. It is worse – a whole lot worse. Cops in Australia are now heavily armed thugs, and you (who pay them) are their enemy. *Comply or Die* is their working credo. – **ed**.

¹⁰⁶ Protest saying/slogan used in Australia. Never forget, it is the State that has the ultimate word on what killing is murder. Cops kill and never do time for it. The following is from Dennis Mahoney. *Report of the commission of inquiry into the death of Joseph Gilewicz*; 2000: p. 2: "It is not possible now to know whether he intended to shoot at the police officer [Michael Fogarty]. If he did not, his **death was a tragic accident**. But no-one knows whether that is so." (added emphasis) That Tasmania Police SOG sniper intentionally blew out Joe's heart, and it was all just a *tragic accident* Mahoney said. If you have no sense of morality you could believe that.

¹⁰⁷ Wee Waa is a small (pop. c.2000) rural town and area in north-eastern New South Wales.

¹⁰⁸ Eddie Murray. en.wikipedia.org; 24 December 2012. So ask yourself this: How could Murray's death have been properly investigated when the person who conducted the 1st post-mortem (autopsy) **failed to detect a bloody smashed sternum?** HOW! The sternum (breast bone) is right up front, but whoever performed the post-mortem was **not** up front with the truth. You see, this is one of the jobs of coroners all of whom are employees of the State. They are to conduct inquests which cover up crimes of the State. And was the person who allegedly conducted the post-mortem a real qualified forensic pathologist, or just some corrupt local physician making some extra cash on the side? Was there a proper post-mortem? Or was it just a quick-look-over-and-get-the-body-in-the-box job? Sssssh....

**AUSTRALIA'S POLICE & MILITARY
MUST NOT BE THE SAME**

THE establishment of paramilitary units in state police forces during the late 1970s has blurred the lines between the police and the military. These paramilitary units...train with the military, include former members of the military, use a wide range of military weapons and equipment, and train and use **extremely high levels of force**. In short, the units straddle the line between the two organisations. Groups like the SOG were originally set up as counter terrorist groups and it was on this basis that their special training and equipment were justified. Despite this the SOG, and its counterparts in other states, has been used in a wide and increasing range of traditional policing duties.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS GROUP – TASMANIA

FOUNDED	1978, preceded by Armed Offender Squad
ALLEGED ROLE	counter-terrorism & law enforcement
ALLEGED SIZE	30 members
MOTTO (official)	Blessed are the Peacemakers
MOTTO (unofficial)	Sons of God (judge, jury, & executioners)
ANSWERS TO	never to taxpayers who pay them
CRIMES (official)	1991 Pelterata – Joe Gilewicz 1996 Tasman Peninsula – Martin Bryant

The blurring of the military and police functions is of great significance. Philosophically police are duty bound to protect life and to operate using only minimum force. The military, on the other hand, are **trained to kill** and may use maximum force to overcome an enemy. In addition, paramilitary police, unlike the military proper, are operationally independent from the government. Police command, rather than an elected government, decides where and when this *military* force will be used.

The paramilitary units are considered elite by other police and so provide role models for police, who are culturally predisposed to admire macho action-oriented methods of policing. In Victoria, the police hierarchy has greatly encouraged and facilitated the passing on of paramilitary tactics to other police by placing former SOG members in charge of firearms and public order training, and arranging regular secondments to other policing areas where further opportunities arise for paramilitary methods to be taught and operationalised. In addition, the SOG has been used as a testing ground for new weapons, which are subsequently absorbed into everyday policing. Many of the most controversial and problematic policing incidents in Victoria since the early 1980s – **fatal shootings, forced entry raids, mass strip searches of nightclub patrons, pressure point neck holds and the batoning of peaceful protestors** – are directly linked to the SOG or its influence over operational tactics.

Jude McCulloch¹⁰⁹
onlineopinion.com.au
15 May 2001
(added emphasis)

¹⁰⁹ McCulloch also said this in that opinion piece: “The establishment of paramilitary police units within state police forces and the integration of their methods and tactics into everyday policing have taken place almost **entirely in secret allowing little opportunity for public debate.**”

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

■ 2004

New South Wales Police

TJ Hickey (17 years; Black)

ON February 14, hundreds of Aboriginal people, many young ones, and non-Aboriginal people gathered at the fence where 17-year-old **TJ Hickey was fatally wounded** in Waterloo¹¹⁰ in February 2004. A police vehicle driven by a Redfern¹¹⁰ officer rammed TJ's bike.

He was **impaled on the fence and died** in hospital the next day. There has been a corrupt coronial inquest, and a cover-up by the NSW government and Redfern police, and continuous protests. But eight years later there is still **no justice** for the young Aboriginal man and his family. This year, the eighth anniversary of his death, the rally, called by the Indigenous Social Justice Association in the name of the Hickey family, remembered his death and recommitted to the fight for justice.

TJ HICKEY RALLY, SYDNEY **14 February 2012**




image: Peter Boyle

Speakers from the Hickey family, Aboriginal leaders, political organisations from interstate and Sydney remembered TJ, how he died and particularly what happened after his death. Two minutes of silence were observed at 11:20 a.m., the time of his impalement. A spirited march followed, headed by TJ's mother, Gail Hickey, and the family. The march demanded justice, the end of **black deaths in custody** and for Aboriginal rights. It stopped in front of the Redfern courthouse to observe another two minutes silence and highlight the **lack of justice in the courts** for Aboriginal people.

¹¹⁰ Two adjacent inner suburbs of Sydney, New South Wales.

The next stop was in front of Redfern police station. **Police tried to hinder demonstrators and changed the previously agreed place to gather.** But the strong action of the participants ensured that the agreements were respected. Heavy rain began to fall, but the group remained on the street and kept marching. President of the Indigenous Social Justice Association¹¹¹ Ray Jackson said: "Don't go away this is not rain these are tears for TJ."

TJ HICKEY RALLY POSTER



After two more minutes of silence, the march finished at The Block, where another two minutes of silence were observed, fulfilling the promise to observe one minute for every year since his death until justice has been achieved.

A BBQ organised by Gail was offered to the participants and was a good opportunity for everyone "to sit down and have a good yarn," as an elder said. When the marchers left, the resounding chant in The Block could be heard: "**They say accident, we say murder.**" The action re-energised the "Justice for TJ" campaign. New people have become involved, including bigger Aboriginal participation and members of the Occupy movement. The campaign will renew fight to have a plaque fixed where TJ was fatally injured, which has been refused by Redfern police. A "poster plaque" will be placed at the site every week to remind everyone how it will look.

The national campaign against Aboriginal deaths in custody has been restarted as a result of the Tent Embassy 40th anniversary. Representatives of different campaigns around Australia decided to make public every single death in custody, on the streets if possible. As one participant said: "If we could remember TJ and the way that he died every day, instead of every year, justice would be closer." ■

Raul Bassi

Big rally says still no justice for TJ Hickey
greenleft.org.au
18 February 2012
(amended; added emphasis)

¹¹¹ For more information about this association and others in the areas of Redfern-Waterloo see this website: redwatch.org.au

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

■ 2004

Queensland Police

Mulrunji (36 years; Black)

THE 2004 Palm Island¹¹² **death in custody** incident relates to the death of Palm Island, Queensland resident, Cameron Doomadgee¹¹³ on Friday, 19 November 2004 in a police cell. The death of Mulrunji led to civic disturbances on the island and a legal, political and media sensation that continued for three years culminating in the first time the Attorney General indicted an individual for a criminal trial since the public prosecutor's office was established and the **first trial of an Australian police officer for a death in custody**. The officer [Chris Hurley] was acquitted by a jury in June 2007.¹¹⁴

Two legal questions arose from the death, firstly whether the taking into custody of Mulrunji was lawful and were the injuries that led to his death illegally caused by the arresting officer. Politically this event raised questions relating to the 1990 Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and whether its recommendations to prevent deaths in custody had been implemented by Government.

Mulrunji, an Indigenous Australian was aged 36 when he died. The time of death was about 11:20 a.m. on Palm Island, one hour after being picked up for allegedly causing a public nuisance. Mulrunji was placed in the two-cell lockup which was the back section of the Palm Island police station. Fellow Palm Islander Patrick Bramwell was placed in the adjoining cell. The arresting officer, sergeant Chris Hurley, and the indigenous police liaison officer, Lloyd Bengaroo, were flown off the island the following Monday after receiving death threats and Hurley's house being burned down.

This was the 147th death of an Aboriginal person in custody since the handing down of the 1990 Royal Commission. An autopsy report by Coroner Michael Barnes was produced for the family one week after the death. It stated that **Mulrunji had suffered four broken ribs, which had ruptured his liver and spleen....** The family of the deceased was informed by the Coroner that the death was the result of **"an intra-abdominal haemorrhage caused by a ruptured liver and portal vein."**

According to residents and relatives as reported in the media; Mulrunji visited his new baby niece early on the morning of 19 November 2004, he was drinking beer at the time but was not considered to be drunk, he was carrying a bucket containing a mud crab which he was going to sell. He then walked from his mother and sister's house to "D" Street where he was picked up.... Mulrunji was then taken in the back of the police vehicle for the short trip to the police station.

Doomadgee family spokesman, Brad Foster, claimed that 15 minutes lapsed before a seven-second check was done on the inmates. Forty-two minutes later a second police officer observed Mulrunji was a strange colour and that he was cold to the touch, he could not find a pulse. On being alerted to this, arresting officer Hurley

¹¹² Palm Island community (c.pop. 4,000) is located on Great Palm Island which is 65 kilometres off the coast north-north-west from Townsville. The following history is taken from en.wikipedia.org: "By the early 1920s Palm Island had become the largest of the Government Aboriginal settlements. Administrators found its location attractive as Aboriginal people could be isolated, but Palm Island quickly gained a reputation amongst Aborigines as a penal settlement. They were removed from across Queensland as punishment; for being *disruptive*, falling pregnant to a white man or being born with *mixed blood* were included in the infringements which could lead to the penalty of being sent to Palm Island. New arrivals came after being sentenced by a court, or released from prison, or were sent by administrators of other missions wishing to weed out their more ill-mannered or *disruptive* Aborigines. These removals to the Palm Island Mission continued until the late 1960s. On arrival, children were separated from their parents and then segregated by gender. Aborigines were forbidden to speak their language and from going into *white zones*. Every day activity was highly controlled by administrators including nightly curfews and the vetting of mail.... It was recorded at the time that there was almost military-like discipline in the segregation between white and black, and that inmates 'were treated as rather dull retarded children'.... The administrators had complete and unaccountable control over the lives of residents. Punishments included the shaving of the girls' heads. On a surprise inspection of the Palm Island Prison during an official visit in the late 1960s, senator Jim Keeffe and academic Henry Reynolds discovered two 12-13-year-old school-girls incarcerated in the settlement's prison by the senior administrator on the island (the superintendent), because 'they swore at the teacher'." Control by white cops à la Chris Hurley has a shocking, tragic, and **criminal** history on that island.

¹¹³ He is usually referred to by his Aboriginal name: **Mulrunji**.

¹¹⁴ An all-White jury.

115 Now, do you think Hurley was troubled by what he had done, or was he concerned about the trouble he knew he was then in? Or put another way – was Hurley thinking about how he killed Mulrunji, or was he thinking about how he was going to cover up that killing?

116 You see, Mulrunji had a family who cared about him. But when his sister took him some food, the cops told her to *piss off*. Mulrunji lay dead right on the floor, right in the police station where he had died in agony. His limp body was still warm and the State lies had started, and it went on for years. And it still goes on. Oooh, the pig-stench of it all is sickening.

117 This is really hard to believe. One purpose of an autopsy (coronial post-mortem examination) is the **cause-of-death** determination. It is a section to be answered on the associated official form. But we are to believe the form completed by the forensic pathologist did not declare the cause of death. If this is true, the person who conducted that autopsy is unfit for purpose. Then we read that **possible causes** were listed. This tells us a medical person tossed the monkey over to a legal person, the coroner who might not have known a headache from a haemorrhoid. Yet again, the truth was in short supply.

118 115 kilograms! That's over 250 rib-smashing liver-rupturing pounds. But we can't say Chris did a knee drop on Mulrunji. No one saw that. No. Mulrunji must have fallen over. He was drunk and disorderly, so Hurley claimed. Big Chris couldn't lose control over that situation, so he had to do something. He was okay. Later that day, he was having a beer with his copper mates who had gone over from Townsville to investigate how Mulrunji fell up the stairs at the police station. Or was it down those stairs? *Doesn't really matter.....*

119 And here we have it. This is exactly the role of the coroner, all of whom are State employees. Cover up problems and crimes which will cause problems for the State. The people – taxpayers – pay these overweening officials, who play hide-and-seek with **your Truths**.

came in and thought he could detect a pulse. By all accounts an ambulance was then called. It took 15 minutes to arrive during which time **no attempts were made to resuscitate the prisoner**, although the autopsy found that there would have been no chance of saving him. Instead, the videotape footage from the cell shows Hurley checking for breathing and pulse then "sliding down the wall of the cell until he sat with his face in his hands."**115**

Soon after Mulrunji's sister brought lunch for him to the front section of the police station, **she was told to go away by the police and was not informed of events.****116** The family and the state coroner were informed of the death at about 3 p.m. that afternoon. Police began taking statements from witnesses however procedures for taking of statements from illiterate Aborigines were not followed, including that they are required to have a representative present who understands the process (preferably a legal representation). The family later stated the Government's response was not to provide counselling for the family but **to send in 18 extra police** from Townsville who "strut around this community, looking intimidating."

For the following week public meetings were held on the island, **anger rising in the community about the death.** On Friday 26 November 2004 the results of the autopsy report were read to a public meeting by then Palm Island council chairwoman Erykah Kyle. Although the autopsy report was medical and **did not state what caused his death**, it did list possible causes....**117** The deceased was 181 cm tall and weighed 74 kg. Hurley was 201 cm tall and weighed 115 kg.**118** The injury may have been caused by Hurley falling on the deceased. The Coroner later stated that the autopsy was "far too sensitive and private" to be publicly released.**119**

Subsequent to the autopsy report reading a succession of angry young Aboriginal men spoke to the crowd and encouraged immediate action be taken against the police. Mulrunji's death was repeatedly branded "cold-blooded murder." A riot erupted involving an estimated 400 people, half of them school children....

Because they were suspicious about the results of the first autopsy by the Queensland government pathologist, the family delayed Mulrunji's funeral and insisted that the Coroner order a second independent autopsy which would be observed by a pathologist on behalf of the Doomadgee family. The family also hired a private investigator to conduct an independent investigation of the death.

In September 2006, coroner Christine Clements found that Mulrunji was killed as a result of punches by Chris Hurley. Clements also accused the police of failing to investigate his death fully. In response to the coroner's findings, Queensland Police Union president Gary Wilkinson was highly critical, saying that the coroner's use of "unreliable evidence from a drunk" was "simply unbelievable." Then the Queensland director of public prosecutions (DPP) Leanne Clare announced on 14 December 2006 that no charges would be laid as there was no evidence proving **Chris Hurley was responsible for Mulrunji's death.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

After several days of media and public pressure, Queensland state premier Peter Beattie appointed retired judge Pat Shanahan to review the DPP's decision not to lay charges against the police officer, but Shanahan resigned after it was revealed he had sat on the panel that originally appointed Leanne Clare in 1999. Former chief judge of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, Laurence Street, was selected to review the decision not to charge Hurley over the death of Mulrunji. The review resulted in the overturning of the DPP's decision, with Street finding **there was sufficient evidence to prosecute Chris Hurley with manslaughter.**

This was the first time since the prosecutor's office was established in Queensland that anyone other than the DPP made a decision concerning whether or not to indict an individual. The Townsville based trial of Hurley on charges of assault and manslaughter took place in June 2007. Hurley was found not guilty after medical evidence was given which discredited claims by other witnesses of an assault by Hurley upon Doomadgee. Public funded investigation and prosecution alone cost at least **\$7 million.**

In September 2008, Hurley's lawyers appealed coroner Christine Clements' findings (September 2006) that he had killed Mulrunji with three fatal punches. On 17 December 2008, district court judge Bob Pack, in Townsville, ruled that Clements' finding "...was against the weight of the evidence...", so upholding Hurley's appeal, requiring **another Coronial Inquiry** and outraging local Aboriginal people....

Aboriginal activist Gracelyn Smallwood publicly criticized Hurley's appeal and the District Court's decision, reportedly saying: "Here we are in the most racist part of Australia, with brother **Mulrunji dead in a police station, with other brothers in jail over the riot, and the police and the government getting off scot-free....** This is simply a disgrace, bully boys getting their own way while Aboriginal people suffer."

In 2012, a journalist publically maintained the view that the medical consensus regarding the possibility the injury could have been caused during the fall was incorrect. Documentary director Tony Krawitz opined in an interview that "something really violent happened" and shortly after stated "**It wasn't treated as a murder investigation** which is what was meant to have happened."

On 14 May 2010 a new full coronial inquiry into the death in custody concluded. During the course of the coronial enquiry it was revealed that a police witness Senior Sergeant Michael Leafe originally estimated that Chris Hurley was alone with Mulrunji for 10 seconds but changed it to 6 or 7 seconds after re-enacting his actions during that time and timing it on the request of Chris Hurley's lawyer. At trial he only gave his revised estimate. The prosecutor Peter Davis suggested that this (the fact of giving a shorter estimate in court not the out of court attempt to get a more accurate estimate) was an attempt to sabotage prosecutors. However, Sen. Sgt. Leafe said he believed Hurley's prosecution was a cynical political exercise.

CHRIS HURLEY



*Official thug
who killed
Mulrunji
19 November 2004.*

STOPPING PEOPLE FROM LEARNING HOW MULRUNJI DIED
Palm Island Police Station, Queensland
19 November 2004

ONE of Australia's most distinguished Aboriginal police officers – and the first officer to volunteer information on the **corrupt underbelly of the Queensland Police Force** to the Fitzgerald inquiry in the late eighties, has called for a similar inquiry to be convened today. Doctor Colin Dillon, APM, has told *Tracker* "the culture within the Queensland Police which brought about the Fitzgerald inquiry* is today stronger than it ever was." He has also called for police commissioner Bob Atkinson to step down. (* 1987-89 inquiry into **gross official corruption** in Queensland)

Dr. Dillon was Australia's highest ranking Aboriginal police officer when he retired in June, 2000 as Inspector of Police after serving 36 years in the Queensland Police. He rose to national prominence during the bleakest days of the Queensland Police Force (QPS) when Tony Fitzgerald presided over a royal commission, which **revealed widespread corruption** and, ultimately, led to the downfall of a premier and a police commissioner. He is a recipient of the Australian Police Medal for distinguished police service to Queensland.

Two years after Mulrunji **died on the floor** of the Palm Island watchhouse, Dr. Dillon quit his job as an adviser to the Queensland government in protest at its disgraceful handling of the case. Dr. Dillon spoke to *Tracker* after it emerged **the QPS would not take any disciplinary action** against police officers involved in the botched investigation of the Mulrunji case. The man who caused his death – senior sergeant Chris Hurley – was acquitted of manslaughter in 2006, and is today working as a cop on the Gold Coast. He has been **promoted** since the killing, and occasionally serves as an acting inspector.

Last year, a crime and misconduct commission (CMC) report found **the initial investigation and the internal police investigation into the matter were "seriously flawed."** It recommended the QPS take disciplinary action. It has refused to do so. CMC chair Martin Moynihan has labelled the decision "astounding." "It is almost incomprehensible that the police service has decided that there is no case for these officers to answer," Mr. Moynihan said. "The Doomadgee family, Palm Island community and the general public have a right to expect that the police service would – at the very least – investigate Mulrunji's death rigorously, impartially and thoroughly."

Dr. Dillon told *Tracker* that his first reaction to the decision was one of "absolute disgust." "There's no excuse they could give that could justify the course of action they have taken," he said. Dr. Dillon cited the recommendations arising from the royal commission into *Aboriginal Deaths in Custody* regarding investigations.

"It's clearly spelled out that when a death in custody occurs, police should be called from another region. The matter should not be investigated by any police in the region where the death in custody occurred," he said. "Why? So that there's transparency and it's totally impartial," he added. "Otherwise it gives a perception of a Caesar-investigating-Caesar scenario, which is **the old MO** (method of operation) pre-Fitzgerald."

"...You have the whole membership of the Queensland Police Service, where not one member stood up or raised their hand to say that something was wrong, that something was amiss in the way those investigations were carried out. "It just reinforces the view that the culture within the Queensland Police Service which brought about the Fitzgerald inquiry is today stronger than it ever was."
(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

The CMC has said it has no power to make the QPS discipline the officers. "It shows, very sadly, how ineffective the top watchdog in Queensland is. It's more or less been rendered a toothless tiger," Dr. Dillon said. "...It gives Queenslanders little comfort that they can expect any sense of justice to come from the CMC's role in overseeing the Queensland Police Service and criminal justice system.

QUEENSLAND POLICE (all White)
protesting manslaughter charge against Hurley (2006)



image: Dave Hunt

"The commissioner (of Police) handpicked the two officers to investigate what happened at the Palm Island watchhouse," Dr. Dillon says. "That certainly calls into question any sense of transparency or impartiality that a proper investigation would have been held. "Anybody that is in charge, whether it be the CEO of any corporation or any organisation such as the Queensland Police Service, should be well aware of that. "The buck ultimately stops at the head of the organisation and they must shoulder the responsibility for the eventual outcomes."

Dr. Dillon said another inquiry into the police force was now warranted. "My view is that nothing has changed," he said. "**Racism is every bit as entrenched today** as it was pre-Fitzgerald. "Only a tragedy and travesty of justice such as the death in custody at Palm Island could occur and virtually be treated as a non-event." Dr. Dillon said he supported the call from the Palm Island mayor Alf Lacey for police commissioner Atkinson to step down over the outrage.

Amy McGuire, Brian Johnstone

Former top cop savages record on Mulrunji death

tracker.org.au

4 April 2011

(amended; added emphasis)

NOTE that the Queensland cops in the image above are not voting for Truth and Justice – "There can be no justice without truth." (Joseph Raz) Neither is guaranteed in any court in Australia and the existence of appeal courts proves this. What these cops are voting for is stopping people from learning how Mulrunji died inside Palm Island police station. The cop Chris Hurley who killed Mulrunji was even promoted. It is diabolically EVIL! – ed.

120 Reader, do you really believe this will happen? Or did happen? Well, in Queensland there is no way on earth anything like that will ever happen. Cops in Australia kill with impunity. Oh yes there is a lot of talk, warnings, promises, dishonesty – lots of that, and on and on it goes. *Piss off* is the official rejoinder. This is what appears on theaustralian.com.au website of 16 March 2011: “Crime and Misconduct Commission chairman Martin Moynihan yesterday said the decision of deputy police commissioner Kathy Rynders to reject recommended charges against six officers was ‘almost incomprehensible.’ Instead four officers, who led the initial investigation [of Hurley] – described by deputy coroner Christine Clements as lacking ‘transparency, objectivity and independence’ – will undergo ‘managerial guidance,’ along with two senior officers who later reviewed and endorsed their probe. Last year, a CMC report slammed the investigations and recommended disciplinary action against all six officers* with a warning the watchdog would file charges directly in Queensland’s Civil and Administrative Tribunal if it was unsatisfied with [the] response of police commissioner Bob Atkinson. It is understood Ms Rynders found that the officers **did not follow operational procedures and had compromised the integrity of the investigation.** But Ms Rynders found they should only face ‘managerial guidance’ and would not launch a formal disciplinary process.” So to answer the questions posed earlier, the truth is nothing has happened, and **nothing ever will happen.** In the Australian vernacular, it’s all bull – total crap: Hurley got a promotion; Hurley was paid \$102,955 compensation of taxpayer money; Queensland taxpayers also had to pay for Hurley’s legal defence (not publicly disclosed – wonder why?); Queensland taxpayers also had to pay for the investigations and prosecution – said to cost **\$7 million**; Mulrunji died in agony; his family is devastated; Palm Islanders were terrorised by State thugs let loose; and then, cops who covered up for Hurley will get “managerial guidance.” And you, well all you can do is *piss off*, there’s nothing new here. (* Official motto of those Queensland cops – aka human scum – is: With Honour We Serve.)

State coroner Brian Hine disagreed with the Supreme Court of Appeal regarding the knee drop. He believed that the evidence left room for a finding that a **knee drop may have occurred.** He found that the injuries could have been caused by Hurley accidentally falling on top of Mr. Doomadgee or by the officer “dropping a knee into his torso.” He said that due to the unreliability of police and aboriginal witnesses he could not make a definitive finding. However, he found that Hurley **punched Mulrunji in the face and abused him** while attempting to get him into the station and found that police colluded to protect Hurley. A CMC report leaked to the media reportedly recommends that 7 officers will face charges.¹²⁰

Chris Hurley received a confidential payout of over A\$100,000 from the Queensland Government in February 2005. The Queensland government agreed to provide a confidential payout of A\$370,000 to Mulrunji’s family in May 2011. In mid-February 2005 Chris Hurley resumed duties after three months on paid leave. He was appointed to a duty officer position at the Broadbeach police station on the Gold Coast, **effectively a promotion.** When coroner Barnes disqualified himself from the inquiry the QPU called for him to be sacked immediately from the position of state coroner for the indiscretion of drinking with one of the lawyers during the inquest.

In 2007 Tony Koch, *The Australian’s* chief reporter in Queensland, won the *Graham Perkin Australian Journalist of the Year* award for his coverage of the 2004 Palm Island death in custody and related events since. In 2012 Tony Krawitz, film and television writer and director won the Walkley Foundation Long-form Journalism Documentary award for his *Tall Man* documentary based on the book *Tall Man* by The Age newspaper journalist Chloe Hooper.

Brisbane based band Powderfinger wrote a song *Black Tears* which was said to mention the Palm Island death in custody by the words “An island watch-house bed, a black man’s lying dead”. The song was to be released as part of their 2007 album *Dream Days at the Hotel Existence*. Fearing that the lyrics of the song might prejudice the case against their client, Chris Hurley’s legal team referred the song to Queensland’s Attorney-General, Kerry Shine, in an attempt to get the song banned or the lyrics changed. ■

en.wikipedia.org
2004 Palm Island death in custody
22 December 2012
(amended; added emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

■ **2008**

West Australian Department of Corrective Services & G4S
Ian Ward (47 years; Black)

"HE was a central community figure at Warburton and in the surrounding lands with a knowledge of culture, land, and art, and was known as a *culture man*. He was involved in forging relationships between his own community and non-Aboriginal communities in WA, Australia and overseas: he represented the Ngaanyatjarra lands in a delegation to China.... On 26 January 2008, Ward was arrested by Laverton police and charged with driving under the influence of alcohol. He was then driven 570 kilometres to a courthouse, remanded in custody, and driven a further 352 kilometres to a prison."

en.wikipedia.org

25 December 2012

"The deceased was transported...on a journey of approximately 3 hours and 45 minutes on an extremely hot day with the outside temperatures being over 40°C. At a point during that journey the deceased collapsed and at Kalgoorlie the deceased was taken to the Emergency Department at Kalgoorlie Regional Hospital where it was noted that he had a laceration on his forehead and a large burn on the right side of his abdomen. Evidence at the inquest subsequently revealed that the burn had been caused by contact between the deceased's flesh and the metal steel pod in which he had been held in custody. At the hospital a doctor who assisted in removing the deceased from the rear of the van, Dr. Lucien Lagrange, stated that as he opened the doors to the pod, although external conditions were very hot, the air from the van was "like a blast from a furnace".... A subsequent post-mortem examination revealed that the deceased had died from heatstroke and it is clear that the deceased died as a result of being held in the rear pod of the vehicle in conditions of grossly excessive heat.... It is clear that the deceased suffered a terrible death while in custody which was wholly unnecessary and avoidable.... Dr. Cadden noted that the deceased otherwise appeared to have been in reasonable health but had suffered a recent laceration in the area of the left eyebrow (this injury had occurred while the deceased was in the pod).... Of particular significance was a large area of burn over the side surface of the abdomen on the right.... In relation to the time taken for such a burn to occur, that would depend on the temperature of the surface with which the skin was in contact.... Assuming that the surface temperature was over 50°C [*sic*], contact would have had to have taken place for at least five minutes although longer exposure time could not be excluded. The burn would have been painful which suggests that the deceased was unconscious or at least in an altered state of consciousness to have remained still while the hot metal of the pod burned his skin.... Based on the pathology evidence, there is no doubt that the deceased died as a result of being subjected to conditions of grossly excessive heat over an extended period of time." ■

Alastair Neil Hope

RECORD OF INVESTIGATION INTO DEATH (9/09)

Perth; State Coroner

12 June 2009

*922 kilometres
in a locked
metal pod
on the back of
a vehicle driven
in desert terrain,
in scorching dry
summer heat,
sent Mr. Ward
to his ancestors
– they say accident,
we say*

MURDER!

121 With regard to unethical police, Hargrave Adam says this in his book *The Story of Crime*; c.1914: p. 23: "I have from time to time spoken with several London magistrates on this subject, and I am at a loss to understand their seeming blind confidence in the sworn word of a police constable. One would have thought that the very bad cases which at various times have come to light of [police] duplicity and mendacity would have shaken their confidence. But nothing, however, seems to be equal to that task. **It is a dangerous infatuation.**" (added emphasis; note this was said **over 100 years ago**) This judicial failing, which obviously has been around for quite some time, reveals some of the corruption associated with judiciaries. What States and judiciaries claim about justice and its administration is the ideal – but, ideal and reality are usually discrepant. Deceptive claims about judiciaries being impartial are made, but the truth is such claims refer to what we want judiciaries to be – it is **not** what the judiciaries are. With respect to the credibility of evidence presented by police, more and more of the public realize that everything that cops are involved with can be corrupted. In Canada, an unprecedented number of cops are facing criminal charges of perjury. Yahoo (CA; 21 January 2008) reported at least **eight cops** are facing charges related to dishonesty. In that report, Toronto lawyer and professor James Merton stated: "It used to be that people just didn't believe policemen would lie. That sort of restriction has disappeared now." The fact is, and it is well recorded in the literature, police deceive juries & judges who have innocent people executed (in the US for example), or sent to prison, or fined, or who ignore the corruption and incompetence of colleagues leaving the victim as well as the victim's family and relatives without **truth** and **justice**. In the Queensland case of wrongly imprisoned Terry Irving, FOI [freedom-of-information] documents show **19 instances where evidence was falsified or withheld by cops**. (*Sunday Mail*; 3 January 2010. added emphasis) And those criminal cops will not be imprisoned. Probably all of them have been promoted. (Extract from Noble, KA. *CORRUPT TO THE CORE: Concealing Crimes in Queensland, Australia*; 2010: p. 364.)

WHY SOME COPS GET AWAY WITH IT
Letter to the Editor – The Australian, 4 March 2004

"YOUR report (*Nation's worst police force riddled with corruption*) is of concern to all in our community. The commissioner denounced the Western Australia force as the nation's poorest performer, blaming a lack of leadership and internal scrutiny for corrupt behaviour that included verballing,* graft, witness perjury, forgery and stealing. The one thing that the Wood royal commission and other royal commissions of the police service always forget is why do police get away with verballing witnesses, perjury, forgery, and stealing evidence. There is a very simple reason. It is the **failure of our magistrates and judiciaries to question the police evidence, to be cynical about police¹²¹ evidence....** It is the failure of magistrates and judiciaries to have what is basic to our common law system – a reasonable doubt. It is their failure to say police evidence is no better or worse.... It is the radio jocks, tabloid press and poll-driven politicians who encourage magistrates and judges to believe the police and accept the police evidence. One cannot blame the police alone. If they were subject to proper scrutiny and their evidence was subject to proper scrutiny, and their activities were subject to proper scrutiny by those in power, then we would not have police forces where there is **SIGNIFICANT and SUSTAINED CORRUPTION.**" (added emphasis; added capitals)

J. R. Marsden

* The corrupt practice in which an accused person's *confession*, or a report, or statement is concocted (falsely worded) by criminal cops to fit a version of events desired by those cops so that person, or some other person, can be charged then convicted of a crime, either real or imaginary. (Also referred to as being banged-up, framed, railroaded, set-up, etc.)

*JOHN Robert Marsden LLM, AM (1942-2006) was a past president of the NSW Law Society, member of the NSW Police Board, and delegate to the Law Council of Australia. He held many other public offices and community leadership positions over 30 years. He himself had legal difficulties and was described as a "perjuring blackmailer" – but his words above stand on their own. Of course the police are not the sole cause of the problem within Australian legal systems. Corrupt and incompetent police are just one of the major causes of injustice. Corrupt lawyers, that vortex of vultures who put money before truth and justice are another major cause. So too are judges and gutless politicians, from all political parties, who refuse to take corrective action to **rectify failings**. When Australians, the media, ethical lawyers, and even jurists declare problems exist, it is rare to see politicians (usually lawyers) rushing to resolve the issue. What the public sees and hears is more blather, more promises, more acquiescence – then more of the same. All the official talk about justice being served is nothing but **claptrap**. Note the police are part of the legal system, not part of a judicial system. There is no system in all of Australia that can guarantee justice will be served. And the existence of appeal courts that not infrequently overturn convictions and sentences is proof that not only is there no system of justice in Australia, **no judge should ever be addressed as Justice.** – ed.*

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

■ **2009**
Queensland Police
Antonio Galeano (39 years; White)

WHEN police arrived at the yellow brick units in the central Queensland town of Brandon [south of Townsville] about 2:50 a.m. on June 12, Antonio Galeano was in a rage....

Galeano was well known to police as an addict with a taste for methamphetamine, and someone of whom to be especially wary. A year ago he had been arrested on weapons charges, including possession of guns and a samurai sword. This father of one had a history of mental illness and had somehow walked out of the Townsville hospital hours earlier, after having been taken there by police the previous day for a mental health assessment.

Doctors had cleared him. An overnight stay was apparently enough to free the demons that led him on a frolic among highway traffic. He was too fast for police. The chase ended hours later when he was found naked, lying starfish-like on the busy railway tracks that lead into the industrial hub of Townsville.

Galeano had a death wish. Police reported he had said as much. So it was hardly surprising what confronted the two officers when they went to the unit that Friday morning. Galeano, according to police, was semi-naked, bloodied - either from self-harm or through wounds from his destruction of the unit - and wielding a metal bar.

But what happened next stunned Antonio Galeano and an Australian community demanding protection from the ever-increasing drug-fuelled violence breaking out across suburbia. Faced with the raging bull of a man, the two officers - a senior constable with seven years experience and his female rookie partner - first tried talking, then used capsicum [pepper] spray. It made no difference, according to police. The senior constable, waiting for back-up, then pulled out his Taser.

Galeano was dead within minutes, handcuffed and lifeless on the bathroom floor where he had been cornered. It was Australia's third taser-related death. A Northern Territory man [Kwementyaye Rubuntja] died just two months ago after being shocked several times by police called to a violent domestic dispute. Like him, Galeano, according to police commissioner Bob Atkinson hours later, had been shocked just "two or three times" before he spoke briefly and then dropped to the floor. **But it wasn't the truth.**

As revealed in The Australian last Thursday, data downloaded from the controversial stun gun pointed to a more disturbing reality: he had been shocked 28 times by the 50,000 volt weapon. Police were speechless. With 1200 Tasers in use by general duties officers in Queensland since January, Atkinson and Police Minister Neil Roberts had frozen a further roll-out of 1300 more of the weapons and ordered a Crime and Misconduct Commission review the Monday after Galeano's death. **But they refused to say why.**

*State
coroner
Christine Clements
said she found
no evidence the
firing of the
taser
directly caused the
death
- but
did not say
28 hits
with **50,000 volts**
played no part in
killing
Tony Galeano.*

*"It has been an
absolute nightmare
and today the
[State]
coroner continued
that nightmare."
Tony's sister*

It was only after the newspaper's revelations that they came clean. The world's media has now picked up the story, with The Australian unable to find a reported case where a person has been stunned with a Taser more than five times.

The Taser uses a high voltage, low power charge of electricity to **immobilise or inflict pain**. It can function in two ways: direct skin contact or by shooting two metal darts on wires at the target, who can be farther away than 10 metres. The darts, which can penetrate clothing 2.5 centimetres thick, deliver a painful **50,000-volt shock** that causes involuntary muscular contractions which incapacitate a person for five seconds. The Arizona-based manufacturer of the guns, Taser International, has long claimed that there is no conclusive medical evidence that the product can kill. Its motto is Protect Life [*sic*]. But it is a worldwide public relations battle that the company is finding hard to win.

The UN has referred to Tasers - commonly known as stun guns - as an **instrument of torture**. Amnesty International has claimed that more than 350 people have died across the world, mostly in the US and Canada. The claim has been dismissed by Taser, which says there has been no coronial finding confirming the links in any case. But last year Taser International was held partially responsible for the death of a man in Texas, shocked repeatedly with the stun gun, after a civil jury found police "didn't know repeated exposures could kill someone."

Taser introduced a caveat on its website, a warning that stated: "The effect of repeated (more than three) or continuous (more than 15 seconds) device exposures on humans has not been extensively studied and may increase the risk of inducing an adverse event." Galeano, according to an autopsy report, died of a heart attack after being **shocked 28 times, each of five seconds**. Police have claimed the gun may have malfunctioned, sending the volts down in a continuous surge that lasted 28 cycles.

RMIT University criminologist Julian Bondy has been a vocal critic of the weapon's seemingly unchallenged proliferation. He has long warned that their deployment in anything but life-threatening situations was a ticking bomb for misuse, injury and death. "**Police are using increasingly paramilitary paraphernalia**," he tells The Australian. "They are carrying capsicum spray, wearing body armour and arming themselves with semi-automatic guns: **police in Australia are looking more and more like an occupying force**. It presents a danger to engaging with the community and there is, of course, the issue of whether the police are well-enough trained and are using these dangerous weapons too much."

Overseas, the gun's increasingly regular use in the most mundane of situations has been labelled as *Taser creep* and an elevation of **police methods to securing compliance through pain**. Yet the weapons have largely been introduced to Australia's police forces by stealth, without parliamentary scrutiny and, until recently, little public debate.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Western Australia and Queensland have armed general duties officers with the guns, and New South Wales this month announced it will soon follow, putting them in most patrol cars. Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and the ACT have, so far, restricted them to the specialist, tactical response squads. Victoria Police commissioner Simon Overland has echoed the concerns of his predecessor Christine Nixon about rolling the guns out to street and patrol car police. But pressure, particularly from police unions, is on.

In Queensland the roll-out of 2500 Tasers was embraced early last year by the police minister at the time, Judy Spence, halfway through a year-long trial to evaluate their use for general duties officers. The trial had been ordered after a state coroner had recommended their use following inquests into the deaths of several mentally-ill people. But in the middle of a police union election, Spence, who was close to the hierarchy, allowed the acting union president Denis Fitzpatrick, standing for election, to make the announcement. Atkinson, a hands-on police commissioner, is understood not to have been aware of the decision until he saw the evening news.

Galeano's death is the sort of case that lawyers and civil libertarians have been warning about since the guns first began to be used by Australia's specialist police units in 2001. Australian Council of Civil Liberties spokesman Terry O'Gorman says a nationwide review should be held into the stun guns. "**Police are using these weapons in mundane situations**, when they should be restricted to life-threatening incidents," he says.

The claim is supported by the slow leak of incidents emerging across Australia as more and more police are getting their hands on the weapons. Last year, on the first day of the general duties roll-out in Queensland, an officer **shocked an unarmed 16-year-old girl** in Brisbane's South Bank parklands after she refused to move on because she was waiting for an ambulance to pick up her sick friend.

The case, revealed by The Australian, sparked a CMC inquiry that savaged police Taser training. And this month an investigation was launched in NSW after Channel 7 aired CCTV footage which appeared to contradict a police report clearing officers over **the use of a Taser in Sydney on March 29, seemingly for jay-walking.**

Terry O'Gorman says Galeano's case is a **culmination of misuse**: "The amount of shots in this case is completely contrary to appropriate guidelines and against evidence that a Taser is not supposed to be used more than once in a given period." In fact, Queensland police Taser guidelines do not prevent an officer from using the gun more than once on a target. But George Hateley, the distributor of Tasers in Australia, says he has taught police across Australia to shoot the Taser only once so as to reduce the risk of injury.

Hateley, a Victorian police tactical response unit veteran of 18 years, admits circumstance does not always allow for the restrained use of the gun. "Obviously, it depends on the situation, and sometimes there are people - high on drugs and pumped up - who just won't

CRAIG MYLES



*Official thug
who pulled the
Taser trigger,
then again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
and again, and again,
- all the while
Tony Galeano
was
dying in agony.*

go down. I tell police to minimise the exposures as much as possible, and that is what the manufacturer is now saying. One proper and efficient deployment should suffice."

122 Of course the police union official would say this – *police never kill anyone*. All people have to do is exactly what the cops tell them to do. Some people walk into cop bullets or pepper spray. Some others deserve a good smack around. How about this as an example: The cop Benjamin Thomas Price arrested the tourist Timothy Steele. As per the couriermail.com.au website of 2 April 2009, Steele suffered "a broken nose, black eyes, a head wound, hearing problems, memory loss and lack of sensation in his arms and hands." Price had jammed a fire hose into Steele's mouth. One cop who witnessed the assault broke the conspiracy of silence and most probably has been badly victimized by other police. That same newspaper said Price was charged with **six assaults on three victims**. But in the Tony Galeano case, no cop will be charged with anything. Because, it is, just as the union official said (maybe it had all been worked out with the union before the state coroner released her report), Tony had a bad heart – so they said. Honest, that's what did him in not **28 hits** with **50,000 volts**. Maybe he could have taken a lot more hits if he tried. In Perth, cops hit Kevin Pratt with a taser **41 times** in one week of 2008. (theaustralian.com.au; 24 February 2011) They actually said Pratt was obstructing justice (*sic*). It was not 28 hits with a taser that killed Tony. It was, according to the State coroner of Queensland, the fact Tony's heart: "was severely affected by coronary atherosclerosis, anatomical changes due to amphetamine use, and cardiomyopathy." (Christine Clements. *Office of the state coroner findings of inquest; Inquest into the death of Antonio Carmelo Galeano*; 2012: p. 93) A significant fact so convenient to overlook is that Tony was 39. Most people of that age have some form of degenerative heart disease. So if you keep poking around in a dead person's thoracic cavity, you will find some indication of degeneration in most bodies. That's what coroners use to save the State: **Heart degeneration is God's gift to corrupt coroners**. It's known as blaming the victim – but then, the State can't be rushing to condemn its own killers.

The senior constable who shocked the Queensland man has told officers from the police Ethical Standards Command – investigating on behalf of the state coroner – that he only triggered the gun two or three times. A malfunction during the incident or an incorrect recording by the gun's inbuilt software is also being looked at. Hateley says a malfunction is unlikely. "It is an outside possibility," he says. "And the data taken off the weapon is very accurate."

COP TASERS TONY TO DEATH

"SANDRA Wynne the witness of this horror called the police to the scene where this mentally-disturbed man was a concern. She begged the cops to cease their brutality: 'I was screaming...at the police officer **stop, stop, stop** you are supposed to be helping me. How many times can you hit him with that before **you're going to kill him?**' She said: 'They were electrocuting him. He was screaming in pain.... It looked like someone had a bolt of lightning hitting him and taking every bit of life out of him'."

CORRUPT to the CORE
Concealing Crimes in Queensland, Australia

2010: p. 563
news.com.au; 19 June 2009

Police union officials tell The Australian that evidence of high potassium levels might offer an alternative theory to how Galeano – who had pre-existing heart problems – may have died. The elevated levels, according to the union, could point to the cause of death as "excited delirium." This medical diagnosis is the subject of intense debate among doctors, law enforcement people and civil libertarians around the world. The medical community is split over the existence of the condition, but it has been accepted as causing the death of a man in Queensland who was held down and subjected to capsicum spray during a drug-fuelled rampage several years ago. It is a term coroners have been increasingly using in the US to explain how **people die suddenly while in police custody**.

"It is very possible that this bloke [Galeano] died of excited delirium," a union official says. "He had a heart condition, apparently caused by his drug habit, and was basically a **walking heart attack**."¹²² This confrontation alone, even without the use of a Taser, may have killed him." Last week, federal Home Affairs Minister Brendan O'Connor said he would consider establishing national guidelines for Taser use. ■

Michael McKenna
Shocked to the core
The Australian
23 June 2009
(amended; added & original emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

■ 2009

Victoria Police Shootings

Too Many (age irrelevant to cops)

...THE numbers of fatal police shootings in Victoria by 1994 led to the then police commissioner [Neil Comrie] to write: "There have been an extraordinary number of fatal shootings by police officers in this state. I believe we have reached the point where we must reconsider our position and reassess the impact that this level of force has on the relationship that we have with the community."¹²³

In the 11-year period between 1984 and 1995 the **Victoria Police force had shot and killed more people than all the other states and territories combined**. Of 69 fatal police shootings across Australia, 35 had occurred in Victoria. So disproportionate was the figure that in the first 9 months of 1994 Victoria Police fatal shootings more than doubled NSW for the previous 6 years.

The sharpest increase of fatal shootings in Victoria occurred in the two-year period between 1987 and 1989. In these two years alone Victoria Police killed more people than they had in the previous 13 years. 11 people had died at the hands of the Victoria Police. The controversy not only related to the number of fatal shootings but also the legality of many of the shootings.

It is widely accepted that the incident that sparked the 1988 murder of two police constables in Walsh Street, South Yarra was the fatal shooting of career criminal Graeme Jensen the preceding day. Regardless of the police investigations and findings relating to Jensen's death, criminal associates and friends of Jensen **believe police murdered him**. So much so that police allege the group responsible for the killings declared that two police shall die for every criminal killed.

Following the Walsh street murders, police fatally shot two males believed to be involved in the payback plot against police. Jedd Houghton was shot dead by two members of the Special Operations Group at a Bendigo caravan park, where he was staying in a cabin with his girlfriend. After forcing entry into the cabin police members allege that Houghton threatened them with a firearm and they fired upon him in self-defence. He was shot three times at close range. His girlfriend disputes the police claims maintaining that Houghton was asleep at the time police entered the cabin.¹²⁴

Gary Abdallah was also an associate of Graeme Jensen and was shot by a detective from City West CIB [Criminal Investigation Branch] at his Carlton flat. Abdallah was believed to have supplied the Walsh street killers with the stolen vehicle crucial in the gang's plan. After being intercepted in a vehicle Abdallah was taken back to his flat by police. Police allege that he produced an imitation firearm and threatened them.¹²⁵ One detective fired 6 shots at Abdallah and then a seventh shot using his partner's gun. He survived for forty days in a coma before dying from complications arising from a bullet wound to the back of the head.

¹²³ Jude McCulloch. *Blue Army: Paramilitary Policing in Australia*; 2001: p. 92.

¹²⁴ Seems exactly like the killing of Joe Gilewicz.

¹²⁵ This is the bog-standard argument presented by cops. Another is, *he tried to get my gun*. Given the cops are employees of the State their words are given far more credibility than should be given to them, certainly more credibility than words of the average citizen. And if the person shot is killed it is better. Then there is no witness to contradict the cop version of the killing.

There is no doubt that during this time police tensions and emotion over the slaying of two young constables had reached boiling point and it was no stretch for the public in surmising that **these shootings were revenge killings and police had in fact executed the men.**

Comments by the then Chief Commissioner Kelvin Glare did nothing to help the strained relationship between police and the public. He meagerly offered vague and unsubstantiated excuses for the rise in police shootings such as an increase in community violence and violence against the police.

Many argue that the increase in Victoria's fatal shootings was a direct result of the emergence of liberal police firearm policies and lack of scrutiny after [each] police shooting. In an obvious ploy to soften media scrutiny and adverse public opinions, police hierarchy within hours of a fatal shooting would come out publicly in support of police actions and the use of firearms.¹²⁶ In reality, it would be virtually impossible for any officer to investigate fully the actions of police members involved in shootings within hours of the event.

Other factors that had a direct impact on the number of police shootings in Victoria can be largely contributed to the deinstitutionalization of mentally-ill persons. Police suddenly found themselves more frequently dealing with the mentally ill without any former training, knowledge or expertise. Again the statistics of fatally killed mentally-ill persons soared in comparison to other Australian states and territories. Probably the most disturbing and unavoidable of fatal shootings by police was the emergence of the ugly fad, Suicide by Cop. This was and remains an impossible dilemma for anyone to contend with.

Since the mid 90's the introduction of better training procedures and alternative methods of criminal compliance, such as capsicum spray, has led to a distinct reduction in the number of fatal police shootings in Victoria. However any incidents where the public believe police used **unwarranted deadly force** has the potential to **breakdown and destroy any relationship between police and the public.**¹²⁷ ■

Damian Marrett
Victoria Police fatal shootings
damianmarrett.com
1 March 2009
(added emphasis)

¹²⁶ This is a perennial problem. It is the stuff of outrageously ridiculous arguments by **thick cops**. Of blind support. Of the conspiracy of silence. All the things that harm the reputation of police.

¹²⁷ Australian police seem unable or unwilling to develop humane models of policing suited to the circumstances in their own nation. Murderous methods of policing as now exist in the United States* are being copied. The relationship between police and the public in Australia is not a relationship which reflects trust, respect, and mutual concern. (* Things are so bad in the *land of the indebted home of the enslaved* that the public there is being warned about this: "[Police] have become so insanely militarized" and "the fear of terror has become so wildly overblown" police "have become hair-trigger tense." (see *Legal Experts: Even Totally Innocent People Should Avoid Talking to Law Enforcement*; infowars.com; 7 November 2013.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

■ 2012

New South Wales Police Killing

Roberto Laudisio Curti (21 years; White; temporary resident)

THE uncle of Brazilian student Roberto Laudisio Curti, who died¹²⁸ after being Tasered by police in Sydney, says the notion that his nephew was a thief or may have had a pre-existing health condition was inconceivable.

Joao Eduardo Laudisio, a financier from a well-known and powerful family in Brazil, hit at NSW police as the family hired a team of Australian investigators to find out how the 21-year-old student died. "He has money for everything he wants," said Mr. Laudisio, who helped raise Roberto after Roberto's parents died from cancer. He said he had personally taken Roberto for a thorough health check before Roberto left for Australia last year. Doctors at the hospital, one of the best in South America, had declared him "very healthy." Roberto had no pre-existing condition that could have been aggravated by Taser jolts or capsicum [pepper] spray.

At least three police officers fired their stun guns at the unarmed 21-year-old student early on Sunday morning [18 March 2012]. He stopped breathing soon after he was stunned and hit with capsicum spray. CCTV footage from Sunday showed up to **six officers** chasing Roberto.¹²⁹ Police said he matched the description of a man they claimed stole a packet of biscuits from a convenience store.

Friends of Roberto, who came to Sydney to learn English and experience Australian life, have planned a protest outside the Australian consulate in Sao Paulo on March 30. They said they plan to dump biscuits at the consulate gates. DFAT has asked for a briefing and Brazilian consulate officials in Sydney confirmed his family was "extremely wealthy and well connected" and would not let the matter rest.

"They own corporations, financial companies and are involved in the stockmarket," the official said. "I know they are most disturbed at what has happened and are talking to lawyers. The young man was living with his sister and her husband in Sydney. She is extremely upset at what has happened." Joao Eduardo Laudisio said reports that Roberto had stolen biscuits were wrong. "I don't understand why newspapers put that he is a robber," he said. Roberto was an educated young man who was not desperate in any way.

He also dismissed reports that family members were on the way to Australia, saying that Roberto's Sydney-based sister, Ana Luisa Laudisio, was handling matters for the family. Ms. Laudisio works with an international financial and legal consultancy firm DC Strategy in Sydney. Her Australian-born husband holds a prominent position in the banking industry. Neither would comment on the case yesterday.

A statement released from the family said: "We are still coming to terms with the sudden and unexpected loss of our beloved Roberto following his tragic death on Sunday morning. He was a young man

¹²⁸ The heading on an article which appeared 14 November 2012, on the dailytelegraph.com.au website is as follows: *Officers used excessive force and showed appalling judgement, says NSW coroner.*

¹²⁹ The likelihood is the victim, Roberto Laudisio Curti, will be blamed for his own death. Cops will cry accident, the family will cry murder. And the cops will get away with it. Sydney is a big city with some big criminal issues. Yet there were **six** cops in this area watching out for an alleged biscuit thief. Or, were those cops doing a drug deal in that part of the city and Roberto stumbled upon it? Or was he in some way involved? No. Six cops and just one packet of biscuits does not go down that easy. There's more to this.....

who was much loved by family and his many friends, both in Australia and Brazil, and had a promising future ahead of him. We will all miss him immensely." Andre Costa, the Brazilian consul in Sydney, told the ABC yesterday: "(Roberto) went out just for fun like any other young male on Saturday night and that happened to him, so the family cannot understand it at all. They want to know exactly what happened to this young man, that he was so healthy and a good student, studying at a very good university in Brazil."

COPS KILL FOR BISCUITS

"IS this what Australia has come to? Where police can kill anyone over a packet of biscuits. The New South Wales police are out of control. This is a national tragedy. I don't want to live in a country where this type of behaviour by police is considered acceptable."

Hamish

comment; *He was no thief*
news.com.au; 21 March 2012

A Sydney based friend said: "Roberto's best friend at home is Enrico De La Lastra, the son of the Formula 1 driver. Enrico was upset when he told her of his death. Everyone is looking for an explanation." Roberto's death comes almost seven years after another high-profile shooting of a Brazilian overseas. Jean Charles de Menezes was shot in the head seven times at a London tube station by the police the day after terrorists struck the city. Police had mistaken him for one of the terrorists involved in the bombings but the shooting became controversial because police statements made in the immediate aftermath tried to characterise Mr. De Menezes' behaviour on the day as erratic and suspicious.¹³⁰

Roberto studied English at a language school in Bondi Junction.... He is believed to have come to Australia in the past few months after losing both his parents to cancer but his visa had expired. His friends have started a website calling for protest action at the Australian consulate in Sao Paulo: "In solidarity with our friend Roberto Laudisio, killed by police in Australia, for an apparent robbery of a packet of biscuits. We are asking all our friends, and whoever else, to join in a minute of silence at the door of the Australian consulate. We suggest we all take a pack of biscuits and leave them on the door of the consulate."

Goran Nuhich, speaking for the Australian Embassy in Brasilia, said he was aware of plans for a protest. "We'll take necessary measures to protect the consulate," he said, adding that he expected the protest would more be in the manner of a vigil than a show of violence. ■

Paul Toohey, Mark Morri, staff writers

He was no thief: Uncle of taser victim
Roberto Laudisio Curti hits out at police
news.com.au

21 March 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

¹³⁰ In a nice way, the authors said that the cops lied. And those cops **did lie** as the murdered man was not displaying erratic and suspicious behaviour. There is considerable literature on the State killing of Jean Charles De Menezes in London on 22 July 2005. No cop was charged with the killing. In fact, some have been promoted. On telegraph.co.uk 2 October 2009, it says: "Relatives and friends who have campaigned for the past four years remain outraged that no-one at Scotland Yard has accepted personal responsibility, and complain that many of the officers involved have since been promoted." So, shoot a human being in the head seven times – innocent or guilty it **doesn't matter** – then get a pay raise.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

■ **2012**

Northern Territory Police Killing

Kwementyaye Briscoe (27 years; Black)

YOU'LL see Patricia Morton-Thomas in an episode of *Redfern Now* dealing with Aboriginal deaths in custody on ABC TV. Her nephew (**Kwementyaye Briscoe**) died in custody eight weeks before she took on the role.

The episode of *Redfern Now* on ABC TV tonight [6 December 2012] deals with the issue of Aboriginal deaths in custody. I was asked by my long time friend Rachel Perkins, who directed the episode, to come on board and play the character of Mona, who has lost her son to a death in custody. My own nephew Kwementyaye Briscoe had **died in the Alice Springs lock-up just eight weeks prior**. I went away and thought about whether I was emotionally capable of carrying this character.

KWEMENTYAYE BRISCOE



***assaulted by NT cops, left to die
"died in NT custody as cop played iPod"***

Whether I could draw that line between myself and this character. I decided to go ahead with it, and figured playing the part could be quite therapeutic. At that time I hadn't seen the horrific CCTV footage of my own nephew's death. There's no way in the world that I would have agreed to play the character if I had seen the footage. I would not have been able to contain the anger I felt and continue to feel. I would not have been able to carry her dignity. The lovingness and forgivingness of Mona. **It would have only been rage coming through.**

On the night my nephew was picked up he committed no crime. He was taken into "protective custody." **It was the 31st time he had been arrested like this.** He had been drinking with some friends in a public park in Alice Springs. The police came along and they all ran. I believe my nephew was scared. **He had had his eye cut open by police just a fortnight earlier.** My nephew was chased down by police. They threw him in the paddy wagon. There were 2 or 3 other men who had not been searched properly and one had a bottle of rum.

*A
death in custody
every
four to five days
in Australia
is on record.*

BILL McDONNELL



*Official goon
in charge at
Alice Springs
on the night of
the killing
said he was
more concerned
about cleaning up
the blood
than getting
Mr. Briscoe
to the hospital.
(Cops in Australia
have lots of
BLOOD
on their hands
– it will never
wash off.)*

On the way to the police station my nephew and those men drank almost the whole bottle, with my nephew drinking the bulk of it. I would do this myself if I was looking to face another night in the lock up bored out of my brain. When he was picked up he was moderately drunk. But by the time they put him in the holding cell he was extremely drunk. He was then dragged out of his cell and assaulted in the reception room.

The coroner used words like “flung and slung across the floor.” But if he was being honest he would use the word “assault.” My nephew was thrown head first into a counter and cut his head. He lost consciousness. He was dragged and then carried to the cell. He was placed in the cell face down on a mattress in a very awkward position. He couldn’t breathe in this position and died from positional asphyxia. No police officer ever gave him a medical assessment or any first aid. They checked off an assessment form saying he was fit for the cells.

Other prisoners were **calling and screaming** for them to come down and pay some attention to him because they believed there was something seriously wrong with him. They were first chastised and then ignored. Police spoke to each other a number of times about his deteriorating condition and his need for medical attention. But they decided not to take him to hospital because “he might run away.”

While he slowly died police sat on Facebook and listened to their iPods. The Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody was concluded 20 years ago. Millions of dollars were spent. We were given reassurances by government after government that things would change – **but the situation is getting worse.** In 2009, **Kwementyaye Trigger** died in very similar circumstances in the Alice Springs lock up. The police at that time assured the coroner that changes would be made and that it wouldn’t happen again.

My family is calling for justice, we are not calling for revenge. We are not calling for anything other than what a court of law owes my family and my nephew. **We want these police charged with negligent manslaughter.** They owed my nephew a duty of care. He is dead because of their **callous disregard for his life.** We’ve been assured police have faced “internal discipline.” I am starting to firmly believe that there’s **no such thing as justice in Australia,** especially for deaths in custody. I truly hate to think that Australia is the kind of country that will turn a blind eye to this kind of treatment of its citizens. But so far this seems to be the case where our politicians and where our legal system is concerned.

My nephew was treated as **subhuman.** But **official policy** treats Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory as **subhuman.** We are still living under the Intervention, renamed “Stronger Futures,” which strips away our fundamental rights. I’m on the BasicsCard like thousands of my people. I am capable of acting in an internationally-acclaimed drama for our national broadcaster [ABC], but because I’m black and from the NT, the government says I’m incapable of managing a Centrelink [national human services] payment.

KILLING KWEMENTYAYE BRISCOE

THE Northern Territory coroner has found the death of an Aboriginal man in custody was **due to a lack of care by police and could have been prevented**. An inquest heard Kwementyaye Briscoe, 27, was dragged along the floor by police at the Alice Springs watch house after being taken into protective custody for being drunk.... Police told the inquest they **did not seek medical treatment** for a wound on Mr. Briscoe's head **nor check on him in his cell for more than two hours**. Instead, officers were on the internet or listening to music.

Coroner Greg Cavanagh said the **police errors were extensive**. "I find that the care, supervision and treatment of the deceased while being held in custody by the Northern Territory Police was completely inadequate and unsatisfactory and not sufficient to meet his medical needs," he said. "This lack of care resulted in his death. That is to say **this death was preventable and it should not have occurred**." Mr. Cavanagh said the issue raised serious questions about mismanagement in the police force. "In my view the catalogue of errors is so extensive and involves so many police officers of various ranks as to suggest mismanagement for a period of time by police command at a level higher than just local."

The coroner said other prisoners had heard "choking and gasping" coming from Mr. Briscoe's cell at 11:45 p.m., but their efforts to get the attention of police officers were in vain. Mr. Briscoe's body was not discovered until 1:43 a.m. when the watch commander went to check on him.

The coroner said up to 10 officers have been formally disciplined over "errors and failures" on the night of Mr. Briscoe's death. He noted another young Indigenous man had died in the same watch house in 2009, and the failings should have been rectified then. "It is completely unacceptable that it took another death in custody to highlight the persistent failures," Mr. Cavanagh said. He said NT Police have since devoted significant resources to implementing reforms, including an increase in staff numbers and watch-house nurses.

Outside the court, assistant police commissioner Mark Payne said it was clear the death was a tragedy. "We certainly have accepted the full findings. We now need to review them," he said. "Certainly any death in custody is a tragedy. The Northern Territory Police Force sees it as a tragedy. "We've taken steps up to this point, we certainly will continue to take steps to ensure that another tragedy is unlikely and should never happen again in the future."¹³¹

Family members of Mr. Briscoe shouted abuse at police officers as they left court. "He was a young man, didn't even have a wife and kids and policemen walk free," one said.

Allyson Horn, Ruby Jones

'Lack of care' by NT police led to death in custody
abc.net.au

17 September 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

¹³¹ This jackass should be sent to scrub public lavatories for a few months for uttering platitudinous rot. **Payne is part of the problem**, not the solution. Recall the coroner said: "mismanagement for a period of time by police command at a level higher than just local." How many cops were fired over this negligent manslaughter? **NONE!** When the next person dies in custody in the Northern Territory, please remind the media of Payne's platitudes. Get him on national radio/television to explain why another person has been killed by mongrel officials.

Q. *Between 1982 and 2008, how many people died in custody in Australia?*

A. *379 Black
1677 White
2056 total
(80 a year for 26 years)*

Q. *How many officials have served prison time in relation to all those deaths?*

A. **NONE!**

Aboriginal people are fourth class people in a first world country and I don't understand how that can happen. We are not seen as human beings, we are unwanted fauna on the landscape. Dave Tollner, the Health Minister for the Northern Territory, recently said he wants to criminalise public drunkenness so Aboriginal people will be forced "back into the scrub" if they want to drink.

The approach of our Health Minister to such a serious problem is to push people where no tourists can see them - and if that's the attitude at the top, imagine what it's like further down the scale. **It's that attitude that killed my nephew.** I walk among a great many filmmakers and film producers and people who are very capable and open-minded. They are well-educated about what goes on in Australia. But when I start to talk about the Intervention they have no idea what is really happening here.

When even the most informed people in the country are not informed, then you have a very serious situation. On 10 December, Human Rights Day, we will be holding a rally in Alice Springs to bring some light onto issues of deaths in custody and to call on the Northern Territory Government and the DPP to lay charges for the officers responsible for my nephew's death.

Alice Springs is really not such a large town. But in the last four years there have been **four deaths with the involvement of the Alice Springs Police or Corrections Service.** That body count is way too high. I am hoping people join us at the rally to say: "we are not going to accept this in our town anymore and we are not going to accept this in our Territory anymore, and things have to change."

Poor non-Aboriginal families, the African community and other members of minority groups in Alice Springs are also being constantly harassed by police. This treatment has to stop and the police force has to be made accountable. I would like to personally put all this aside and rest. My family has had a hell of a year. But we must speak up. It is so important that we all **start speaking up.**

Even if you are doing something as simple as adding your signature to a petition or boosting the numbers at a rally, it makes a huge difference to change in our country. And change has to come. It is extremely important that every single Australian stand up and be counted on these incredibly important issues, social issues that will shape the future of our country. The time to do that is now. ■

Patricia Morton-Thomas

My family is calling for justice

newmatilda.com/contributor/46778

6 December 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

CRADLE TO GRAVE, ONE INJUSTICE AFTER ANOTHER

THREE and half years have passed since **a police-four-wheel-drive struck down 15-year-old Rex Bellotti Jr., dragging him underneath the undercarriage of the vehicle, nearly amputating his right leg at the knee which hung on by torn tendons.** The WA police have languished in their duty to settle the insurance pay-out to the Bellotti family who are now bitterly [*sic*] in debt to meet the costs of convalescence for their eldest child, and as they watch **the trauma of being blind-sided by the WA police** impact upon their five other children.

"We have gone everywhere, to everyone, we have done the government inside out, all of them have let us down – ministers and departments don't find the time to help with the settlement between ourselves and the WA Police, **we can't get an apology from the police** for what they did to Rex Jr. and which would have meant so much for my boy and all my children. No minister or government bureaucrat will help us with finding Rex Jr. accommodation and with his convalescence," said Mr. Rex Bellotti Sr. "The anger and torment they have built in us is torture, and it explains why our people are devastated and **do not trust police and government.**" Eight rallies later, a 450 kilometres Justice Walk through South West WA, a submission to a government Standing Committee, submissions to the WA police Commissioner, to the Minister for police have all failed to mitigate any positive outcome for the Bellotti family.

Mr. Bellotti said that the family's pain was compounded by a recent letter from police Commissioner Rob Johnson who responded with a number of factual inaccuracies. Minister for police, Road and Safety, Rob Johnson wrote, "The CCC subsequently reported that they were satisfied of the adequacy of the WA police investigation and closed the file accordingly." The Corruption and Crimes Commission of WA in fact criticised the handling of the police investigation and slammed a number of investigative deficiencies which included **not interviewing third-party witnesses** – there are contrary reports to what actually occurred on the night in question as to how Rex Jr. was **struck down** and what followed.

"Our hearts hurt," said Mr. Bellotti Sr. "It is not just institutions like the police and government and many high profile advocates for what is right who have let us down, it is our own people too. We hurt at the seams as we watch those of our people who we supported in trust to achieve status and capacity now tear away from all of us.... They should be fighting in the news media, in the corridors and halls of parliaments and in the courts for the family Doomadgee, for the family Hickey, for the family Ward, for the family Bellotti. Instead of leaving us all to flounder, there should be one court case after another and no matter how many were lost in the courts of the day we would have a say, some things would change, and when the courts finally were strained by the log of cases before them from families like ours, then they will start to **remedy the many wrongs they have done to us, hold police and prison officers culpable, settle compensation and some justice,** things would change, however at this time no one speaks for us but the few, and sadly we have many Aboriginal folk who we long supported into the corridors and halls of power, and instead like those who treated us like second class citizens now they do so likewise. In the meantime we have to try and live out our lives and alongside experiences which were no fault of ours," said Mr. Bellotti Sr.

Gerry Georgatos

From the cradle to the grave

one injustice after another - Rex Bellotti Jr.

indymedia.org.au

10 June 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

*And
cops in Sydney
opened fire
to kill
– their victims
were unarmed,
cornered, trapped.*

■ **2012**
Australia-wide Police Corruption & Killing
Brutality

SYDNEY'S Indigenous Social Justice Association (ISJA) held a rally outside the NSW state parliament in protest to the recent spate of perceived **police brutality and to the five deaths in police custodial incidents** in NSW. Hundreds of angry protesters blocked off half the road in front of the NSW Parliament in a protest against the **police shooting and bashing** of two unarmed Aboriginal teenagers on April 22.

The rally, initiated by the ISJA, demanded an independent public investigation into the incident, which had been filmed on mobile phones by stunned bystanders. Many young Aboriginal people and other high school students braved rain to join the protest. Popular Aboriginal boxer Anthony Mundine joined the protest.

Mundine said he came to lend his support to the cause. "There's no room for any debate," he told the Herald. "They were pretty much unarmed, cornered, trapped...and they [the police] opened fire at pointblank range – **to kill**." Mr. Mundine said the issues were not about race, but the families of the teens injured wanted answers.

Mr. Mundine, who also visited the 14-year-old driver this week, said the police officers who shot six times into the stolen car should be investigated for **attempted murder**. ISJA president Ray Jackson said, "Our NSW police are just too deadly!" "The actions of NSW police in Kings Cross, and for all the world to see, and the five police related deaths this year need to get some scrutiny. We are hoping to pile pressure on Barry O'Farrell's government to do something," said Mr. Jackson.

"We are asking NSW police minister Mike Gallacher to remove tasers from frontline police. Tasers are lethal." & "The shooting of two Aboriginal teenagers at Kings Cross, who stole a car, needs to be properly investigated, but not by internal affairs however by some independent body," said Mr. Jackson. "It appears **police brutality is out of control Australia-wide**."

"We do not condone the stealing of the car or any criminality, however **shooting them is not on**. There were six Aboriginal teenagers in there, **aged as young as 13**." "I've had my car stolen and yet I wouldn't have anyone shot or hung for it." "What if passersby had got shot? Or the car skewed further out of control into pedestrians?"

Western Australia's Nyikina rights advocate, Sofia Mirniyinna echoed these sentiments. "In WA police are now disobeying their own protocols, and a police chase which was unauthorised slammed into the car of 50-year-old mum and her 16 year old daughter and killed the mother. Coppers have to learn real life is not some television cartoon or ridiculous cop show where they can go wild on a chase. Not every crime is worth going wild over it."

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Mr. Jackson is disturbed by the images of police officers dragging out the youth from the car, who had been shot and then [was] allegedly punched. "The driver had been wounded by gunfire twice, in the chest and in the shoulder. He was dragged from the car. He did not appear to resist arrest however the police officer is seen in still images **laying into him.**"

"The arrest technique, with the knee drop needs to be overhauled as it can lead to asphyxia and let us remember it was used on Terence Briscoe and Cameron Doomadgee [Mulrunji]," said Mr. Jackson. "Why did the police officer drag the wounded driver by the shirt over the roadway like a sack of potatoes?" "Let us not confine ourselves only to the Kings Cross shootings and violence when looking at our deadly NSW police let us look at their record from February to present – **five police-custodial deaths.**"

"And let us not forget the tragic death of Brazilian Roberto Laudisio Curti at the hands of six police. The tourist did nothing and was **tasered to death.** And he was being pursued as a mistaken identity over a stolen packet of biscuits. Do you fire on someone over biscuits?" "He wasn't just tasered, video shows the police slamming his head into a shop window. His death should have led into a Royal Commission into our **deadly NSW police.**" Footage from the Kings Cross incident shows the dramatic arrest of the wounded driver and passengers from the stolen vehicle and of a police officer punching one of them. A **police officer unleashed a series of blows** to the head of a teenager bleeding from a bullet wound to the neck during the brutal arrest. Footage shows the then beaten teenager kneed in the back as he was being handcuffed, all this moments after he was dragged from the vehicle. Bystanders stood by seemingly stunned. Redfern's Elder Mick Mundine said he was shocked by the footage of the **police brutality and the manner of the arrests.** "It was pathetic." Mr. Mundine asked for calm from everyone. Ms. Mirniyinna said it appeared that police officers were flustered and maybe had a public meltdown after pedestrians were injured however "it's still not good enough to engage in that sort of **police brutality.**"

Mr. Jackson and Ms. Mirniyinna have come together, from Sydney and Broome to develop a national deaths in custody organisation. Mr. Jackson said, "This is the best way, a national body so our voice rises and we become a check and balance to what's going on out there. We have Sofie in the Kimberley, a watch committee in Perth, Sam Watson in Brisbane, Townsville and Melbourne mobs, us in Sydney, and we need to unite as one." On the same day a protest was led in Brisbane by Sam Watson and others over the police-related death of a boy. A National Action to stop deaths in custody and highlight perceived **police brutality** will be held on May 12, said Mr. Jackson. ■

Gerry Georgatos

Our NSW police are just too deadly! – Ray Jackson

greenleft.org.au

24 April 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

Police
do not have the
public's respect,
which is one
reason why
their organization is
dysfunctional
and thus
unfit for purpose.

MASSACRES IN AUSTRALIA

THE following is taken from wikipedia.org (*List of massacres of indigenous Australians*; 19 March 2013):

"Massacres on Australia's frontier were often not recorded and generally tended to fall under **a veil of secrecy** due to fear of possible legal consequences, especially following the Myall Creek Massacre in 1838. Recent studies reveal that many conflict records from the Australian Frontier, notably those of Queensland and its Native Police Force, were **deliberately expunged** sometime in the first half of the twentieth century. It is generally acknowledged that the European as well as indigenous death toll in frontier conflicts and massacres in Queensland exceeded that of all other Australian colonies, yet it is certainly not possible to map out more than a small percentage of the numerous massacre sites in Queensland. We can calculate in various ways the minimum amount of frontier *dispersals* performed by the Native Police Force.... However, we will never be able to locate or describe in detail more than a small percentage of these events. Thus any attempt to list all events of this nature will of nature (at least in Queensland), be more **deceptive than revealing.**" (amended; added emphasis)

As could be expected, the official emphasis has been – still is – on **secrecy**. On not telling the truth, the whole truth. The State in Australia has been killing people, Blacks predominantly but also Whites, from the time Europeans discovered *Terra Australis*. The reason for all the massacres listed here was to dominate and thereby exert control. And that same reason applies to the official killing at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, in 1996.

Below is a list of massacres which have taken place in Australia. Note that this list is **not complete**, and that the **number murdered**, particularly with the earlier massacres, is an estimate. Also note that where massacres were not perpetrated by the State, the State often took no prosecutorial action. It is reasonable to believe that many more people have been **killed by the State and others than official records reveal**. The Australian State has also approved and enabled the massacring of people outside of Australia during the engagements in which its military personnel (killers) have participated.

NO.	GIVEN NAME	LOCATION	DATE	NUMBER ⁺
1.	Appin	New South Wales	1816	14*
2.	Avenue Range	South Australia	1849	9*
3.	Barrow Creek	Northern Territory	1874	90*
4.	Bathurst	New South Wales	1824	16*
5.	Battle Camp	Queensland	1873	???*
6.	Battle Mountain	Queensland	1884	200*
7.	Battle of Pinjarra	Western Australia	1834	40*
8.	Bedford Downs	Western Australia	1924	???* As part of a cover-up, the bodies were burnt by local WA police.
9.	Bentinck Island	Queensland	1918	???*
10.	Brisbane Valley	Queensland	1842	50*
11.	Broken Hill	New South Wales	1915	4
12.	Butchers Tree	New South Wales	1849	???*
13.	Campaspe Plains	Victoria	1839	40*

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

NO.	GIVEN NAME	LOCATION	DATE	NUMBER ⁺
14.	Canning Stock R.	Western Australia	1907-07	???*
15.	Cape Bedford	Queensland	1879	28*
16.	Cape Grim	Tasmania	1828	30*
17.	Cape Otway	Victoria	1846	7-9*
18.	Central Highlands	Queensland	1861	170*
19.	Corniston	Northern Territory	1928	60-170*
20.	Convincing Ground	Victoria	1833-34	60-200*
21.	Central Coast	New South Wales	1992	6
22.	Cullin-La-Ringo	Queensland	1919	19
23.	Eureka Rebellion	Victoria	1854	22
24.	Evans Head	New South Wales	1842	100*
	It is also known as the Goanna Headland Massacre.			
25.	Faithful	Victoria	1838	8, 100*
26.	Flying Foam	Western Australia	1868	20-150*
27.	Forrest River	Western Australia	1926	30*
28.	Fremantle	Western Australia	1830	???
29.	Gippsland	Victoria	1840	1000*
30.	Goulbolba Hill	Queensland	1867	300*
31.	Gwydir River	New South Wales	1838	???*
32.	Hamilton	Victoria	1840	50-80*
33.	Hoddle Street	Victoria	1987	7
34.	Hospital Creek	New South Wales	1849	400*
35.	Kilcoy Station	Queensland	1842	30-60*
36.	Kimberley	Western Australia	1890-1926	hundreds*
37.	La Grange	Western Australia	1865	20*
38.	Milperra	New South Wales	1984	7
	It is also known as the Father's Day Massacre.			
39.	Mowla Bluff	Western Australia	1916	300-400*
40.	Murdering Gully	Victoria	1839	35-40*
41.	M'bidgee-Murray	New South Wales	1838	14*
42.	Myall Creek	New South Wales	1838	30*
	First successful prosecution of perpetrators. Resulted in the widespread cover-ups of later massacres and use of poison (arsenic, strychnine) by Whites to kill Indigenous people.			
43.	Pinjarra	Western Australia	1834	25*
44.	Port Arthur	Tasmania	1996	35
45.	Queens Street	Victoria	1987	9
46.	Rufus River	South Australia	1841	16-50*
47.	Speewah	Queensland	1890	???*
48.	Strathfield	New South Wales	1991	8
49.	Waterloo Creek	New South Wales	1838	100-300*
50.	Warrigal Creek	Victoria	1843	100-150*
51.	Whisky Au Go-Go	Queensland	1973	15
52.	Wiradjuri Wars	New South Wales	1830s-40s	???*
53.	Yeeman	Queensland	1857	12,* 11, 300*
	William Fraser headed a killing campaign against the Yeeman. His actions resulted in the complete extermination of those people and of their unique language. He became a folk hero.			

+ estimate; * Black/Indigenous Australians

Note that this list is incomplete and that the numbers of people who were murdered are, in many case, estimates. The State does not want to know about these massacres, particularly those for which it is responsible. – ed.

ENDING

POET, scientist, and statesman, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832) told us that we benefit by stopping our forward movement then casting our eye back over where we have come from. He said people miss half the view by looking just one way during their travels.

Attempts to understand the Port Arthur incident addressed in this book all seem to have been based on acquiring, assessing, apportioning, *etc.*, facts and then intermingling those facts, both true and false, into scenarios that can be used to aid our understanding. There is nothing wrong with this. It has to be done to help explain the mass murder, because the official narrative explains none of the significant parts. It can't because its foundation is a **LIE**.

But the reason that the preceding articles were compiled is to show that the history of the Port Arthur incident did not begin in April 1996. The truth is, this incident has roots reaching back before the time of Trugernanner/Truganini (d. 1876). All the way back to the time when Aboriginals watched the English unload their first convict cargo from sailing ships at the Derwent River mouth in 1803. With the help of officials, the original people on that island – now called Tasmania – who did not succumb to introduced diseases were, as a phrase of the 19th century reveals: *hunted down like wild beasts and destroyed*. Killing people with firearms (the MEANS) to exercise absolute control (the END) is not new in Tasmania – or in Australia.

Within the literature there is ample evidence that officialdom in Australia has aided and abetted the testing and use of lethal weapons not just on walkabout Blacks, but on their own White kind. Historical records and medical diagnoses prove it. All along a conga-line of corruption, officials approved, planned, signed off, then later lied about those deaths they are responsible for. Warmongering is pushed as essential, false-flag bombs to kill in Sydney central, murder is covered up with soggy lies, everywhere it's officially not for your eyes. And these State killings continue.

Any thinking person who puts the official narrative to one side and then goes about studying the true facts of the Port Arthur incident, of which there are many, will inevitably and quickly reach a point of disbelief. Given the **absolute absence of hard evidence** proving Martin Bryant planned the entire incident, then single-handedly performed all the acts of that incident, the official narrative can only confirm just how corrupt and callous officials involved with the incident are. And that there was **no trial** in which alleged evidence was put before a jury, which is the right of all people in Australia, confirms the official corruption and secrecy which has put a *boy-man* – mentally handicapped having an IQ of 66 – **into prison for life**.

Reader, looking back on all parts of the Port Arthur incident is not something corrupt officials do, or want you to do. There are too many unanswered questions – dangerous questions, answers to which could lead to uncontrollable public reactions. Have no doubt that the guilty officials do not want you to have answers to your questions, because those answers confirm that **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT! ■**

THE INCIDENT

4

CONCERN

All significant components of the Port Arthur incident have never been completely documented and made available to the public which has been fed a devious diet of official lies and deceptively false facts.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS	135
■ INTRODUCTION	137
AUSTRALIA	Map
TASMANIA	Map
TASMAN PENINSULA, TASMANIA	Map
■ SEARCH OUT, ASSEMBLE, PUBLISH	Beattie 141
TWO BUS LOADS	
■ WE HAVE BEEN TOLD	MacGregor 149
BLUE BAG & THE TRAY	
SEASCAPE COTTAGE c.1996	Image
■ MY EXPERIENCES AT PORT ARTHUR	Scurr 157
BROAD ARROW CAFÉ APRIL 1996	Image
TASMANIAN DISASTER INCIDENTS	
■ SEASCAPE COTTAGE SIEGE	MacGregor 169
WHAT'S IN A WORD	
MY DAY....	
IS THERE A SMOKING GUN?	
PORT ARTHUR SHOOTING INCIDENT	
BUNKUM, GEMS, DISCREPANCIES	
■ ENDING	198

COUNTS

Images 4, Inserts 13, Maps 3, Notes 151, Pages 66

FORETHOUGHTS

■ “[T]he siege continued with Const. Pat Allen, with his hand-held radio (on the same OPEN wave length as all emergency services in Tasmania incidentally) seeking from a police officer senior in rank to him, for permission to shoot the gunman, saying words to the effect, ‘I have the gunman in my sights: **permission to shoot,**’ and with the answer coming straight back over the radio, a direct order, repeated I would point out, for a second time emphatically, ‘**Do not shoot, this has to happen. I repeat do not shoot this has to happen.**’” (added emphasis)

Stewart K. Beattie
email to editor
13 November 2012

■ “The media sees it as its role to report on incidents and to bring this to the attention of its audiences, so the media in effect becomes the conduit to the public of our image. Proper management of the media can influence the way in which the information forming the basis for reporting of an incident is gathered and interpreted. It is this management role that becomes vital if the public are to be given a positive perception of the organisation and its handling of a crisis situation.”¹ (sic)

Geoff Easton
Port Arthur – media management
Port Arthur Seminar Papers
11-12 March 1997: p. 120

■ “Video footage after the massacre shows 3 men standing in the doorway of the Broad Arrow Café...quite relaxed casually having a cup of coffee and talking with 20 dead bodies just metres away – something strange after such a traumatic event – while others rush blankets to the wounded. These three have now been identified and it makes a very interesting gathering. They were: Hans OVERBEEKE,² NSW Police Constable Justin NOBLE,³ and Joe VIALLS.”⁴

editor
3 men at the Broad Arrow Café
shootersnews.addr.com
no date

■ “As I was moving my vehicle I saw a person running past one of the [Seascape] cottages towards the entrance of the main residence. This person appeared to have **black hair** and appeared to be **naked**. I quickly lost sight of this person.” (added emphasis)

Paul Barry Hyland⁵
Witness Statement
no date

■ “After such a traumatic event as the Port Arthur Massacre, certain events would have registered differently with different witnesses, as each would have seen things in his or her perspective, angle and relevance.”⁶

Alexander S. MacGregor
Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur
2001-4: p. 293

¹ It is clear from the case-related literature that considerable energy, time, and money were spent nurturing members of the media several hundred of whom were already gathered at Hobart to attend a conference arranged by the Pacific Area Newspaper Publishers Association. This conference was planned to commence on Monday, **29 April 1996**. (Note that strangely, Easton does not mention this significant media conference at Hobart. Why did he fail to mention a gathering of c.700 journalists exactly at the place where and when he needed them? It seems Easton did not declare a word about this conference and all the attendees because it would have looked planned – part of the official set-up. It was.)

² Said to be the father of Benjamin & Warren. It is believed **Benjamin was a/the gunman in the incident**. (It could be argued that Warren also had a role.) It seems Benjamin was then 20 years of age, which fits age descriptions in *Witness Statements*. Martin Bryant was 9 days short of being 29 at the time of the incident.

³ To the editor’s knowledge and relief, he is not related to this mongrel who it seems was/is a member of the BCI (Bureau of Criminal Intelligence) in New South Wales. (see *Witness Statement* at Part 7)

⁴ A big name in the Port Arthur incident, this person has left a trail of suspicious involvement. That Vialls (aka: Otho Jewell Vialls & Ari Ben-Menashe) was at the café supports the belief that he was involved with the planning and execution of the incident. His name has been mentioned in conjunction with Mossad, the Israeli intelligence and killing service.

⁵ Then a constable with Tasmania Police, stationed at Nubeena. (see Map). Note his observation supports that of his colleague Garry Whittle (see *Witness Statement* at Part 7)

⁶ This author confirms that not all eyewitnesses will give the same or even similar descriptions of things that they have seen. This is expected. Note that this does not mean investigators and officials can pick out what they need from *Witness Statements* to support an official narrative, and ignore everything else.

7 Then a constable with Tasmania Police, stationed at Dunalley. (see Map). Note his observation supports that of his colleague Paul Hyland (see preceding page). Another constable, Patrick James Allen, said the following about his experience while observing Seascapc cottage on Sunday (28 April 1996) afternoon and evening: "I heard the sound of a high pitched yelling and screaming coming from the direction of Seascapc."* Thus during the siege of Seascapc by police: three constables identified a person there **who was not Bryant**; two constables said they saw a naked person; two constables wrote they heard screaming; and, one constable wrote he definitely saw a female. And this was late Sunday afternoon. Based on police documents, Bryant was not alone at Seascapc. For officials to say Bryant killed Sally Martin is a lie as there is **no evidence** to prove it. Regardless of whether the naked woman was or was not Mrs. Martin, there is **no evidence** Bryant killed her or anyone else at or near PAHS. (* see *Witness Statement* at Part 7)

8 At Seascapc, SOG members conclude a night-viewing device was being used inside the cottage to watch their movements. Their conclusion was confirmed by comments made by a *Jamie* during his discussions with police negotiator Terry McCarthy. It seems that device was removed from Seascapc by the gunman/men when exiting, leaving patsy Martin Bryant to burn to death inside the cottage.

9 Wilson is a former agent of the CIA. Her husband publicly raised the illegality of the American-led war against Iraq. (2003-ongoing) This resulted in her being outed and fired by the American government. Her words describe exactly what is now being inflicted on Julian Assange (abandoned by Australian governments), Kim Dotcom, Bradley Manning, and Edward Snowden.

10 Wooley spoke out in support of Carleen Bryant, mother of Martin Bryant. It was hoped that Wooley's support would go beyond her book *My Story*. (see *BIBLIOGRAPHY* & extract at Part 5) But on 2 December 2013, unprofessional gutless Wooley suppressed the Port Arthur story/case by describing it as a conspiracy theory in an email to this editor.

■ "In the emergency plan for the area, the Dunalley [see Map] bridge should have been closed, it never was. [This would have] completely sealed the area off, stopping anyone leaving or entering the area by road. There was one way in and only one way out of that place. I was aware of the plan as I had attended meetings when I held the position as ambulance officer in charge of the Tasman Peninsula, where it was discussed. We put it in place considering a major bus accident.... Of course there would be someone on duty to open and close the bridge to allow emergency vehicles to enter and leave 24 hours a day. Here we have a mass shooting with the gunman on the loose and they let vehicles come and go as they liked. Why wasn't he [Chris Iles] ordered to close the bridge from police headquarters due to the absence of Constable Whittle who was the policeman at Dunalley? He JUST HAPPENED to be away at the time looking for a heroin haul at Saltwater River on the Tasman Peninsula. He was accompanied by Constable Paul Hyland the Nubeena policeman. This heroin turned out to be soap powder in two jars. The time, approx. 1:30 p.m. WHO REPORTED THIS MAJOR INCIDENT? (original capitals)

Wendy Scurr
email to editor
18 October 2012

■ "At one stage **saw a female running around the [Seascapc] back yard naked**. Yelling and screaming." (*sic*; added emphasis)

Garry Thomas Whittle⁷
Debriefing Notes
28 April 1996

■ "[W]e were advised by one of the SOG members that it was believed that gunman was looking in our direction using a **night viewing device**, we remained huddled to the ground in a still position until we were advised that it was clear, at which time we were advised to return to the culvert. I understood this to be in the best interest of our safety, due to the threat the **night viewing device** presented at this time."⁸ (added emphasis)

Garry Thomas Whittle
Witness Statement
no date

■ "If you offer the public a true story that is at odds with what the government wants you to know, they will stop at nothing to destroy you, your reputation, and the reputations of the people around you."

Valerie Plame Wilson⁹
US government is bullying an American hero
readersupportednews.org
15 September 2012

■ "I'm both a Tasmanian and a journalist. I don't believe that this is a story that should be suppressed. I believe this is more than a footnote to the Port Arthur massacre."

Charles Wooley¹⁰
A mother's burden
60 MINUTES (Channel 9 TV)
27 February 2011

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

OFFICIALS in Tasmania compiled a list of 72 charges for (alleged) crimes and attributed all of them to Martin Bryant.¹¹ To the State, he was the murderous gunman who had killed and wounded all those people at and near Port Arthur. Before an iota of evidence was ever examined in a trial by jury, the State pronounced Bryant guilty.

Given he was – they said – guilty of everything, the coronial inquest was denied. Having that **legally-required inquest** would have been too upsetting – they said. (A coronial inquest would have been very revealing. It would have destroyed the official narrative. This is the real reason why the State would not have one.) And to avoid having a trial, at which the State would have had to prove all its allegations (but could/can not do that), the corrupt criminal lawyer John Avery coerced the **mentally-incompetent** Bryant to accept a guilty plea. Then they sentenced him and forgot him. But, the Truth is still there and around the world innocent Martin Bryant has not been forgotten.

Before the truth, which disproves this official lie of guilt, is exposed here in detail, readers need to know about the actual crime scenes. Commencing on Sunday, 28 April 1996, seven places at or near the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS) became crime scenes. They are, with the (alleged) associated deaths in italicized numbers, as follows:

1. Broad Arrow Café within PAHS (20);
2. Parking area (bus & car) near the café (4);
3. Jetty Road leading from parking area & jetty to tollbooth (3);
4. Tollbooth beside two-lane roadway at PAHS boundary line (4);
5. Port Arthur general store not far from PAHS boundary line (1);
6. Arthur Highway near entrance driveway to Seascope cottage; &
7. Seascope cottage owned & occupied by David & Sally Martin (3).¹²

As you can see, the incident actually comprises what went on at seven different locations over two days, more specifically over 19 hours on 28 and 29 April 1996. (Shooting commenced at c.13:30 Sunday afternoon; Martin Bryant was apprehended at c.8:30 on Monday morning.) Note that this incident, as described here, was preceded by preparatory actions (by officials) and was followed by both investigative and evasive actions (by officials). The Port Arthur incident had a history when it commenced. It was not a spontaneous thing. It also has a history from the time that incident ended. To become fixated solely on what happened over those terrible 19 hours and not acknowledge and assess the history leading to and from that incident, leaves all investigators and all persons who are interested in the case/incident **ill-informed**.


Only through the dedicated efforts of moral investigators and others have truthful facts of the incident been brought to light. Through the efforts of these good people we have learnt the official narrative is all **nonsense** – highly offensive, deceptive, and criminal nonsense. And all the abuse these people have endured proves yet again what Carthaginian theologian Tertullian (c.160.-c.220) said centuries ago: *The first reaction to truth is hatred. The moment it appears, it is treated as an enemy.* It is the truth-seekers and truth-tellers who face this evil hatred of the corrupt and unjust State.

¹¹ At the hearing on 22 November 1996, the following are the charges for which Bryant was sentenced: **35** charges of murder; **20** charges of attempted murder; **3** charges of grievous bodily harm; **8** charges of inflicting wounds; **4** charges of aggravated assault; **1** charge of arson – motor vehicle; & **1** charge of arson – building. (see R v. Martin Bryant; 22 November 1996) Reader, there is **not a shred of evidence** to prove any one of these charges and that is why the State could not, under any circumstances, allow a trial to take place. If the State did not prove all 72 charges, the resultant national furor could have turned the county into chaos. This is why Bryant's so-called lawyer, John Avery, brow-beat Martin into accepting the plea of guilty which Avery kept insisting and pushing at him. **It was Avery's plea**, not what Martin Bryant wanted or freely pleaded. (see Insert *JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY* in Part 5)

¹² How and when these three victims were killed at Seascope has never been explained in a credible manner by the State. There is not a shred of hard evidence confirming they were killed by Martin Bryant. But there are official words on a knife and shooting and animosity, but none of the allegations are confirmed by logic or true facts. And none of those allegations were proved during a trial. Note that within the literature on the case, it clearly says the BMW vehicle which was driven to the Seascope property by the gunman was deliberately set alight there by a cop of the Special Operations Group of Tasmania Police. It is highly significant. It is said Glenn Pears, who was taken hostage enroute, was still inside the rear (boot/trunk) of the vehicle. Thus it seems Mr. Pears was killed, perhaps unintentionally, by Tasmania Police – not by Martin Bryant or any other person who was at Seascope cottage.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

AUSTRALIA




maps not to scale and place locations approx.

see opposite enlargement

dist: N-S c.364 kilometres; E-W c.306 kilometres
area: 68,401 square kilometres **pop:** 459,000 in 1996
size: Netherlands smaller; Lithuania similar; Ireland larger

TASMAN PENINSULA, TASMANIA



source: Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997

correction: Arthur Highway (A9) not Tasman Highway (A3) between Sorrell and Port Arthur

In this part of the book, significant writing of several people is included. Each was either directly involved with the incident, or was/is directly involved with the investigation of the incident. Their moral words speak for them as well as for their findings and subsequent beliefs. All these people have been criticized and most certainly cursed for **seeking and speaking the truth**.

When reading their words, there are some things you need to bear in mind. Not one of these good people knew anything about the incident until it happened. While Mmes. Cooper and Scurr had horrible first-hand experiences as they were at the Port Arthur Historic Site, Messrs. Beattie, MacGregor, and Schulze were not directly involved with the incident. But the latter three bring the needed external viewpoint to us for consideration.

Also note that no one, regardless of their action, position, rank, *etc.*, could possibly grasp every component of the incident in its entirety – either at the time, or now decades later. So many facts and truths associated with each component are unknown. And not all the facts known to us are the truth. There were many actors in this incident, and we know the stages where action took place. But what went on behind the scenes of the incident and what has gone on since continues to hold the attention of ethical investigators. No thinking person would rely on the facts presented by officials as they have a diametrically different agenda. Their agenda is to keep, at all costs, the official narrative as the explanation of the Port Arthur incident.

The complexity of the incident/case is a challenge. Discoveries and realizations have been slow and incremental. But over time, a mass of truthful facts has been assembled which prove beyond all reasonable doubt that **Martin Bryant was not the gunman** who planned, orchestrated, and acted out the entire incident – either on his own or with assistance.

And please note that if you still believe Bryant was the lone gunman at the Port Arthur Historic Site, he also has to be the lone gunman at all seven sites. He cannot just be responsible for the killing at the Broad Arrow Café and not be responsible for all the others. And if witnesses along the way say **Bryant was not the gunman**, there are several who have stated this in writing, and if indisputable facts confirm Bryant was not the gunman, and there are many such facts, these truths cannot be erased from reality by the so-called plea of guilty which Bryant was coerced and browbeaten to make.

Also please bear in mind that all those whose words make up this part of the book did not write their words to garner praise or further their positions or profiles. Unlike officials whose status and career can be attached to official narratives, those whose words appear here have not stated them for self-gain, or self-aggrandizement, or self-preservation.¹³ Because an entity or a person can be described as official, this must never be interpreted to mean that what emanates therefrom is accurate, complete, and wholly integrous. Human trails of assassinations, disappearances, genocides, killing, torture, *etc.*, are signposted their entire length by corrupt officials. – **ed**.

¹³ The legal phrase associated with this fundamental consideration is: **Cui bono**. (Latin; to whose benefit?; pronounced KWE.bono) It is posed to stimulate thinking, and possibly an answer, to the matter of determining who perpetrated some act(s). The rationale for posing the question is the belief that the person(s) responsible for the act(s) is/are the one(s) who benefit from it – the benefit perceived to be forthcoming motivates the perpetration of the act(s).

SEARCH OUT, ASSEMBLE, PUBLISH

Stewart K. Beattie¹⁴

A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur; 2006

[T]he matters I have raised with you here, are I believe of the gravest nature possible.¹⁵

FROM the mid 1980s, Noel Hicks, the National Party candidate for the federal seat/electorate of Riverina in New South Wales, expressed to me his grave misgivings as to the volume of legislation which produced **unwarranted controls upon ordinary citizens**. He exhibited a willingness to listen to the advice and concerns from aggrieved constituents when elected on 2 March 1996.

From early 1997, I began formally expressing my concerns to Noel Hicks about a number of anomalies that were coming to light regarding the Port Arthur massacre. Upon reflection the Hon. Noel Hicks MHR¹⁶ for Riverina never officially took any of the concerns I raised to the federal parliament; none whatsoever. After a series of letters, a meeting, and 18 months had passed Mr. Hicks was elected onto the "ASIO¹⁷ committee" and after just two years as our federal Member, Noel Hicks took the unusual step of taking early retirement.

The National Party's Kay Hull won the seat in the federal election of March 1998. It was in late May or early June, I met with a friend as witness to reiterate a letter expressing my growing concerns in relation to the massacre at Port Arthur. Initially Mrs. Hull's reaction was encouraging, even exhibiting an interest and concern. However, when I formally requested she take the matter to The House, in an instant the Member did a back-flip; she mailed to me a veracious rebuke. Mrs. Hull MHR refused point blank to fulfil her obligation to **represent my will** in the Parliament, instead choosing to deliberately and arbitrarily disenfranchise me, and her choice of words was unmistakably offensive. She told me emphatically not to attend her electoral office, or to write or phone her on the matter. At time of writing to my knowledge Mrs. Hull's position has not changed. Eight years on I remain disenfranchised.

This situation was *the catalyst*, which motivated me to begin to examine the whole of the Port Arthur massacre. In that same year, information on the massacre I posted to Joe Vialls¹⁸ was dismissed out of hand. That fomented in me a passion to search out, assemble and publish everything I could on the massacre that occurred at Port Arthur on 28 April 1996. Until recent times, whenever I uttered the words "Port Arthur massacre" it was my personal experience for all in earshot to go quiet and leave the conversation. Normally bold media editors **ignored my approach, or scoffed at me, and some others spat out rebuke.**¹⁹

¹⁴ Retired Australian gunsmith now author and investigator.

¹⁵ Extract from a letter (7 September 2004) sent by Stewart K. Beattie to Ken Moroney then commissioner of the NSW Police. (see Insert *LETTER TO KEN MORONEY* in Part 5)

¹⁶ Member of the House of Representatives, the legislature of NSW.

¹⁷ Australian Security Intelligence Organisation.

¹⁸ See *NAME INDEX* for related comments re the professional deceiver Joe Vialls.

¹⁹ This is how seekers of truth are generally treated. Such aggressive animosity and action is not new. It is the predictable response of those who **do not think** and who, because of this, become unsettled and disturbed by the questioning of an official narrative.

20 John Howard, then prime minister of Australia. (aka: *Bonsai* – a little Bush; *Captain Smirk*; etc.)

21 “A **D Notice** is a communication issued to the media by the Defence, Press and Broadcasting Committee. It outlines subjects which bear upon defence or national security, and requests editors to refrain from publishing certain information about those subjects. In other words this pre-wartime control is a legislated *censorship* of published news that has never been repealed by governments; they always seek to extend their powers but once having these powers enacted, governments NEVER repeal their legislation. Though successive governments would have you believe free speech is preserved in what they claim to be a *free and democratic society* . The origin of the insidious **D Notice** was England in 1912, and since 1952 in Australia they have been issued by the Defence, Press & Broadcasting Committee comprised of 16 representatives of the print and broadcasting media along with four Defence personnel of the government. Although they rely upon a voluntary arrangement, it becomes very obvious the taboos associated with the print and electronic media informing the public of the grave accusations that have been raised from time to time regarding the Port Arthur incident, the situation remains undeniably very tightly controlled, and very censored.” (Beattie) This editor has not found any evidence of a **D Notice** applying to the Port Arthur case. A related letter was faxed to the prime minister of Australia Julia Gillard, on 1 February and again on 14 February 2013. As anticipated, **no reply was received**. A copy of that letter and an email dated 17 February 2013 were also directed to Dr. Kathleen Dermody, secretary, senate standing committee on foreign affairs, defence, and trade. (She was also sent a draft part of the book *MASS MURDER* .) **No reply was received**. This editor is not concerned about any **D Notice**. What he is more concerned about is the three mongrel officials – Avery, Bugg, Cox. If a **D Notice** does exist, it will have been issued to protect these three criminals. And it will all be paid for by taxpayers, the same people who **the State murdered at Port Arthur** . see *OFFICIAL COVER-UPS*

In my experience most politicians remain true to their hidden masters. Howard²⁰ is no exception. Only a tyrant would deny individuals their inalienable RIGHT to self-defence. Rich men make the wars politicians declare; poor men fight, spill their blood and give their lives for nothing more than medals hung on ribbons. Perhaps the journalists’ demeanour results from the issuance of a **D Notice**²¹ to the media against people such as me, or indeed the whole of the Port Arthur massacre story.

In 2002, federal attorney general, the Hon. Darryl Williams introduced to the House seven Bills of draconian amendments along with the horrid **Security Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002** , concurrently with their *coalition-of-the-willing* partners. While taxpayer-funded fridge magnets told people to “be alert and not alarmed,” in true Orwellian fashion and concurrently, the ministry promised to “fight terror(ists).” More than a few people became fearful – with good reason – while the majority began hating minority communities as a past-time.

As their *new order* agenda rolled out, it has materialised into a bizarre madness: control by way of fear and trauma. Now theoretically possible *incidents* are selected. Scenarios of theoretically possible causes are then woven. Then presumably, the theoretical culprit with a theoretical grudge or cause is summarily arrested and jailed.

Those wielding the power in America, Britain and Australia at least, have, as a solution to the theories embarked upon, actual solutions of clone-like pre-emptive security to theoretical and therefore non-existent “threats” to our nations. This entails penalising and destroying their people’s entire heritage of justice and law, previously their birthright for centuries. In Australia, the now infamous summit of the unconstitutional “heads of government” meeting (each of the states being sovereign), held on 27 September 2005, saw the state ministers join in a barefaced conspiracy to defile **The Constitution** by agreeing to deprive the people of their basic rights and ancient protections under the law that have guarded against free men and women ever being arbitrarily arrested and incarcerated without legal counsel or trial by their peers.

Until now, these rights I speak of used to set us apart from despotic republics which currently the *coalition-of-the-willing* are seeking to destroy. It is entirely possible for these draconian laws to see many ordinary patriotic Australians branded as dissidents at least, or *terrorists* at worst! The definition of the term patriot has been turned on its head by the establishment; **black is now white and the lie made holy** .

The illusionary opposition with Kim Beazley (Australian Labor Party – ALP) reinstated as *leader* in an extraordinary move has demonstrated a willingness not only to “support the Bill” but to **outdo** anything Ruddock or Howard drafted; flinging people into prison is one thing, but Beazley expressed a willingness to give the coalition’s sinister *storm troopers* power to lock-down entire suburbs so as to search any and everyone they wish to and **still fling them into prison!**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

But what of the protests from journalists? Well they screamed blue murder for a time then, just as the legislation reached the Senate, they lost voice. Another story caught their attention – a scandal here, notoriety or violence there; the bread and butter of media barons since time immemorial. But, in 1995 when an out-of-office treasurer blossomed into Liberal Party leadership, through television-friendly lenses restraining his box-thorn-hedge eyebrows and with a wrap-around smile concealing his Menzies' agenda, reptilian-eyes were fixed upon the Commonwealth's top job.

Fifty-seven days before the massacre, on 2 March 1996, John Howard lead a coalition group of Liberals and a diminishing National Party to a coalition win in the federal election. Along with another of his best kept secrets – Goods & Services Tax (GST) for all – was his hatred for all guns, and private citizens who wished to keep them. He successfully concealed this hatred even from some coalition ministers until the opportunity presented itself. Despite his contrary rhetoric, Howard did have an agenda. His duplicity was exposed all in good time when the dogs of war (on terror) were unleashed on humanity at Port Arthur on 28 April 1996. I'm confident in stating Howard's agenda had been pent-up and cleverly concealed for his entire political life, or even longer: **hatred is not a spontaneous emotion!**

After winning a battle, the victor can afford to be candid. For after the state ministers had surrendered to Howard's threats on 10 May 1996, he began disclosing his true emotions: "We will find any means we can to further restrict [firearms]. Because I hate guns. I don't think people should have guns. Unless they are police, in the military or security industry. Ordinary citizens should not have weapons."²²

Howard had been prime minister for 57 days when the terrorist attack at Port Arthur unfolded. Twelve days later, and with the national trauma (Howard called it *amazement*) mixed with the palpable grief among survivors and loved ones of the massacre now at its height, Howard stated this during a nationally televised Nine Network interview: "I would call that very definitely an extraordinary outpouring of amazement and grief in this country and I knew out of that there was an opportunity to grab the moment and think about a fundamental change to gun laws in this country."²³

Howard said he did not want Australia to adopt the American stance. "I did not want Australia to go down the American path," he said. "There are some things about America I admire and there are some things I don't. And one of the things I don't admire about America is their slavish love of guns. They're evil."²⁴ But as a partner in the *coalition of the willing*, the butchering of Iraqi women and children with very big guns is okay. Predictably, that was not a subject raised by him or the media in this widely reported anniversary press-fest.

During the 1995-6 pre-election campaign the contentious GST was raised. This broad-based tax had earlier been a most unpopular government policy objective, while Howard was shadow treasurer under John Hewson.²⁵ Asked in 1995 whether he'd ever adopt the GST again as policy, Howard replied [lied]: "**Never ever. It's dead.**"

²² Interview; Philip Clark program; 2GB (Sydney radio); 17 April 2002.

²³ "10 May 1996; Howard threatened to curtail federal funds to the states. This let him announce a scheme of so-called *uniform gun laws* throughout Australia. Howard's scheme involved the expenditure of a predicted AU\$500 million he promoted as a *buy-back* of privately owned firearms, which the Act more accurately described as the **surrender and destruction of firearms**, in the name of *safety*. It was funded by a special 1.7 percent levy upon all taxpayers' Medicare contributions. In quick time, the Australians experienced the reality of such **treachery** with the use of firearms in crimes of violence escalating at an alarming rate and now they can safely say they likely will become **victims in their lifetime.**" (Beattie; added emphasis)

²⁴ Interview; National Nine News; 1 March 2006.

²⁵ Leader of the Liberal Party of Australia from 1990-94.

TWO BUS LOADS
North American Tourists

I do not believe they were ever expected to arrive at Port Arthur on that day (28 April 1996) which is very unusual as mostly all bus tours were booked for their different tours etc. many days prior. It is very hard to slot in 70 extra people. That many tourists would mean extra two guides would be needed as there was a limit of 35 people per walking tour.

I was speaking to Mrs. Ann Hillman, who was in charge of the tour office, when I arrived from the ferry trip to eat my lunch. She said that **two bus loads of American tourists had arrived unexpectedly** and that they wanted to do a trip on the ferry (*Bundeena*) at 1:30 p.m.

Prior to Easter, the ferry was going out at least every half hour doing trips (8 per day) around the harbour, as every person who purchased a ticket to tour Port Arthur Historic Site was given in the price charged this complimentary tour of the harbour.

The *Isle of the Dead*, which was a small island off the mainland,²⁶ was the convict burial ground and we took a one-hour tour over there between 12 and 1 p.m. and 3 and 4 p.m. On this day I had returned from my trip to the island at 1 p.m. and the ferry was tied up until 2 p.m. **These tourists were booked on a tour of the harbour at 2:30 p.m.**, an extra tour put on for them by Ann as they were not expected.

We believe they were to be targets on the 1:30 p.m. sailing that didn't happen. So the shooting venue was changed to the Broad Arrow Café at 1:30 p.m. It HAD to happen at 1:30 as there were so many plans in place and I believe that these people were part of the plan to be killed out on the *Bundeena*.

Wendy Scurr
email to editor
16 October 2012
(amended; emphasis added)

If you view the Police training video, you will see Luppo Prins, then assistant commissioner of Tasmania Police, saying the two police boats (Van Dieman & Vigilant) were sent to Port Arthur. But those vessels did not arrive. So where did they go, and why? The staff at Port Arthur Historic Site was desperate for assistance and the police on those two boats would have been a big help and reassurance. It is certain that this Prins thought the shooting might involve the cruise boat Bundeena. But it seems that once the Tasmania Police learnt the shooting had taken place at the Broad Arrow Café, not on the Isle of the Dead or the Bundeena, the police boats were radioed back to base. What a criminal thing to do. Nowhere in the case-related literature has this editor been able to find any additional statement(s) on what those police vessels did that Sunday. Without a doubt those bus loads of North American tourists cursed that change in the schedule – but it probably saved their lives. – ed.

²⁶ On goaustralia.about.com it says: "In the harbour adjacent to the Port Arthur historic site lies the Isle of the Dead which was selected as a burial place for those who died on Port Arthur. Some 1,000 burials took place on [that island] from 1833 to 1877, a majority of them of convicts and former convicts."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Draft legislation to impose a GST was commenced immediately the coalition took the treasury benches in 1996 and soon Howard could reveal his most cosseted agenda exposing his consuming hatred of guns and their private owners – but first the inanimate gun had to be thoroughly demonised. And all of this from a politician when speaking in support of his colleagues, including the Liberal's subservient and diminishing National Party partners, is reputed to have said: "We want to assert the very principle that truth is absolute, truth is supreme, truth is never disposable in national political life."²⁷

But regarding his *war on terror* and in an eleventh hour bid to express its outrage, which had also welled up among many in the nation, the normally conservative Law Council of Australia objected "particularly to the introduction of control orders and preventative detention orders," contained in the December 2005 proposed amendments to the "anti-terrorism" laws. On behalf of all its constituent members, the president of the Law Council of Australia wrote directly to the Member for Bennelong, John Winston Howard, stating this: "The legislation offends our traditional rights and freedoms. The laws have properly been described as draconian. The justification advanced for their introduction has been meagre. It is impossible for the Australian community to know whether the laws are necessary or proportionate."²⁸

Even some cartoonists dared to lampoon our treacherous *masters* and I salute them for their pluck. I awoke on the morning of my 64th birthday in December 2005 – to learn these obnoxious draconian law amendments had passed through the upper House²⁹ with no more than token amendments; the ALP opposition supported the Bill along with lone and now reviled Queensland national party senator, Barnaby Joyce. Applied domestically, **Howard's principles of justice are quite deplorable.**

It's a sad and disturbing situation, when even those who investigate and publish findings of a covert terrorist attack, the Port Arthur massacre, are threatened by legislated enactments which arguably exceed the power granted parliament by The Constitution.³⁰ Would these Commonwealth agents dare to admit that in researching and writing this story, I'm in possession of "something" (their term), these new thought police could link to acts they define as "terrorism"? Even *Habeas Corpus* – enacted 1640 – the right of every Australian since the First Fleet of 1788, **has by this offensive enactment been suspended**; replaced by the UN's Babylonian rule of law!

I'm concerned for those who live a delusion of *democracy*. For in truth, we live under a tyranny in government, one and the same as that which two centuries ago Thomas Jefferson warned all free men was "inevitable," and to be on guard against and the very purpose for retaining at all cost the **right to keep and bear arms**. But remember it was an apparent psychic Roland Browne, in 1996 the co-chair of the National Coalition for Gun Control (NCGC), who with astonishing accuracy predicted the Port Arthur massacre when he said; "We are going to see a mass shooting in Tasmania...unless we get national gun control laws."³¹

²⁷ On the Nebo literature website – neboliterature.mrkdevelopment.com.au/film/frontline/telling-the-truth The author Beattie also stated this: "Yet over the past years countless ministers of Howard's government have been exposed as misrepresenting the truth with impunity and his lame justification of the **deceit** regarding the Children Overboard Affair was that he did not need to apologise because he had believed what he said to be true at the time so that was it. Lately he has justified his **lies** by merely claiming he had not been informed of the true situations."

²⁸ Letter of 3 November 2005 sent by John North, President of the Law Council of Australia, to John Howard.

²⁹ The Australian federal legislature is bicameral: house of representatives (lower; elected); and, senate (upper; elected).

³⁰ As chief judge of the high court of Australia, John Latham stated this: "A pretended law made in excess of power is not and never has been a law at all. Anybody in the country is entitled to disregard it..." See: *Uniform Tax Case HCA 1942* (65 CLR 373 at 408).

³¹ A Current Affair – Ray Martin; Nine Network; March 1996.

What knowledge did Roland possess about which ordinary Australians were ignorant? Perhaps this explanation is simpler. Maybe Roland Browne by his then position in the federal justice department and close association with Tasmania's legal aid commission – its chairman then being no other than **David Gunson**, Martin Bryant's second lawyer³² – was just well connected to an *impeccable* source.

Does this explain how Browne was already there in the media room at Police headquarters in Hobart, when ABC journalists arrived on the afternoon of the massacre? Is it also not just too convenient, that in 1996 the NCGC had as its patron in Perth, Western Australia, none other than the then federal attorney general, Daryl Williams? His successor in this high office, Phillip Ruddock, now carries on to oversee the passage of further amendments to their **abhorrent war-on-terror** legislation to see it pass through the parliament and enforced as law. However, one must realise that collectively good people **must speak out publicly** so as to ensure evil does not prosper over the individual.

With that very reason in mind, my work is published **in the national interest** and in the interest of every freedom-loving Australian who dares to question these tyrants' arrogance, threats, and unconstitutional actions against our people that are in truth **acts of sedition, treachery, and treason**; under the *Crimes Act 1914* such actions are prescribed severe punishment.

Would parliament dare allow the people to express their will by referendum on such important matters? In the true vein of a legal mindset, why would Howard risk asking a question on anything, other than for that which he foreknows their answer? Remember there *never ever will be a GST*? The people would have to conduct their own referendum and realistically that is not about to happen.

It is my hope and prayer that by exposing the Port Arthur tragedy, **an unrelenting disquiet and outrage across the nation** will spotlight every horrid individual as they scurry for their bolt holes to enjoy their superannuation, the amassed rewards of their misdeeds. Of course I should include among this number those members of the international cabal who've planned and plotted similar exercises, which I can demonstrate were replicated across the globe.

These people must never be allowed to forget the legacy they have foisted upon our nation: helplessness, unconsolable grief and, that product of trauma, the illness **PTSD** (post-traumatic stress disorder) – an insidious, silent illness which is manifest to varying degrees among almost all surviving victims of the massacre – and, on the nation as a whole, a loathing acceptance of control.³³

It is my hope that the sheer magnitude of that disquiet does force change – for the good. In the long run, if nothing is ventured, if you the public are only partially committed to such a worthy cause, then for generations to come, the destruction of the people's rights, their freedoms and their wellbeing will be assured; **our children's children will hate us for this inheritance.**

32 The first to *represent* Bryant was the legal-aid* lawyer **Debra Rigby**. She was replaced by **David Gunson** who was replaced by **John Avery**. (* All three were appointed by the State. Martin Bryant was not allowed to engage his own lawyer, nor could he if he wanted to. It was not simply a matter of him being confused and totally out of his intellectual depth, which he was. It was not just a matter of him not having the required guardian with him, which is true. It was the fact that the State had control over his assets. A guardianship order controlling his sizeable assets came into place in **November 1993**. The public employees of Tasmanian Perpetual Trustees who, from then on, controlled Bryant's money would not have gone against the State and assisted Bryant to engage a lawyer to stop the State imprisoning him.)

33 PTSD is described as follows by Mark Creamer, an associate professor at the University of Melbourne, on the *australianprescriber.com* website:

- The person has been exposed to a traumatic event; their response involves fear, helplessness, or horror;
- The traumatic event is persistently re-experienced (one of: intrusive memories, dreams, flashbacks, psychological distress, physiological reactivity);
- Persistent avoidance of stimuli associated with the trauma & numbing of general responsiveness (three of: avoidance of thoughts, feelings, conversations; avoidance of situations, places, people; amnesia; loss of interest; flattened affect; estrangement from significant others; sense of foreshortened future);
- Persistent symptoms of increased arousal (two of: sleep problems, anger, poor concentration, hypervigilance, exaggerated startle response);
- The disturbance causes significant distress or impairment in functioning; and,
- Duration more than one month.

(8 November 2012)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

To succeed in ANY venture, it is the resolute, steadfast commitment to a project that the quality of tenacity will carry the day and win out for us all. So **let us all partake in this project of exposing what actually happened that April day at Port Arthur in Tasmania.**

If there are some people out there who remain unconvinced that Port Arthur was a **psycho-political exercise**, a massive conspiracy – **not a conspiracy theory** – then consider this admission made in a letter to Mr. Ron Owen of Queensland's Firearm Owners Association, dated 17 November 1995 – five months before the massacre – from the Queensland Police Service's commissioner's office:

"At its meeting on 10 November 1995, the Australasian Police Ministers' Council (APMC) discussed a proposal to move forwards national uniformity in firearms legislation."

And for something truly telling, we know that "**national uniformity in firearms legislation**" spoken of above was already agreed to by all state police ministers except Queensland, **way back in November of 1987!**³⁴

Or consider this Internet release, at gun.law.gov.au/Guns/releases/releases.htm, under this nation's Coat of Arms [*sic*] and entitled *The Australian Firearms Buyback*. It heralds federal government support for an "International firearms study," to be undertaken by a former AIC's (Australian Investment Commission) statistical analyst, John Walker, and contains one of the most obnoxious *faux pas* I've seen to date. We shouldn't be surprised if by now that web posting has gone, for it reads: "**We will also be closely involved in the subsequent development of proposals for reform [to gun control laws], which is expected to commence in May 1996.**"

Two witness documents surely should suffice as irrefutable proof of a conspiracy of global proportions being put in place by the real architects and partners of gun control, the commonwealth government's ministers and their bureaucrats, firstly drawn-up under the Keating ALP ministers and then delivered by the Howard LP/NP ministers. Keating's colleagues were informing dealers that the already drafted, *uniform gun laws* that everyone thinks resulted from Port Arthur were being moved forward many months earlier in November 1995.

In the latter example after the event, and under Howard's hand dated 10 January 1997, its author has inadvertently and obviously used earlier documents promoting the UN's program timetable which, like Roland Browne, was predicting a significant event occurring in "**May 1996.**" An incident which would fulfil their expectations for Australia – gun-control laws would then commence.

Bureaucrats appear to work for any master. But reality demonstrates that they definitely promote and even create machinery that fulfils an ideology that crosses all present political boundaries. Surely you do not require further convincing evidence.

³⁴ David Armstrong. *Private gun ban in tough new law*; The Daily Telegraph; 11 December 1987: pp. 1-2.

Those in authority are our servants. It is not pushing the limits too far to point out that our servants have a *duty of impartial care and service* to all of the Commonwealth's people, to uphold our right to convene at the earliest possible time an open and impartial coronial inquest into all that enshrouds the Port Arthur massacre. That is the least which is owed the victims, survivors and their relatives who lost loved ones or suffered hurt and injury from that horrid thespian exercise. The majority of survivors only were ever able to extract entirely inadequate compensation for their hurt from the Tasmanian government as is explained in Chapter 26.³⁵

John Howard, in a now familiar manner of a suburban solicitor that he is, at the time refused to admit any federal liability that would require them to make monetary assistance to the survivors available in any form. One survivor whom I have gotten to know, who lost his fresh, young bride to the gunman's bullets, received a pitiful settlement for his awful loss of less than \$80,000 and that measly sum **only after years of legal wrangling!** So our collectively benevolent politicians expect this man to eke out the rest of life at the rate of around \$2,000 per annum.

But there is at least one exception to this rule: the Melbourne-based law firm of Slater and Gordon successfully sued the employment agency and Commonwealth Bank employer of an unnamed female survivor and secured an undisclosed six-figure settlement; more on that mysterious case later.³⁶

So I also ask you to contemplate the circumstances that now surround all who survived that outrageous terrorist act on 28 April 1996; the Port Arthur Historic Site staff, visitors and service personnel and even the **falsely convicted accused**, all of whom suffer continuing hurt, trauma, and anxiety and who have been abandoned and ignored by *the system* – pray for them.

All Australians deserve to know what really occurred there on the Tasman Peninsula that autumn in 1996.³⁷

You can play your part to ensure that it does happen. Remember the power of one. It really does come down to YOU. For my fellow Australians to obtain the justice they deserve, it comes down to you expressing your outrage. **You must speak out and tell all who cross your path that it's intolerable that their fellow countrymen are abandoned to suffer such injustice.** ■

(amended; original italics; original & added emphasis)

³⁵ Chapter 26 of Stewart Beattie's *A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur*; DVD Book, 2006.

³⁶ On 10 August 2004, The Mercury newspaper of Hobart, described the sum as follows: "...a secret six-figure payout...."

³⁷ This point is correct, but viewed from a moral perspective it goes beyond Australians just deserving to know. Australians have every right to know and officials have **no right to cover up what really occurred there on the Tasman Peninsula that autumn in 1996.** This covering up of those events, and of the people involved with the planning of those events and the execution of them, are crimes. Not only do Australians have a right to know, the whole world has a need to know as these highly suspicious and never fully or credibly explained incidents occur around the world. Official *lone-nut* gunman stories too frequently turn out to be false when investigated thoroughly and reported honestly.

WE HAVE BEEN TOLD

Andrew S. MacGregor

hiddenmysteries.org

*Sunday 28th and Monday 29th of April 1996 –
most Australians are only vaguely aware of
the events that occurred on those two days
at and near Port Arthur in Tasmania.³⁸*

WE have been told that a gunman armed with a Colt AR-15 semi-automatic rifle fired 29 rounds inside the Broad Arrow Café at Port Arthur, killing 20 and wounding another 12 of the approximately 60 people inside the café. It is also stated that the killer fired 17 shots, killing 12 and wounding another five victims in the first 15 seconds. Most of the dead were headshot, and the killer fired from his right hip, not sighted shots from his right shoulder.³⁹ **So we have been told.**

The gunman then changed magazines and left the café carrying the *Prince* sports bag with his right arm through the carry straps, still firing the Colt AR-15 until he changed firearms to a Belgian FN assault rifle and continued his assault killing four and wounding five at the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS) bus and car parking area.

The gunman then drove towards the tollbooth, where he murdered the Mikac mother and her two children, and then at the tollbooth, stole a BMW after murdering the four who had been travelling in it. He drove a short distance to the Port Arthur service station/general store and kidnapped Glenn Pears before murdering Zoe Hall, his female companion. Then, the gunman drove northward along the Arthur Highway and parked the BMW just off the highway outside the entrance to a cottage called Seascope.

It is interesting to note that **three minutes after the murder** of Zoe Hall, the former Nubeena policeman, the constable Chris Iles, who was at the time stationed at the Sorell Police Station, attended at the Port Arthur Store and spoke to Jim Laycock and Kyle Spruce, then drove off in pursuit of the stolen BMW. However, Seascope is only approximately 4 kilometres from Port Arthur, and there are no side roads prior to Seascope. Yet, there **is no mention of this constable Iles again in any official records of the incident.**

The BMW was next reportedly seen by John Rooke. It seems he saw the vehicle diverge across the Arthur Highway and park outside Seascope, then saw him commence shooting at passing traffic. The gunman shot at six different vehicles as they passed the driveway of that cottage, seriously wounding two persons – Linda White and Carol Williams, wife of a Canadian embassy official. Other persons

³⁸ Adaptation of the opening words of the article *WE HAVE BEEN TOLD* which is at hiddenmysteries.org.

³⁹ There is a reason why MacGregor identified the gunman as being right handed. The gunman using his right hand is also confirmed by the witness Kyle Spruce whose statement of 2 May 1996 reads in part as follows: “This male had a rifle in his right hand and was pushing the other male around with his left hand.” The righthandedness of the gunman is significant because Martin Bryant **fired lefthanded.**

receiving lesser injuries, mainly from broken glass, before the gunman withdrew to Seascope cottage and prepared for the coming police siege. A total of **35 dead** and **23 injured** for the whole incident, including Seascope cottage.

On Sunday morning, Martin Bryant was arrested naked. When he exited a fiery Seascope, he was clothed in black⁴⁰ and they were alight. He vanished from view for a time while he removed that clothing which had badly burnt his back and buttocks. This supposed gunman had left his alleged armoury behind. So being unarmed, Bryant saved himself from becoming another SOG statistic (killing) like Joe Gilewicz.⁴¹

What the media did not inform the Australian public was that ASIO (Australian Security Intelligence Organisation) had also arrived on the scene. The Tasmanian Police had requested assistance from the Victoria Police SOG (Special Operations Group, or within the job, Sons of God) to reinforce their own SOG squad. However there was no mention of any ASIO personnel being requested at the scene, but at 10:15 hours that Sunday (28th) night Australia's ASIO was dispatched to Port Arthur.⁴² Furthermore, at the debriefing held at the Tasmania Police Academy at Rokeby on the 29th May 1996, ASIO was again in attendance.⁴³

This must raise the question of just what were ASIO doing within a State jurisdiction? Could the Port Arthur massacre have been a *terrorist attack*? The evidence as shown to the Australian public states otherwise and certainly during both the Hoddle Street and Queen Street massacres,⁴⁴ there were no ASIO members collating information. Thus, **why were ASIO operatives called in from weekend leave, and dispatched post-haste to Port Arthur?**

This is reinforced by the fact that the Victoria Police SOGs were instructed that they were to take every means possible to apprehend the person inside Seascope cottage alive, as that person was a possible terrorist. Was it this belief that the person or persons responsible for the Port Arthur massacre were possible terrorists, justification for the presence of ASIO? In fact, the massacre at Port Arthur was indeed a *terrorist attack* in every sense of the word, and it was almost brought undone by one Tasmania Police SOG member at the Seascope cottage. However, to properly portray the events that occurred on the Tasman Peninsula on Sunday the 28th and Monday 29th of April 1996, one must start at the beginning.

There is sufficient evidence to show that Martin Bryant left his home in Clare Street, New Town, at 09:47 hours, and then proceeded to the Tasman Peninsula. This would place Bryant arriving at Seascope cottage approximately 90 minutes later, had he not made all the different stops along the route, as he [is alleged to have done] on that particular morning. Thus there is no possibility that Bryant was present at Seascope when three witnesses, being Andrew and Lyn Simmons who heard two shots emanating from Seascope at 10:40 hours, and Douglas McCutcheon another near neighbour who heard a series of shots at about the same time on that Sunday morning.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ No details relevant to these black clothes appear in any of the official documents provided to the public. It does seem that the State does not want you to give them any attention. **Where did Martin Bryant get these black clothes?** It seems he did not own them, and he did not leave his home wearing them on the morning of 28 April 1996.

⁴¹ Unjustifiably shot and killed at Peverata in 1991 by the SOG member Michael Fogarty. (see Paul Tapp. *Disquiet*; 1998. extract at Part 3)

⁴² Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur – An Overview of the police response*. Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 6.

⁴³ Luppó Prins. *Port Arthur emergency response – police operations centre*. Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 29.

⁴⁴ The Hoddle Street massacre occurred in Melbourne, Australia, on 9 August 1987. There, the 19-year-old former Australian army officer cadet Julian Knight killed seven and injured 19 others. The Queen Street massacre also took place in Melbourne. On 8 December 1987, a former law student, Frank Vitkovic, is officially said to be responsible for the deaths of nine people as well as the wounding of five others. (Readers are referred to the literature on these two highly questionable incidents.)

⁴⁵ See the King, McCutcheon, and Simmons statements at Part 7. The times declared in these statements, all of which are credible, preclude Martin Bryant being at Seascope when these shots were fired.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Those two shots are important, as David Martin was found to have been shot twice. But, there was no evidence to positively prove that his spouse Sally Martin had been shot. Rather, she died from a blow that fractured her skull. Then there was the blood on the hunting knife [allegedly] found in the *Prince* sports bag which DNA tests suggest was that of David Martin.⁴⁶ What becomes even more interesting was the fact that David's body was found with a gag over his mouth. The presence of a gag strongly suggests that David was not murdered immediately, but was bound and gagged prior to his being shot. Of course this raises the question, how could David Martin subject himself to being tied and gagged by a single person? It takes two hands to perform such an act, and another two to operate a rifle. Then there was the body of Glenn Pears which was [allegedly] found with two sets of handcuffs attached to the body.

We must now consider the only reported police on duty within an hour [driving time] from the Tasman Peninsula, were the constables **Garry Whittle** from Dunalley, and **Paul Hyland** from Nubeena. Both were called out, by radio from police headquarters in Hobart, to attend at Saltwater River in relation to a supposed heroin cache, and coincidentally arrived at that location just prior 13:30 hours.⁴⁷ The heroin cache turned out to be jars of soap powder, and the person who had reported the find to police was not located. So who initiated this telephone call to police?⁴⁸ **It was not Martin Bryant**, and police have been very coy in relation to how the only protection for the Tasman and Forestier Peninsulas was lured to that remote area. Shortly after these two constables reported their presence at Saltwater River, **the massacre at Port Arthur commenced.**

With the initial call to the Tasmania Police via the emergency telephone number 000, logged in at 13:32 hours, the police were alerted to something occurring at Port Arthur. Within minutes they received numerous calls giving them more details of what had been occurring at the Tasman Peninsula.

At this stage what the police had was a lone gunman creating absolute panic and mayhem in the area, and it was treated as such. At 13:38 hours, constables Whittle and Hyland who were still at the Saltwater River region were recalled posthaste, with Whittle attending at the Port Arthur General Store, and Hyland attending at the Fox and Hounds Hotel. Hyland was informed that the gunman was at Seascope cottage, and so he headed in that direction, with Whittle in support.

It takes 25 minutes to travel from Saltwater River to Port Arthur, but both policemen travelled back to the Nubeena Police Station for some **unknown reason**, and then split up, with constable Whittle taking the most direct route to Port Arthur, and constable Hyland taking the longer route via Taranna in an attempt to cut off any escape by the gunman at Port Arthur.

Upon arriving at Seascope, constable Whittle secured the front gate, thus ensuring that the apparent lone gunman was trapped inside the buildings. Constable Hyland proceeded further up the Arthur Highway

⁴⁶ Suggestive DNA tests do not confirm the DNA is from any person and only that person. That the DNA of David Martin was allegedly found on a knife allegedly belonging to Bryant does not confirm Bryant killed David Martin with this alleged knife. Nor does it prove Mr. Martin was killed with this knife. Material containing human DNA is easily transferred. The State constantly pushed onto the public facts which, if they are unthinkingly accepted with no thought being given to them seem negative for Bryant. Recall that no one spoke up for the **mentally-handicapped, confused, and troubled** Bryant who was turned into an *insane monster* by the media then the public. For comprehensible details about how alleged DNA evidence is misunderstood and misused, see *DNA evidence befuddles jurors* by Nicola Berkovic; theaustralian.com.au; 8 April 2011. For a detailed exposé of dangers associated with DNA evidence, see Jane Goodman-Delahunty & Lindsay Hewson. *Enhancing fairness in DNA jury trials*; Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice; March 2010.

⁴⁷ This whole matter of the two local police constables being sent off on a drug tip-off has no underlying credibility whatsoever. That at the very same time the largest number of killings in modern-day Australia occurred, just screams **inside job**. Those local cops, who might not have known a thing about what was going to unfold at and near Port Arthur, were sent off some distance so they would not interfere with the officially planned incident (**inside job**) at and near Port Arthur.

⁴⁸ Wendy Scurr phoned the police pleading for help because there was shooting going on at the Port Arthur Historic Site. She had trouble convincing the cop on the phone that she was not involved with some practical joke. But after a person allegedly called the cops about alleged drugs at Saltwater River, the cops could not even identify the person who they say reported the drugs. Reader, this is just more evidence confirming the murderous incident at and near Port Arthur was an **inside job**.

BLUE BAG & THE TRAY

THERE were so many lies told during and after the Port Arthur massacre that every time a new piece of evidence surfaces it is inevitable that a few more lies are exposed. So it was with the recent acquisition of a **police eyes only** tape discovered in a second-hand shop.⁴⁹ On that tape there was a short segment about the Port Arthur massacre and actual police footage on the day after the massacre.

For those who may recall, the shooter was carrying a "blue bag." There was also an earlier picture of the alleged "blue bag" shown on television. In that picture from the television, the "blue bag" is sitting on a table with some garbage around it and in the background all the rest of the tables in the café are in pristine condition. **The picture was obviously a fake** – but why?

Well, now we know why.

On the day of the massacre at least two statements referred to the food tray that the shooter was eating from. The statements mentioned that the shooter was drinking from a yellow Solo can and that he was not wearing gloves. That tray was important as it was like a personal calling card from the shooter. It contained fingerprints, thumb prints, palm prints, saliva, sweat, skin and possibly hair from the shooter. That tray contained real physical evidence as to the identity of the shooter.

After the massacre the issue of the tray never came up again. It was assumed that the tray was lost in the chaos of the massacre. That was further supported by the police resorting to the very flawed photo ID more than a month after the massacre in order to point a finger at Bryant.

Now, after 8 years, we know where the tray was – it was right next to the "blue bag". It was left exactly where the shooter put it down. All the evidence was preserved for the police investigation. Here is a picture of the fake picture shown on television and the real "blue bag" and the tray in the café.

<http://www.shootersnews.addr.com/snparealsportsbag.html>

So where is the lab report on the tray? Did Bryant's fingerprints and DNA show up on the tray and contents?

Here is a dirty little secret of many police investigations. If some exculpatory⁵⁰ evidence is given to the prosecutor, then the prosecutor is duty bound to furnish that exculpatory evidence to the defence. Since that exculpatory evidence may completely compromise the prosecution case, then in many cases that evidence never gets to the prosecutor – **it gets lost.**

Getting rid of the lab report in regards to the tray is one thing. However, anyone taking a look at that video would immediately ask about the tray and whether there was a lab report – so the tray also had to be **lost!** No tray, no report. **Thus the fake picture we all saw on television.**

(cont.)

⁴⁹ This second-hand shop, which is also identified as the Tip Shop, sold reusable items. It was at this shop that the police **training video** was sold to a customer (Olga Scully).

⁵⁰ This adjective is derived from the noun exculpate meaning to clear of a charge, prove guiltless or blameless.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The story doesn't stop there however. One of the witnesses, Rebecca McKenna, gave a good account⁵¹ about the shooter and his tray. I have been informed that all the witness statements given on the day of the massacre were **handwritten**. Further, subsequent typed statements were produced which **were altered** from the original versions given to police. Rebecca McKenna's statement is one such statement. Here is part of the typed statement given to her later (shortened for brevity):

- "This male was carrying a tray with his food on it"; "His facial skin appeared to be freckly and he was pale"; "He was not wearing gloves"; "When he sat down, he placed his video camera and bag on the floor and began to eat his lunch. I noticed that he had a can of Solo and a plastic Schweppes cup on the table"; "I saw him drink his cordial and I noticed that he appeared anxious"; "The last thing I saw with regard to him was his tray falling out (*explanation handwritten*: "tipping - didn't actually see it fall") of his hand as he was going back inside the cafeteria."

Do you see what has been done? The statement was altered to say "The last thing I saw with regard to him was **his tray falling out of his hand** as he was going back inside the cafeteria." However, Rebecca **caught the change and handwrote into the margin** "tipping - didn't actually see it fall."

So here we have the police, just four weeks after the massacre already trying to get rid of the tray. **As I said, every time a bit more evidence comes out, more lies are uncovered. Just imagine what an inquiry could find.**

UPDATE: The link above no longer has the original picture of the blue bag and the tray with the yellow Solo can on it. The police forced the real picture off the internet. There is only a badly done tracing of the real picture. And so the cover-up continues.⁵²

Terry Schulze

Sydney, NSW

email to editor

3 October 2012

(added & original emphasis)

*As this retired barrister Terry Schulze explains, McKenna's original statement (28 April 1996) was handwritten, and further investigation reveals it was, in the words of the witness, concluded "at midnight." Then, it was sent to Hobart where corrupt cops began to **work on it** as Schulze has proved. A second statement (30 May 1996) submitted by this witness confirms the tray did not fall out of the gunman's hand: "It was the bag that got caught in the fly wire door that nearly caused him to drop the tray." Two additional things need noting about the statements submitted by this witness: **i.** McKenna says (28 April 1996): "He appeared 'dopey' looking, his eyes appeared to be bloodshot." Nowhere in the literature does it say Martin Bryant had bloodshot eyes. He did not do drugs or smoke marijuana; and, **ii.** McKenna acknowledges (30 May 1996) she had "seen his face on television and in the newspapers." Clearly, McKenna's memory after 28 April 1996 had been contaminated by the media.⁵³ - **ed.***

⁵¹ Rebecca Kate McKenna. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996. (see her *Witness Statement* at Part 7)

⁵² See Part 2 for images of the blue bag and video camera which the gunman left behind in the Broad Arrow Café. They are on a table right next to the tray on which there are food containers and eating utensils which were handled by the gunman. Police willfully did not collect fingerprint and forensic evidence. Or if they did, this evidence was ignored by the DPP as it would have confirmed **Martin Bryant was not the gunman.**

⁵³ It is revealed in the literature that Martin Bryant did not use illicit drugs, either orally or intravenously. Nor did he smoke marijuana. The fact that the gunman's eyes were bloodshot suggests he had ingested some recreational drug or he had been given some drug to assist him do what he was about to do. Nowhere in the literature is there a record of an analysis for drugs having been conducted on the blood of Martin Bryant. It seems no such blood sample was taken from him for drug testing. And, like everyone else who saw the gunman at the Broad Arrow Café, the memory held by those witnesses was contaminated by the highly illegal media onslaught of images and words about Martin Bryant who the media clearly and repeatedly declared and implied was the gunman who all the witnesses had seen.

and set up a police roadblock to ensure that no further motorists entered the danger area. Whilst proceeding to set up this roadblock, constable **Hyland saw a naked dark-haired person** within the grounds at Seascapes enter the cottage. Constable Whittle also saw a naked person and states that it was **a female**.⁵⁴ Hyland set up the roadblock in company with Andrew Fogarty of the SOG. Shortly afterwards, constable Whittle was joined by constable Pat Allen of the Traffic Operations Group. With the arrival of Allen, shots were fired in their direction, striking the bush above them, so both policemen took cover in the ditch at the side of the road.

In the meantime, the other police services had not been idle. Superintendent Barry Bennett was called in just as assistant commissioner Luppo Prins initiated the SAC-PAV* national anti-terrorist plan that had been endorsed in November 1995. A police major incident room was set up at police headquarters with Luppo Prins the *Commander*, and a police forward command post at Taranna, where superintendent Bennett was the forward commander. The police negotiation team under sergeant Terry McCarthy was called to work, and an initial team of three SOG members were flown to Taranna to start operations to apprehend the lone gunman. (* Standing Advisory Committee for Commonwealth-State Cooperation for the Protection Against Violence)

54 There is only one female person known with certainty to have lived at Seascapes cottage at that time – Sally Martin. And it is the position of the State, that Bryant had killed her several hours earlier. But **no credible evidence to prove this claim has ever been presented by the State.** The public is expected to believe that because poor Mrs. Martin was killed at Seascapes, Bryant must have killed her as he was found at that cottage. **But there is not a shred of hard evidence Martin Bryant killed her, or anyone else.**

55 No evidence has ever been presented which confirms or even suggests Martin Bryant knew or had ever met the constable Paul Hyland. If Martin was this *Jamie*, (more likely it was Michael Charles Dyson or the real gunman) someone (perhaps it was Dyson) must have given Martin the phone number of the Nubeena police station and told him to phone that number. There is no reason on earth for Martin Bryant to have voluntarily telephoned the Nubeena police station and ask for Paul Hyland, a police constable who Martin did not know. What was allegedly said by this *Jamie*, if there was such a strange telephone call, appears in the *Witness Statement* of Merran Craig, a statement totally lacking credibility. (see her *Witness Statement* at Part 7)

At 15:08 hours and again at 15:25 hours, the girlfriend of constable Hyland, Merran Craig, received two telephone calls at the Nubeena police station taunting her, and Mr. Perks [assistant to DPP] states that the first call referred specifically to "Mr. Hyland." This particular telephone call was made by *Jamie*, the same person to whom the police negotiator spoke to for over two-and-a-half hours during the evening of the siege at Seascapes. What this strongly suggests is that *Jamie* knew constable Hyland personally.⁵⁵

Witnesses have always stated that the first helicopter containing paramedics Peter Stride and Warwick Allen to Port Arthur flew over the cottage and was fired upon by the gunman. However, it was shortly after 17:00 hours that a Tasmania Police SOG marksman was able to position himself with a good view of the buildings at Seascapes, and he **saw a person on the roof** of an adjoining building to the cottage.

Before this marksman could shoot the suspect on the roof, he needed positive identification that this was the gunman. The SOG marksman, via police radio communications, contacted constable Pat Allen, in the ditch, by the roadside, and Allen offered to take a look from under the police car, and as soon as constable Allen raised his head, a bullet was fired at him, which went through the front bumper bar of the police car. This is where the excreta hit the fan.

The marksman was watching the suspect on the roof. This suspect did not fire the shot at constable Allen. Had that shot come from the gunman on the roof, then the marksman would have been able to shoot that particular gunman. This did not happen. The shot came from **within** Seascapes. There were **two gunmen at the cottage.**

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

The reaction by the Tasmania Police was immediate and justified. At 17:15 hours, a call went to the Victoria Police requesting assistance for a terrorist attack. At 17:19, the National Crisis Centre was notified. This call was answered by the PSCC (Protective Security Co-ordination Centre) providing transport and technical equipment for ASIO's Technical Surveillance Unit (TSU) that was attending. This was as per SAC-PAV's national anti-terrorist plan that had been endorsed in November 1995. In fact, Port Arthur was seen as an excellent example of the coordination skills required to cope with any possible terrorist attack, and ensured that SAC-PAV was in command of the security of the Sydney Olympics in 2000.

*The
official narrative
is incomplete,
inaccurate,
and immoral
– it confirms
the concealment of
State crimes
in Tasmania.*

SEASCAPE COTTAGE c.1996



The premier Tony Rundle and the Tasmanian attorney-general Ray Groom were also informed, and attended immediately to the major incident room at Police headquarters, along with other political leaders. Moves were made, as the victims waited fearfully for the protection and support that should have been available to them was utilised elsewhere, and most Australians are not aware that it was **six hours after** the actual massacre that the Tasmania Police were finally permitted to arrive in sufficient numbers at Port Arthur.

However at Seascape, the various police resources under SAC-PAV control and ASIO were in attendance, with the SOG wanting to get stuck in and do their job, but held back by their commander who required the terrorists to be taken alive if possible. That was not to be. All the police were able to arrest was Martin Bryant, burnt, confused and of no help to them whatsoever. All the others who were in the cottage had vanished. That the massacre was a terrorist attack becomes undeniable when in the aftermath, the number of moves and countermoves that had been made within government and bureaucratic circles before, during and after the event became apparent. These moves created one of the **biggest cover-ups in Australia's history**, and should be shown to all Australians so that they may judge for themselves, just **who and what** caused Australia's first *terrorist attack*, and the lies and deceit this terrorist attack created.

There is one final twist to this macabre story. There was only one emergency exit door to that part of the Broad Arrow Café, known as the Giftshop. This door was inoperative due to a faulty fire exit door lock.⁵⁶ When the shooting started inside the café, several patrons headed for this exit door but found that it wouldn't open. The two staff at the gift shop counter were already aware that the door was inoperative and all they could do was to hide behind the counter, and that was where **they were slain**.

Some patrons, when they realised their position, were able to hide their wives behind display stands and curtains, but were unable to save themselves. These women watched in horror as the gunman shot their husbands whose last acts were to save their loved ones.

The problem of the **inoperative emergency exit door** was a major Tasmanian government problem, which was and still is a Tasmanian government enterprise. Thus, moves were taken to ensure that any blame that could have been laid on the faulty door was covered up, and every skerrick of fault was to be laid wholly upon the gunman. These moves, initiated by politicians and bureaucrats, were outside their arena though. The moves entered into the *judicial* arena, the last bastion of democracy.

It was the prime minister's statement that now the perpetrator had been apprehended, the need for an inquest should be ignored so as the survivors didn't have to relive the suffering and anguish of their experiences at Port Arthur. This has been a continued theme throughout the politicians' defence of their actions in rebuffing every plea by the victims for a **proper investigation into the massacre**.

The coroner refused to hold an inquest on the basis that the primary facts of the various deaths are already known. In this stance, the coroner ignored section 28. 1(f) of the *Coroners Act of 1995*. The attorney general, Ray Groom, has supported the coroner, citing the *Coroners Act of 1957* **which was repealed in 1995** when he was the premier of Tasmania.

We can now begin to understand the necessity for Martin Bryant to plead guilty, and all the various moves made to ensure this occurred have been documented. By these moves, all **Australians have been denied justice**, along with any knowledge of the events that transpired in what is now called the Port Arthur massacre.

Consider also that Martin Bryant has been sentenced to life imprisonment **without any form of a trial whatsoever**. It is not the victims that are being protected, but corrupt bureaucracies.

This is the reason for the cover-up. ■

(amended; original italics; added emphasis)

⁵⁶ For an exposition on this see Insert *THAT BLOODY DOOR* in Part 8. Additional shocking details appear in a paper *A Question of Egress Denied*; 2012: 41 pp., by Stewart K. Beattie.

MY EXPERIENCES AT PORT ARTHUR

28th April 1996

Wendy Scurr

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur; 2001-4

*We waited many hours for police protection
and also had 5 crime scenes to deal with,
along with 32 dead bodies and
many injured people.⁵⁷*

MY job description at Port Arthur was Information Officer. This meant I was multiskilled and was required to work in all places at the site where there was direct involvement with the visiting tourists. I also worked at night doing night tours.

I am also a qualified St. John Ambulance first aid instructor. Prior to 1996, I had spent 10 years working with the Tasmanian Ambulance Service as a volunteer on the Tasman Peninsula.⁵⁸ I also arranged for the staff to have their first aid certificates kept up-to-date as well as being responsible for keeping the first aid kits in all the different areas well stocked.

The Port Arthur Historic Site is government owned and run by a board of management. I believe an average of over 600 tourists a day visit Port Arthur, with most of them being from interstate and overseas. The Tasman Peninsula is south-east of Hobart and is accessed via the Arthur Highway. Travelling time is approximately one-and-a-half hours from the capital city of Tasmania, Hobart.

I started work at 11 a.m. on the ferry *Bundeena*⁵⁹ doing harbour cruises and landings on the *Isle of the Dead*. I loved this part of my work as I found the trips on the ferry always seemed to be interesting for visitors. Everyone enjoyed the history of the harbour. The island tours are also very interesting. The whole area is so picturesque.

On that day I had taken a harbour cruise and then took a group of visitors on an island tour at 12 p.m. arriving back to the jetty at 1 p.m. Unbeknown to me a lot of the people that accompanied me on that tour were to die that day. This included Nanette Mikac and her two children. Nanette was well known to me, she was also a tour guide at Port Arthur. I left the ferry at about 1:10 p.m. When I reached the outside balcony of the Broad Arrow Café, I noticed a young man with blond hair staring at me. He would have known I was a staff member as we all wore a uniform with a name tag attached to our blazer.

As I walked by I nodded at him as he seemed to be paying me some attention. He just nodded back as I walked past and into the café to purchase something for my lunch.

⁵⁷ Email from Scurr to the editor; 26 September 2012.

⁵⁸ Port Arthur is on the Tasman Peninsula, which is located on the eastern coast of Tasmania.

⁵⁹ Built in 1946, the motor vessel *Bundeena* worked in NSW on the Bundeena-Cronulla ferry service until 1975. It was sold to operators in Tasmania who used it for harbour cruises at the Port Arthur Historic Site. People, including police, have speculated the gunman planned to target that boat on 28 April of 1996. Some say he planned to board it. Others have suggested he planned to shoot passengers from a distance as they embarked and disembarked. It has also been said he intended to set the *Bundeena* alight so it would sink in the harbour making it more difficult to recover evidence of his crime. So what happened to foil this plan to shoot the *Bundeena's* passengers? It seems those officials who planned the incident miscalculated the departure time. The gunman arrived at the wharf expecting the ferry to depart at 1:30 p.m. But a few weeks earlier, the cruise schedule changed to coincide with the ending of daylight saving time – *Bundeena* was not leaving until 2:30. This forced a change in plan. The gunman either selected a new target or he was told the new target – visitors in the Broad Arrow Café, then people outside. (adaptation from bundeena.info.com) It is alleged the gunman had earlier told the witness Gaye Lynd that he was going to the *Isle of the Dead* to kill WASPS/wasps. This island is near the mainland at Port Arthur. (Site visitors now take their cruises aboard the motor vessel *Marana*.)

I went to an area near the counter where the staff could purchase without getting held up and walked out of the side door of the café to the Information Centre. (This building is only about 20 metres from the café.) It was then about 1:20 p.m. I made a cup of coffee and started to eat my lunch when the shooting started just before 1:30 p.m. There were about 70 people outside of the centre waiting to go on a guided walking tour at 1:30 p.m. Many of these were elderly. I know it was before 1:30 pm when the shooting started as the guides hadn't left with the groups. We had no idea what was causing the noise we heard. Initially, I was thinking something was exploding, but it wasn't stopping. **It went on and on.**⁶⁰

After a short discussion with staff, I ran toward the café. Several shots had been fired prior to my leaving. I had only taken a few steps when something flew over my right shoulder. I stopped. I was trying to work out what was happening in there. I didn't have to wait long. A person came running down the steps in front of the café screaming *run*. Then the person said: *There's a man in there killing everyone*. I froze. I can't remember how long I stood there. I was thinking of somewhere to hide. I thought the steep embankment behind the Information Office and café would be a good place. There was thick undergrowth and trees there. At this stage I can remember wishing whoever was in the café would go and kill themselves as often happens in these situations. We were not to be that lucky.

I heard one staff member yell "MOVE" in her best sergeant major's voice as everyone (about 60 people) seemed glued to the spot at that time. There was a great need to move them from there as the shooting was so close. As the staff began to get the visitors moving I started to go with them. I was so frightened. The staff was being assisted by two men who I later learned were Vietnam veterans and who were waiting with the group for the 1:30 pm tour. They later told me that they were "immediately aware" that the noise inside of the café was gun shots, not only by the noise, but also from the smell of cordite [from the fired cartridges].

Then it dawned on me that before I left the area the police should be contacted and the only phone that was close by was in the Information Office. So I left the people and doubled back to make a call. When I arrived I found Sue Burgess. Sue was in charge on the day because **all of the managers had gone to Swansea at 11 a.m. on that Sunday morning for a conference**. Swansea is over 2 hours drive from Port Arthur. Sue was with Steven Howard.

Steven was assisting her to phone around the site and warn the staff as to our situation. Many could hear the noise, but had no idea what was going on. They were being told to warn people in their areas and get them locked into houses for their own safety. At this stage no-one knew what the gunman intended or where he would go when he left the café. The tollbooth was nearly a kilometre from the Information Centre. Aileen Kingston stayed in the tollbooth and stopped cars from entering the site until she herself was virtually confronted by the gunman.

⁶⁰ There is no definitive count for the number of shots fired inside the Broad Arrow Café. Officials say only a rifle was used, but there is irrefutable evidence that a shotgun was taken into the café and used there. After the gunman left the Port Arthur Historic Site and drove to Seascape cottage, all the crime scenes at the site were unrestricted to the public, members of which no doubt contaminated those scenes. It is said spent cartridge cases were souvenired from crime scenes. So a count of spent cartridge cases found by the police (who arrived **over six hours** later) could not confirm the exact number of shots fired at the Port Arthur Historic Site or in the Broad Arrow Café.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

My phone call to the police was best described as both frustrating and frightening. I was trying desperately to make sure the policeman taking the call believed what I was telling him. He would have been so surprised at what I said. I was terrified. I was shaking because I knew we should have been out of there.

He was only doing his job gathering information, in an effort to satisfy himself that this was not a hoax (in hindsight, the story I must have been telling him would have sounded unbelievable). I carried the phone and put the receiver out of the door facing the café so he could hear the shots for himself. I felt it was so important that he believe me as we needed help as soon as possible. Finally, I knew he believed me when he said something like "be careful" before I hung up. We had no idea what was going to happen next.

Sue, Steven and I decided to leave the Information Office as it was too close to the café. Sue grabbed a two-way radio and as we were leaving she said what will we do about the money in the till. I think I said "buggar the money." I told Sue and Steven I knew where to go. I said follow me. I knew it was important to get into the café as soon as possible. At this stage, there had been at least 40 shots⁶¹ fired. About the time we left our cover, the gunman exited the café.

Shots seemed to be going everywhere as we were running very quickly toward the toilet block. We soon put the toilet block between us and the gunman. This protected us. We continued to go up the hill in the direction of the café under the cover of bushland. While we could hear him shooting we knew where he was and kept running uphill on the clear ground. When he was silent we had no idea of his whereabouts, we hid in the bushes. This continued until we were up on the hill behind the Broad Arrow Café.

We heard the shots starting to come from a different direction. I thought that was lucky. He had driven up the road past where we were hiding in the bush. Evidently, these were the shots that killed Nanette Mikac and her two daughters. It was obvious the shooter was on the move. He was heading for the tollbooth. When we heard shots from that direction, I thought Aileen's got it. She was the tollbooth operator, but she was able to hide on the floor in the toilet. Four were killed in a BMW as they pulled up outside the tollbooth to pay their entrance fee.⁶² Ian Kingston sent a message over our two-way radio to say the yellow Volvo sedan that the gunman had been driving had been abandoned near the tollbooth. His words were: "be careful, his car is here but we don't know where he is."

At that time we were all unaware that the gunman had shot everyone [who had been an occupant] in the BMW...then driven off in the BMW. I was absolutely terrified. I was expecting to die at any minute. I was also thinking about what we would have to confront in the Broad Arrow Café. We had to climb down quite a steep embankment through thick bush to reach the back of the café. On our way down, we met a young girl [Melissa Briggs] who had escaped out the back door of the café kitchen. She was so frightened. I don't know what she had seen, but she was shaking.

⁶¹ The official narrative of what happened at the Broad Arrow Café that day does not correspond with many true facts and the statements of the witnesses who were at Port Arthur Historic Site. Officially, only **29** shots are said to have been fired inside the café. But competent investigators who have studied the incident say at least **40-60** shots were fired there, including at least one from a shotgun which officials falsely claim was not used. Injuries from shotgun pellets **were noted** by Wendy Scurr. They **were noted** again by an ambulance officer who attended the Broad Arrow Café, and **were noted** yet again by Stephen Wilkinson a surgeon who worked with wounded victims at the Royal Hobart Hospital. Officially, the shooting inside the café was *guessed* to have lasted just **90 seconds**. But witnesses who were in/near the café that tragic day have declared it lasted for approximately **5 minutes**.

⁶² This is a common but seemingly false belief. According to the statements prepared by Debra Jane & Thomas Mark Buckley, the mentioned gold-coloured BMW briefly entered the historic site then drove back to the tollbooth where it was parked in the entrance lane facing out of the site toward the highway. There might have been others, but officially there were four people associated with the BMW sedan: Helene and Robert Salzmann; Jim Pollard; and, Mary Rose Nixon. It seems that some or all of them knew the gunman, but none of them knew Martin Bryant. They all waited at the tollbooth for the gunman to arrive from the Broad Arrow Café. The lead-up to the shooting of the two men at the tollbooth is **very suggestive**. What is highly questionable is that Aileen Kingston, an employee at the historic site and who was working in the tollbooth, does not mention seeing a BMW parked beside the tollbooth blocking incoming traffic. Nor does this witness say she saw a red Commodore which had been parked right behind the BMW by the two (alleged) New Zealanders, one of whom (Mr. Buckley) walked to the tollbooth and spoke with Kingston. (see *Witness Statements* at Part 7: Buckley x 2; Cheok x 2; Prout; and, Rabe)

I didn't know what to do with her. She certainly couldn't be left alone and she couldn't come with us. I soon found her a job. We climbed down a little further when we came upon two men who had also escaped through the kitchen door then tried to hide in the bush. The first one had what appeared to be shotgun pellets all over his face, neck, chest and arm.⁶³ The wounds were all very superficial, I wasn't too worried about him. I then found a man who was shot in the head. He had some rag over his head wound. He was saying he didn't know if the bullet was still in there or if it had passed right through his skull. The bleeding was controlled and he was fully conscious, but in a lot of pain.

I told the men to hide in some bushes, the gunman was probably nearby and that we would get them out when we knew it was safe to do so. I left our young staff member with the responsibility for looking after them. She did it admirably. During this time Sue was very quiet. I was then to receive another huge shock when Sue said to me "I wonder if the girls got out?" I said, "What girls?" She said "Nicole and Elizabeth." I can remember feeling **devastated**. I was psyching myself up to deal with what I suspected would be confronting us in there, if anything had happened to them I didn't think I could go on. Nicole was Sue's 17-year-old daughter, Elizabeth was Steven's wife of just three years.

Sue and Steven were both with me as we stood outside the café waiting to enter. I can only describe this situation as **Hell on Earth**. I took some deep breaths, paused and said: "we'll head straight to the giftshop and take a look to see if they're in there." The scene as we entered that building was beyond belief.⁶⁴

It was very quiet, bodies and body parts were everywhere, on the walls, the ceiling. The floor was awash with blood. I will never ever forget the smell of warm blood. But I was on a mission at that stage, that mission was to find the girls. We found them, both lying on the floor behind the counter side by side. Even then, it was obvious to me they were both dead, but I bent down over them and felt their necks to try and find their carotid pulses. I was using this time to think – *what will I do now, what will I say to them*. Sue broke the silence and asked if there was anything I could do for them. I said I'm so sorry, but they're both dead. We just stood there **in absolute silence in that horrible place**.

Looking around us at the bodies, it was so eerie, still, so quiet. There was hardly anyone left alive in there to make a noise. I can't describe my feelings, but this was to be the start of an event that would change our lives forever. It was unbearable. I found it difficult to even look at the faces of my poor workmates, I thought, what am I going to do now. I always taught in first aid, give people in this situation something to do. Both Sue and Steven were trained in first aid. I really needed them, but I had to let them go.

No one in their right mind could ask them to stay in that place. This is what I had trained for but never at this magnitude. When you join the emergency services you don't expect it to be easy. I had witnessed

⁶³ It was Dennis Olsen. (see *NAME INDEX*)

⁶⁴ Note that when police were taking a witness statement from Scurr, it was at this point they told her, **no further statement is required**. Her interview was then terminated. Though Scurr was an eyewitness to the nightmarish aftermath inside that café, the Tasmania Police did not want her observations officially recorded. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this shocking fact is that Scurr's observations were, and still are, in conflict with the official narrative – **the narrative which had to have been formulated prior the shooting at the Broad Arrow Café**.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

many tragedies. But never a war zone like this. No one could be trained for this. I asked Sue and Steven to go and help outside. Sue was a manager and was needed. Steven went in search of some blankets⁶⁵ for me. I looked for survivors. There were only three. The first person I found was Graham.⁶⁶ He was shot in the neck, his carotid artery had been clipped by a bullet. He was choking on his own blood. He was on his side, there was very little I could do for him. I put my fingers in his mouth and cleared the blood away. I knew I couldn't stay long with Graham, because I really thought he was about to die as the blood loss was huge.

A Victorian policeman Dennis⁶⁷ came to the rescue, he sat with Graeme while I searched for more casualties. (I found out much later that Lyn⁶⁸ a nurse from Victoria had gone into the café before me and had cleared Graham's airway by using a drinking straw to physically suck the blood out, this cleared his airway of blood.) Graham has told me since that he was able to kink his neck in a certain position to stop the bleeding. He stayed conscious throughout the shootings, watching the gunman slaughter people, then stepping over and around him before he left the café, all the while dealing with his own wounds and acting dead – all at the same time. Because there were several I had to use my ambulance training to get things into some sort of order of treatment.

This is called triage. To put it simply – triage is the classification and sorting of casualties for the purpose of management according to the degree of urgency to do the best you can with the resources available to you. This meant that there was a limited time I could spend with Graham. I never thought Graham would live.

The second casualty I found was Carolyn.⁶⁹ She was travelling with Graham and her 15-year-old daughter Sarah. Carolyn was starting to make a lot of noise, this made me very nervous because at this stage we still had no protection and were unaware of the whereabouts of the shooter. Carolyn had been shot under the left collarbone. The exit wound was large in the area of the shoulder blade. I asked her to be quiet. She was so scared. So was I. She said to me have you seen Sarah? I had, only a few feet away but out of Carolyn's view.

She said she was looking for her 15-year-old daughter, her only child and who was wearing a hat. The poor girl had horrific head injuries and was deceased. I told Carolyn I hadn't seen her because it was my opinion that this knowledge could have cost Carolyn her own life at this stage. I had to keep her quiet and still because every time she moved her wound bled. Another man came to help, I gave him some tea-towels and he used them to stem Carolyn's bleeding. I then left to see if any more were alive in there.

I found Rob.⁷⁰ He had been shot in the arm and the rear of his head, his arm was a terrible mess. His wife was with him. He was in agony. She had the bleeding under control and was trying to comfort him. **Rob had tried to overpower the gunman** and was shot for his trouble. I then moved further around the café looking for more people that might have been alive. There were none.

⁶⁵ Before Wendy Scurr and her colleagues had to work in what she has described as **Hell on Earth**, something took place at the Port Arthur Historic Site – something that now seems highly suggestive. A supply of **200 blankets** was ordered and supplied to the site some time before the shooting there. At that site, Scurr was responsible for all first-aid supplies (including blankets) plus their maintenance. But Scurr did **not** order that excessive quantity of blankets and she never found out who did. Some of them were used by the wounded victims and visitors in shock to keep warm. (For 28 April 1996, tutiempo.net records a **maximum** temperature at Port Arthur of 11 degrees Celsius.) Only later was it realised that the **200 blankets** could have been surreptitiously supplied for a more horrific mass murder involving the boat which operated from the jetty at the historic site – this tour boat, the *Bundeena*, was built to take **200 passengers**. (see bundeenainfo.com for boat details)

⁶⁶ It was Graham Collyer.

⁶⁷ Dennis Gabbedy who was on holidays with his wife.

⁶⁸ Lyn Beavis. Additional investigation has revealed what Beavis says she did was actually done by the witness Dennis Gabbedy. (see note 67) A reliable source has informed the editor that this first-aid fact was confirmed by Graham Collyer himself.

⁶⁹ Carolyn Laughton.

⁷⁰ Rob Elliott.

71 See article *THAT BLOODY DOOR* by Andrew S. MacGregor at Part 8.

72 In addition to the five people who died at/near the **inoperative emergency exit door**, two PAHS employees, who worked inside the café and who knew that exit door could not be opened, were shot nearby. They were trapped and they would have known it.

73 coarse type of cloth

74 This is the question which Scurr and so many other people rightfully ask – **35 people died and 23 were wounded**, yet **no coronial inquest** was held. Regardless whether an inquest was required by law or not, (it was required by law) one should have been conducted. **The State ignored the truth associated with the death and injury of 58 people.** All the excuses not to have an inquest have the same purpose – **cover-up.** Officials in Hobart and Canberra **do not want the public to know** who planned and who did all the killing and wounding. Officials want you to believe it was all planned, prepared, and conducted by a mentally-handicapped *boy-man* with an IQ of 66. Officials want you to believe this, even though investigators can and have proved there is no link between Bryant and weapons said to have been fired during the incident. That the State did everything it could to ensure there was no trial confirms its own criminal involvement in the Port Arthur incident. Eyewitnesses – one looked the killer right in the face before he was shot, the other local person knew Martin Bryant for years – said with no reservations that the gunman was not Martin. People who do not think want to keep believing the official narrative because they think it has to be true as the source is the government. *Please.....* People who say they saw Bryant there are asserting an assumption as if it was the truth. Yes, they were there. And yes they did see a man with fair-hair. But this does not prove it was Martin Bryant. That the media said he was the gunman is not proof of anything other than illegal statements by the media. **The State has never proved Bryant was at PAHS.** All it has done is assert that he was the gunman, but this has never been proved to a jury at a trial.

When I arrived at the only exit door of the giftshop I found five dead. That door would not open.⁷¹ It then became really evident to me that **the five people I found dead in there died because they were all trapped inside by that door** – including Elizabeth Howard and Nicole Burgess my workmates.

BROAD ARROW CAFÉ APRIL 1996



This door was responsible for the deaths of seven people in total.⁷² I felt so frightened when I tried in vain to open that door so I could move the bodies. I wanted to check to see if there were any people alive underneath. That is when **I found the door latch inoperable.** I can't imagine how all those people would have felt having to wait at least five minutes and cowering there trapped waiting to be shot. It makes me sick every time I think of it as I know how I felt when trapped in there myself not knowing where the gunman was. There were at least three ladies and a young girl who had been hiding behind a hessian⁷³ screen. Two of the poor ladies witnessed their husbands being shot. The husbands had hidden them behind the screen.

HOW COULD THERE NOT BE A CORONIAL INQUEST!?⁷⁴

It's now approximately 2 p.m. It was only half an hour after the shooting had commenced. I left that area and walked quickly to the phone in the office of the café. I couldn't believe my eyes when I saw two Asian people still sitting in their chairs at the table with their meals in front of them. One was still holding his knife and the other had the index finger through the handle of the coffee cup she had been drinking from. Both had been shot through the head. As I continued moving to the office to phone the ambulance radio room, I trod on something. It seemed to crack under my feet. It was the skull of a young woman. She had the top blown off her head and to my horror her brain was lying in a bowl of chips. It looked like it had fallen out of her head as she fell to the floor. I covered the bowl. I thought – I can't take much more of this.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

I finally arrived in the office with the phone. I dialled the main ambulance station in Hobart. Peter⁷⁵ answered the phone. I knew him well and this was a big help. He had a calming effect on me. I must have been babbling a bit. He calmed me down and asked me how many were dead? I didn't really know, all I could say was "there's a lot." He asked how many I could see from where I was standing. I said about 12. He asked me what I needed. I said "ambulances, helicopters and police."

At this stage I had no idea of any injuries or deaths anywhere else. I hadn't been able to leave the café and giftshop. The final count in there was **20 killed** and, **12 wounded** in varying degrees. Just after I left the office, Paul Cooper a staff member arrived in the café. I was doing another round of my injured. He asked if I was alright and was concerned that he couldn't help me. He told me what was going on at the tourist coaches. His story was also unbelievable – **four dead** and **several injured**, some very seriously. I told him I would cope with the help I was now getting from visitors.

I knew it wouldn't be long before local ambulances would be there. Also some helicopters to start evacuating the wounded. It was just a matter of putting all our skills to work using just very basic first aid to achieve a successful result. Help started coming from everywhere on the site. We found we had two retired doctors who helped out as much they could, but without specialist equipment they were unable to do any more than we were. It was comforting to know we had medical people there though. A nursing sister⁷⁶ on leave from her job from Hobart was a wonderful help and support for Paul at the buses. A church minister arrived who had done some nursing. The bus drivers were fantastic even though one of their own had been killed.⁷⁷

Our local doctors arrived but that didn't stop us from having to continue. The wounds were so bad that it was one doctor to one patient, so triage had to continue. Our local ambulance arrived. That gave us some equipment and more valuable help. Then another arrived from Dunalley with a paramedic on board and another two volunteers. By this time I was working my way out of the café. I was instructed by a local doctor to get names and addresses of everyone I could find and list their injuries. This took me into places where I saw more carnage. I can remember finding Brigid Cook (also staff) who had been shot in the thigh, she had controlled the bleeding herself by using her apron.

We still didn't know if the gunman would return. I found a man and his wife on the verandah of a cottage next door to the Broad Arrow Café. He had a severe injury to the side of his face and had a handkerchief against it. They were looking at me a little strangely. I was unaware that I had body parts on my shoulders and in my hair. My legs had a lot of other people's blood on them. I settled them down with a staff member and told them to stay where they were.

I then returned into the café and went into the kitchen to wash myself. The helicopters from Hobart arrived to begin ferrying the injured

⁷⁵ Peter Stainthorpe.

⁷⁶ Robyn Croger/Kroger.

⁷⁷ Royce Thompson.

*There were bodies,
bullet-wounded
victims, and
big bundles of
blankets,
but no real police
protection for
over six hours
– who ordered
Tasmania Police
not to go
to the scene of
Australia’s worst
modern-day
mass murder?*

back to Hobart. With them came Andrew O’Brien, a Hobart based paramedic. Then ambulances from Hobart arrived. Andrew took over the triage. I now started to feel as if I would be free to get out and do something away from there, but this did not happen.

Visitors had evidently observed me going in and out of the café. They would also note that I was a staff member because of my name tag and uniform. I remember a lady came to me. She was so upset. She said her husband was in the café. She had no car keys or money as it was all in a wallet in the pocket of his trousers, she was so desperate she wanted me to go and collect it from her husband’s body. I explained to her that the police were the only ones who could do that. They hadn’t arrived yet. I then had a request from a man who wanted his wife’s handbag for the same reason. This was police work and they weren’t there. **Where were they?**

We had ambulances from Hobart, so why not police? To top this off I had a lady ask me if I had seen a woman with black hair in there. She gave me a description of her clothing. She told me she couldn’t find her anywhere. I went in and found a victim fitting her sister’s description. I went outside and told the lady that I believed it was her sister in the café but as I didn’t know her sister, the only way she could identify her immediately would be to have a look herself. I advised her not to and said the police shouldn’t be too much longer.

Besides all of the urgent medical attention required, we had about 500 other people to care for. **Traumatised people.** Let me say though that they were all wonderful considering what they had been through. I couldn’t believe their calm that confronted me. This was due to the work of the staff and contractors. All 31 of them, they all chipped in to help that day. A lot of off duty staff started to arrive on site. They were being called in or were coming of their own accord as word of the tragedy spread. A lot of these poor people are now experiencing problems as they have the condition Post Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD; see Note 33].

A wonderful sight greeted us at 4 p.m. Our management team of 10 arrived back from Swansea. They had made the journey at a hair-raising speed. I was confronted by my manager Robyn Cooper who was trying to account for her staff. I asked her not to go into the café to where her niece and cousin lay dead. I begged her not to go. She didn’t. I didn’t want anyone to go in there that didn’t have to. As it was, too many people went in there and are now **suffering the consequences.**

Had the police arrived and sealed the area off this would never have happened. The first policeman to arrive to help never got there until 4:30 p.m. and this poor chap was alone. He was just dropped off and left on his own. He was asking for people to stay and provide their names and addresses before they left. Many had gone by 4:30 p.m. We still didn’t know for sure where the gunman was or if he would return. We’d had reports that he was at Seascape cottage, but reports kept coming in that he’d escaped. This went on and on. We felt and actually were so helpless and were still very frightened.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The CEO, Mr. Coombs, was trying to take control but was having great difficulty in getting anyone to take notice of him because he wasn't in a uniform. Eventually we were able to get people to the shelter of the Port Arthur Motor Inn where they received food and drink and could keep warm.⁷⁸ We endeavoured to find as many people as possible who had lost family and took them to the manager's residence on the site where they were looked after by staff.

I was to receive a shock when Walter Mikac approached me to ask if I could tell him of the whereabouts of Nanette, Allanah and Madeline. I didn't know where they were, but I was absolutely shattered when he told me Nanette's car was still at Port Arthur. Earlier in the afternoon I had been advised of the death of a lady and two little girls. I hadn't gone near. There was nothing I could do. I thought to myself: what am I going to say. I decided not to elaborate on my fears for I didn't really know if it was them up the road or not. I believed if I had admitted this to him I would have had to accompany him and take a look. After all that I had been through that afternoon there was just **no more in me to take that onboard**. I was sure that this was Nanette because I know if she'd been there and survived she would have helped us, as Nanette was a registered nurse.

My husband Graeme arrived to take me home, I couldn't go. I didn't tell him we still had no police protection. If I had told him this, he would have taken me anyway. I had family and friends desperately trying to find out how I was. Graeme had attempted to ring me at Port Arthur, but was unable to get a call through on the phone, so he just had to drive over and find out for himself. I asked him to go home and advise family and friends that I was very much alive. By 6:00 p.m. the CEO had sent me to the Port Arthur Motor Inn. Vicki McLoughlin had been there helping people. She had just found out about the death of the Mikacs and wanted to go home. Her husband and sons arrived to take her.

Sandra Carmichael, the director of nursing at the hospital/nursing home at Nubeena, was at the hotel assisting with people when I arrived. We were experiencing many different problems up there. We had one young man with a bullet graze to the top of his head. He was sitting on a chair, swaying. I asked why he had not accompanied the walking wounded on a coach to Hobart. He said his fiancé was killed in the café and he still had not the courage to ring her parents in Western Australia. He said he didn't know how he could do it. I was thinking to myself: those bloody police should be doing this for him.

It should not be his responsibility all alone, and he himself injured. He was put in a bedroom with friends he was travelling with. A lady came to me. She told me how the gunman had shot her husband, brother-in-law and a friend. She said: "He left me alive to watch." At 6:30 p.m. about five staff heard three more shots⁷⁹ that were fired in front of the administration building called Clougha it was only a few metres from the verandah where some of the staff were having a cigarette. Once again the staff and visitors in this house were on the floor with the doors and windows locked – in the dark.

⁷⁸ On 28 April 1996, the historical weather record (tutiempo.net) reveals the **average** temperature at Port Arthur was 9.3 degrees Celsius.

⁷⁹ Who fired those shots has **not** been made public. Given what had just taken place at the Port Arthur Historic Site, the absolute callousness of that act is beyond description. It has been suggested to the editor that those three shots were fired deliberately to further traumatise the survivors. Remember that the incident at and near Port Arthur was a psycho-political action deliberately perpetrated by the State to cause terror and trauma. Because these shots could not be blamed on Martin Bryant, they were ignored by the State which did not attempt to determine who fired them.

**TASMANIAN DISASTER INCIDENTS
1912-2006**

1912

MINING

The 1912 North Mount Lyell Disaster (also referred to as the Mount Lyell Disaster and North Mount Lyell Fire) occurred at the Mount Lyell Mining and Railway Company operations on the west coast of Tasmania. Fire broke out on 12 October 1912 leading to a final fatality count of **43 victims**. Forty-two died underground and one died later from carbon monoxide poisoning.

OFFICIAL REACTION

There was a royal commission which released a public document: *Royal Commission on the North Mount Lyell Mining Disaster*; Tasmania: Parliament; 1913.

1929

FLOODS

In April 1929 as stated on australia.gov.au: "22 people died when heavy rain caused severe flooding in the north-east of Tasmania." The effects of serious flooding were also felt across the north of the state and reached Burnie in the north-west. In June 2009, ABC Radio broadcast (Siobhan Maiden) an anniversary program: "Tasmania floods that left 5000 people homeless. **22 people were killed** and 40 people were injured in the floods. 2000 buildings were damaged and over 100 were destroyed. Rainfalls of 250 mm were monitored in 48 hours and gale-force winds destroyed buildings, roads and farms across the north and north-west."

OFFICIAL REACTION

No findings of an official inquiry⁸⁰ seem to have been made public. But, it was reported privately.⁸¹ It led to the construction of flood levees to protect Launceston.

1946

PLANE CRASH

On 10 March 1946; an Australian National Airways flight left Hobart for Melbourne. The DC-3 crashed into the sea (near Seven-Mile Beach) with both engines operating after takeoff. All **25 people on board were killed**.

OFFICIAL REACTION

There was an inquest and an inquiry chaired by a supreme court judge from the ACT (*sic*). Several recommendations were made.

1967

BUSHFIRES

Bushfires burnt out of control on 7 February 1967.* They were the most deadly disaster Tasmania had experienced: 7000 people were left homeless; 900 were injured; **62 people died**; etc. In five hours, 110 separate fire fronts burnt approximately 2,640 square kilometres (264,000 ha.) of land in southern Tasmania. (* Also referred to as *Black Tuesday*.)

OFFICIAL REACTION

Inquiry undertaken and reported. see: D.M. Chambers and C.G. Brettingham-Moore. *The Bush Fire Disaster of 7th February 1967* – Parliamentary Paper 16/1967; Hobart. (cont.)

⁸⁰ In 2006, the Tasmanian Flood Warning Consultative Committee released *Floods & You*. (ses.tas.gov.au; floodsandyou.org; seems defunct). In that publication and under the flood summary listing for the period 1920–1929, the listing stops, on p. 26, after May 1922, then starts again at 2000. All details associated with the 1929 flood which killed 22 Tasmanians are inexplicably missing. WHY?

⁸¹ A 53-page report on the flooding, *The Flood of April 1929*, was prepared in 1929 by William Fotheringham. He served as the honorary director of supplies during relief operations. A copy of that document is part of the collection held in Launceston by the State Library of Tasmania.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

1975

BRIDGE COLLAPSE

This disaster occurred at Hobart on 5 January 1975. The bulk-ore carrier *Lake Illawarra* moving up the Derwent River collided with several pylons of the Tasman Bridge. This caused a large section of the bridge deck to collapse onto the ship and into the river. A total of **12 people were killed**, including 7 crew on board the ship plus 5 occupants of 4 cars which fell 45 metres off the bridge.

OFFICIAL REACTION

An extensive enquiry was conducted: *Court of Marine Enquiry into Lake Illawarra Collision*, 1975. (search.archives.tas.gov.au)

1996

SHOOTING

On the Tasman Peninsula, specifically at and near the Port Arthur Historic Site, a gunman shot 58 people on 28 April 1996. On the following day the alleged gunman (Martin Bryant) was arrested after leaving a nearby burning building (Seascope cottage), which evidence suggests was deliberately set alight by police. A total of **35 people were killed** in this incident.

OFFICIAL REACTION

The original investigation overseen by Tasmania Police has been criticized and the findings were never presented to a jury for evaluation. There was **no** inquest, **no** royal commission, **no** inquiry, **no** credible investigation by Tasmania Police, **no** complete and honest documentation by the director of prosecutions, etc.

2006

MINING

A gold mine at Beaconsfield collapsed on 25 April 2006. Of the 17 people who were in the mine at the time, 14 escaped immediately following the collapse, **one was killed** and the remaining two were found alive. These two lucky miners were rescued two weeks after being trapped nearly a kilometre below the surface.

OFFICIAL REACTION

An independent investigator (Greg Melick) was appointed to conduct an inquiry into the cause of the rockfall, the adequacy of safety procedure, and the steps that should be taken to make the mine safe. Note this inquiry process was condemned.⁸²

Details and wording for this insert were extracted from the websites of: ABC Radio, Australian Bureau of Meteorology, and wikipedia. In addition, *The Companion to Tasmanian History* (Allison Alexander ed.) was used.

*These seven disasters (natural and unnatural) are considered to be the most significant in Tasmania over the last century (1912-2012). The average loss of human life associated with them was **28 deaths**. In all disasters, there can be both direct and indirect causes and where there are human deaths the public has the right to be informed in full with truthful information. This listing reveals complete and truthful facts **have not been supplied** to the public by the State (or the private sector) in relation to the shooting disaster (1996). Even though **35 people were killed and 23 were wounded**, the State has prevented the determination as well as the dissemination of complete and truthful facts to the good people of Tasmania. – ed.*

⁸² See the article on wsws.org – *Australia: Inquiry into Beaconsfield mine tragedy already smells of cover-up*; 27 May 2006. In it, the author Steve Cook says: “Even before proceedings get underway, the so-called ‘independent’ inquiry commissioned by the Tasmanian state Labor government into the fatal accident at the Beaconsfield Gold Mine smells of cover-up. A massive rock fall at the mine on April 25 resulted in the death of miner Larry Knight and trapped his co-workers Todd Russell and Brant Webb underground for two weeks. Tasmanian state Premier Paul Lennon this week announced that the inquiry – headed by former National Crimes Authority chief and one time Tasmanian Crown prosecutor, barrister Greg Melick – will not be open to the public. He also refused to say if the inquiry’s findings would ever be made public or if copies would be handed to the family of Larry Knight.” The report prepared by Melick on the 2005 incident was completed in August in 2007. But it was not until May 2009 that it was made available to the public and this only happened because of external pressure.

We now had staff who were not present during the first shooting being traumatised. Many who were present from 1:30 p.m. already deeply affected were being re-traumatised. **There was still no effective help or protection from the Tasmania Police.** It was now five hours since the shooting started. We still had no definite proof that the shooter was contained. The media [television] was the only source of information and they kept on giving out conflicting reports. This didn't help anyone.

At the Motor Inn we decided not to alarm the people. They had had enough. We found people with medical problems and had to once again call for assistance from the paramedics. It was after 7:30 p.m. when we were advised that the police had finally arrived at the site. Heavily armed, they escorted the group from Clougha to the backpacker hostel next to the inn. Police also came into the inn and were assisting our lonely policeman who did a superb job.

Several trauma counsellors arrived from Hobart and **treated us like little children.** We were offended by that. All in the room were ordered (by the counsellors) at about 8:30 p.m. to travel by coach to Hobart to the Police Academy. We refused. The visitors who could travel went and were taken care of in Hobart. A lot had no choice. We attended a small meeting with a counsellor, which was not the best thing for us. We weren't even hearing properly what was being said let alone comprehending. It was just impossible.⁸³ All we wanted to do was go home.

I arrived home finally at 1:00 a.m. on Sunday the 29th April. I just fell in the door of the house into my worried husband's arms and cried and cried. I went to the shower to wash myself. As I tried to get my stockings off I found one foot had lacerations on it. I didn't think at the time, but a few days later it dawned on me that I would have to have tests for Hep[atitis] A, B and HIV. Normally this would have really worried me, as I'd had lots of other people's blood on my feet and legs. But it really seemed almost irrelevant in the scale of things that I was experiencing and it didn't seem to bother me. Some weeks later the tests came back negative.

During the following week we buried our dead and attended a local church service. We all began to wonder why we weren't the same as we were before the 28th. When we met, we all seemed the same but most of us were later diagnosed as having PTSD. A Salvation Army counsellor **Don Woodlands and his team were very helpful** and were able to explain to us what was wrong and how it occurred. The events of the next two years for me were worse than the massacre itself. In fact coming to terms with what life is like now, to what it was before, is a little hard to swallow. We were efficient, confident and happy people. The opposite is the case now for a lot of us. ■

(amended; added emphasis)

⁸³ Facts which Scurr has related strongly suggest that she and her colleagues were being assessed – *how much did they see/know?* What these witnesses saw and knew would have been highly significant to the formulation of the final official narrative. This meeting, with all the negative aspects Scurr experienced, was **not** professional counselling. (see Insert *MIND MANIPULATION BY STATE* in Part 7)

SEASCAPE COTTAGE SIEGE

Andrew S. MacGregor

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur; 2001-4

*At one stage [I] saw a female
running around the back yard naked.
Yelling and screaming.⁸⁴*

ON 28th April 1996, the police coverage of the Tasman Peninsula consisted of a single policeman stationed at Nubeena. That person was constable Paul Hyland. He was relatively new to the area, and was a young policeman with a reputation for being hard on drugs. As with all country policemen in Australia, Paul Hyland worked in with the neighbouring policeman, constable Garry Whittle who was stationed at Dunalley, about 50 kilometres away to the north.

At some time prior to 1:00 p.m. on Sunday the 28th April 1996, both constables were instructed to attend at Saltwater River⁸⁵ regarding a suspected drug cache. These policemen would have rendezvoused at some point and proceeded together, each driving their own vehicle to Saltwater River. What they discovered there were two glass containers filled with soap powder. They reported their discovery back to Hobart just prior to 1:30 p.m.

The Tasman Peninsula is notorious for its black spots in regard to radio signals. Saltwater River area is one of the better points on the peninsula for sending and receiving radio signals. However, the black spots are only a ten minute drive from that area. It appears that both policemen were still at Saltwater River when they received instructions to attend at Port Arthur Historic Site. Both vehicles then travelled 16 kilometres back to the Nubeena police station. "They received a further radio message to be on the lookout for a yellow Volvo with a surfboard on roof racks and decided to head for Port Arthur in different directions. Constable Highland travelled to the Taranna turnoff on the Arthur Highway."⁸⁶ (*sic*)

This means that constable Whittle would have driven 13 kilometres from Nubeena to the site, while constable Hyland would have driven approximately 27 kilometres to the Fox and Hounds Hotel, which is close to the site. "Constable Highland travelled to the Taranna turnoff on the Arthur Highway. En route, he received a further message to be on the lookout for a gold BMW sedan. On reaching the turnoff, he received a further message that people had been shot and were at the Fox and Hounds Hotel. Constable Highland then drove south on the Arthur Highway to the Fox and Hounds, at considerable speed, observing Linda White's abandoned Frontera on the roadway about a hundred metres south of the 'Seascape' entrance."⁸⁶ (*sic*)

⁸⁴ Garry Whittle. *Debriefing Notes*; 28 April 1996. Debriefed by constable M. Osborn at "11.25pm 28/4/96." Whittle saw this naked woman when he was in attendance at Seascape cottage on the afternoon and evening of 28 April. He saw her many hours after the Broad Arrow Café shooting. The State assertion is that Martin Bryant shot Mr. & Mrs. Martin before he went to the Broad Arrow Café – which is absolute unproved rubbish. It also seems that poor Mrs. Martin died from a severe blow to the skull, detected by the coroner, not from a gunshot wound.

⁸⁵ see Map.

⁸⁶ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: p. 173. (NOTE In the court transcript, Hyland is, in places, misspelt as Highland.)

The same court document continues as follows: "On his arrival at the Fox and Hounds he spoke briefly with Mr. Williams and others and then drove back in the direction of Seascap. About five hundred metres prior to Seascap he slowed when he noticed Constable Whittle's vehicle behind and they then proceeded slowly in convoy to the Seascap entrance. Both police officers then observed the BMW on the grassed area beside the Seascap buildings. By this time it was on fire and there was heavy black smoke billowing from the vehicle. The rear half of the vehicle had not caught fire at this stage. The time was now approximately 2 p.m. Constable Hyland decided to drive further north up the road to stop any traffic from coming down. As he did so he caught a brief glimpse of a figure running past one of the cottages towards the entrance of the main residence of Seascap. Constable Hyland stopped his vehicle across the roadway about four hundred metres north of Seascap and remained in this position for some time. Constable Whittle meanwhile had positioned his vehicle at forty-five degrees across the highway outside the Seascap entrance to block northbound traffic."

The document then continues: "After hearing a loud explosion coming from the direction of the burning BMW Constable Whittle took cover at the rear of his Police vehicle. The particular vehicle and the position it was parked is shown in photograph 343 and 336. 343 is a close view of Constable Whittle's vehicle. A short time later your Honour, Constable Pat Allen reversed his Police vehicle from the direction of Port Arthur towards Constable Whittle's vehicle. As he did so Constable Whittle heard three very loud shots from the direction of Seascap and bullets passing over Constable Allen's vehicle hitting bush or shrubbery to his right. Constable Whittle moved from his position to a culvert at the rear of his vehicle and was then joined in that position by Constable Allen."⁸⁷ (*sic*)

Constable Whittle after he left the Nubeena Police Station travelled to the Port Arthur General Store. He did not attend at the Port Arthur Historic Site. Had he done so, he would have been expected to remain and fulfil his duties there. However, Whittle left the general store and proceeded to back up constable Hyland at the Seascap cottage. There is one problem though with the court documents and that is the time again. **The actual times are not correct.**

The police commissioner Richard McCreadie reported to Emergency Management Australia (EMA): "The first police arrived at 14:12 and confirmed activity at Seascap and the burning BMW."⁸⁸ McCreadie in a later paragraph also says: "The local police were at the Saltwater River area which is approximately twenty-five minutes travelling time from the site of the carnage, and they were immediately dispatched. They went to the Nubeena Police Station initially and from there one travelled to the Fox and Hounds Hotel via back roads while the other travelled, also by back roads to the Port Arthur General Store. After visiting these sites both police officers continued towards Seascap."

Also reported to Emergency Management Australia was the time of 13:36 associated for the initial dispatch of police from Dunalley and Nubeena, respectively Garry Whittle and Paul Hyland. However,

⁸⁷ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: pp. 174-175. Any gunman who had **kill-ed and wounded 58 people** would have had no reservation about putting bullets through those cop cars. Highly visible, they would have been tempting targets. They should have been riddled with bullet holes. But, the only thing riddled with holes is the make-believe story about a SOG siege at Seascap. No doubt most of those boys in black thought it was a fairdinkum fire. But in reality, it was a farce, set up to incriminate **the patsy Martin Bryant.**

⁸⁸ *Richard McCreadie. Port Arthur: An overview of the police response* (part 1). Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 5.

WHAT'S IN A WORD

FRENCH author Voltaire (1694-1778) admonished us to define our terms. Whether he had read the works of the Dutch humanist and scholar Erasmus (c.1466-1536) is unknown. But Voltaire was bright enough to know what Erasmus said earlier on the subject is very true indeed: *Every definition is dangerous*. So where does that leave us with regard to the incident at Port Arthur?

Well, how we define what went on there influences people and, in fact, can influence our own thinking on the subject. Pick the right word, or the wrong word, and the associated meaning of a qualifying phrase can be changed – subtly or grossly. So, to be fair and neutral (as much as is possible), what word(s) would be best to use with Port Arthur? What is good for media headlines is something sensational – thus gratifying to publishers and editors – but that might be quite some distance from the truth. And to use bland words puts users in danger of drawing negative criticism.

As readers of the literature related to the case involving Martin Bryant will have seen, many words and ways have been used to describe what happened. What is common to all official wordings is the finiteness of the descriptors. There is no tentativeness. There is no reservation or hesitation. There is no expressed doubt. Words used to qualify are **cruel, condemnatory, and conclusive** – killing, massacre, slaughter, all scream out in bright brutal red. And all are associated with the name Martin Bryant.

But given it has **never been proved** that Martin did what many officials allege he did, such words convey meanings not in accordance with truthful facts. And even those who would say their words were used to define what acts took place, cannot prevent the negativeness of those words from painting red the person who written laws declare was/is entitled to a trial. For killing to have occurred, it certainly did – that is not denied, there must have been a killer. But is the person in the sights of officials that killer?

And if massacre becomes the standard defining term, then who is the massacerer? Who did that massacrings? All too easily and quickly answers are found in the name of a person who repeatedly denied being at the Port Arthur Historic Site, and who had nothing but a confused (drugged?) recollection of being at the cottage at Seascope. Compounding this, words like massacre draw and hold people's attention to the deaths and how those deaths were caused. Minds fail at broad critical thinking when they become fixated. What reflection and investigation have told us is that what really happened there goes far beyond those incomprehensible human actions which have fixated many people.

Incident is my word choice. It is an all-encompassing term for what happened late April 1996 at and near Port Arthur, and for what happened before and after – there and elsewhere. It is a broad term. It does not condemn mentally-handicapped Martin Bryant, who was **denied a trial by jury in a sound court**, and it also accommodates **truthful facts revealing he is innocent**. – ed.

*Most people
have no
sound knowledge
of what happened at
Port Arthur
beyond what
has been
disseminated by
corrupt officials.*

we are not given any of the arrival times in any document. These times would have been recorded, but that information is not provided. Regardless, the **disparity between the times stated** in the court document and the EMA report is there and it has been noted.

Commissioner McCreadie gives the normal travelling time from Saltwater River as approximately 25 minutes, which is correct, provided the vehicle travelled by the shortest route. This didn't happen. Both police vehicles returned to the Nubeena police station, then split up. Constable Hyland backtracked then travelled the longer route via Taranna to the Arthur Highway. He then turned right and travelled past Seascapes to the Fox and Hounds Hotel. There, people had to be spoken to and details noted, before the police units could travel back to Seascapes. Hyland contacted Whittle, and both vehicles then proceeded back to that cottage. In all probability, the time the police units arrived to blockade the gunman at Seascapes would have been closer to **14:30** hours, or **2:30** p.m. Mr Perks though gives us more interesting information in the court document:

"At about 2:10 p.m. that day Alison Smith, an ABC⁸⁹ reporter left Hobart headed towards Port Arthur with a camera crew after hearing of the shooting incident. While travelling south Miss Smith made a series of telephone calls on her mobile phone to various businesses in the Port Arthur area to try and glean some further information. Between 2:30 and 2:40 p.m. she telephoned the Seascapes number and Miss Smith gives this account of what occurred: A male person answered the telephone and I said, 'Hullo, hullo.' The male person was laughing hysterically and I again said 'Hullo' and he then said, 'Hullo.' I then asked this person if I had the right number for Seascapes and he laughed again and said, 'Yes' I said, 'Who am I talking to?' he laughed again and said, 'Well, you can call me *Jamie*.' I then said, 'It's the ABC calling. What's happening?' He then replied, 'What's happening? What's happening is I'm having lots of fun.' There was a pause and he said, 'But I really need a shower,' another pause, 'If you try to call me again I'll shoot the hostage.'⁹⁰ (*sic*)

I'll shoot the hostage! It is singular, not plural, as in the later conversations with the negotiator. But this was an incoming call to Seascapes cottage. There was an **outgoing** phone call made from the cottage. Mr. Perks continues with the following from the transcript:

"I mentioned yesterday your Honour, Constable Paul Hyland, the Nubeena Police Constable, who arrived at Seascapes at approximately 2 p.m. to see the BMW ablaze. At 3:08 p.m. Merran Craig, the girlfriend of Constable Paul Hyland, answered the telephone at the Nubeena Police Station residence. The caller was a male person who spoke in a very calm voice. Immediately after the call Craig made notes of the conversation that occurred. The first words spoken by the male caller were: 'Am I speaking with the policeman's - ?' Miss Craig could not make out what was then said because the dog was barking. She told the caller to 'Excuse me a minute while I quieten the dog.' After she had done that she heard the male caller say 'Is that your dogs barking?' and she replied, 'Yes.' [**cont.**]

⁸⁹ Australian Broadcasting Corporation.

⁹⁰ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: p. 180.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The male caller then said, 'Do you know where your husband is?' Miss Craig then said, 'Who is this?' The male person replied, 'Jamie, you can just call me Jamie.' There was a pause, he then said, 'Do you know if he is okay?' Another pause, and then the male caller said, 'I know.' When the caller said that Miss Craig expected the male person to say 'Do you wish to speak to him?' [space here] in other words, Constable Hyland. And she believed at that moment that her boyfriend, Paul, had been taken hostage by the male person. She was aware of what had been happening at Port Arthur and when the male caller said, 'I know where Mr Hyland is.' She felt like she'd collapse on the floor. She just stood there for a few seconds trying to remain calm without saying anything. The male then spoke again in a mocking tone, a different tone, saying, 'Playing with yourself, are we?' Miss Craig held on to the phone for a few seconds and then it was hung up. It is the Crown case that the person who made the telephone call to Merran Craig was the accused, Martin Bryant."⁹¹ (sic)

It is normal police procedure to identify the vehicle, not the person. The Nubeena vehicle would be contacted as Nubeena Unit, not the vehicle driven by constable Hyland. What this telephone call tells us is that the gunman *Jamie* personally knew Hyland, and there was some animosity between them. However there is **no known record of Hyland ever knowing Martin Bryant**. What is more is that this piece of the siege at Seascope has been deliberately hushed up.

Again there are time discrepancies, this time with the information of Alison Smith of the ABC. The court is informed that "at about 2:10 p.m." This is far from accurate. In her article printed in the Hobart newspaper *The Mercury*, Alison Smith informs us that she was alerted to the events when sighting a convoy of ambulances at the ABC roundabout in Hobart, which according to the EMA report were not dispatched until 14:30 hours or 2:30 p.m. Travelling time from Hobart to Copping where Alison Smith made her telephone call to the Seascope cottage is approximately 35 minutes, so the telephone call would have been made at approximately 3:10 p.m. or just after the call by *Jamie* to Merran Craig. Perhaps that was the reason why there was so much mirth and laughter inside the Seascope cottage.

The police commissioner, Richard McCreadie, informs us in the EMA report that the siege at Seascope cottage officially started at 14:12 hours on the Sunday afternoon. By that time constable Garry Whittle of the Dunalley police station arrived at Seascope, and reported back to Hobart that there was a burning BMW sedan on the front lawn of the premises. Constable Whittle then came under fire from a high-powered weapon fired from inside the cottage.

Seascope was built at the edge of Long Bay, not far from Port Arthur. To the east of the property is the bay, and on the west the hills rise to form a precipitous backdrop. To the north, the bay and the hills meet. To the south, past a stand of Australian gums, there is a small paddock and then more natural bushland. The cottage is set back about 150 metres down off the Arthur Highway, which meanders gently past the cottage and paddock to disappear in a sweeping left bend. The road is above the cottage, and because of the steep hills

⁹¹ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: pp. 181-182. When Perks says "It is the Crown case," members of the public are encouraged to believe it means something. But **it means nothing**. The Crown, which is the State, is responsible for killing people in and out of Australia. Get on the Internet and learn how many people have been killed in American-led wars of butchery in the Middle-East over the last decade. Killed by good military killers. Get on the Internet – learn how many people (mostly Black; yes they are people) have been killed in police lock-ups and in prisons right around Australia. Beaten and strung-up. Get on the Internet and read how cops are out there bashing, electrocuting, and lying across the land. The **Crown case was, still is, contrived tripe**. It was never presented at a jury trial – just declared as if it had meaning and substance. But it doesn't and never did. In Australia, the legal system is corrupt beyond your wildest nightmares.

there are ditches and culverts along the shoulders of the bitumen surface. Besides its tranquil and harmonious setting, Seascope cottage had one other excellent quality. Its positioning for defence was superb.

The story is told in *The Mercury*, of constable Pat Allen of the accident investigation squad, and of his involvement at Seascope. Allen was on duty with constable Perry Caulfield, when they were instructed to head towards the Tasman Peninsula. The article states that at Taranna, they saw constable Martin White from Sorell police station at a roadblock. He was being besieged by visitors who had escaped from the Port Arthur Historic Site, and who were thankful that they had finally found a policeman who could protect them.

Constables Allen and Caulfield then passed a roadblock manned by two policemen, and then at Seascope cottage saw constable Whittle crouched behind his police vehicle. Constables Allen and Caulfield drove on to the Fox and Hounds Hotel, where constable Caulfield was dropped off. Constable Allen then returned to assist constable Whittle at Seascope. Realising that he was on the target side of his vehicle, Allen did a U-turn then reversed up the road to where constable Whittle was sheltering. As the vehicle constable Allen was driving approached constable Whittle's position, shots rang out and constable Whittle then ran across the road into a ditch on the west side of the road, putting the road between the gunman and himself. Constable Allen then found himself being the target as two more shots rang out. Allen then grabbed the hand radio and bailed out of the police car leaving it on the roadway. Thus **there were two police cars almost blocking the roadway.**

This was the position when the Dunalley ambulance driven by paramedic Jim Giffard, and containing crewmembers Jodie Branch and Roger Garth. Just after 2 p.m., they were **the second team** to arrive at Port Arthur Historic Site. Giffard was driving and being unable to hear the warnings in relation to Seascope, he took the ambulance vehicle along the most direct route to Port Arthur. He passed Seascope where he found the road almost blocked by two police vehicles. It was a tight fit, and luckily Jim made it without damage to either the ambulance or the police vehicles.

Fine, so now consider this extract taken from Mike Bingham's book: "Pat Allen had been in the traffic office in Hobart with another officer, Perry Caulfield, when he had heard the first reports. They headed for the scene. As they approached Seascope, they saw a vehicle on fire. They stopped and spoke to an SOG member,⁹² who told them that there were wounded people at the Fox and Hounds Hotel up the road.... Having learned this information from the SOG member, police officers Pat Allen and Perry Caulfield had a choice. They could go the back way via Nubeena to avoid Seascope, or go straight through. Allen had seen Garry Whittle, who had been fired on by gunman as he drove along the highway beside Seascope, hiding behind his police car. Caulfield and Allen sped past in the traffic division station wagon straight to the Fox and Hounds. There was an ambulance there and some wounded."⁹³

⁹² How did this police person get there so quickly?

⁹³ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: pp. 106, 107.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The other ambulance in attendance at the Fox and Hounds was apparently crewed by the husband and wife team, Colin and Robin Dell. They arrived at the hotel by driving the detour route via Nubeena.

So the first question is, **what happened to the second police car** that Jim Giffard almost collided with as he passed Seascap? The second question is, at **what time did Allen arrive at Seascap** after driving from the traffic divisional office? Considering he was in Hobart, it still would have taken him over an hour to arrive outside Seascap cottage, and 90 minutes before he joined his colleague constable Whittle. And the third question is, **how did the SOG members arrive so early at Seascap?** Luppo Prins says it was he who authorised the SOG deployment,⁹⁴ and the time given for Prins' notification of the incident was 13:51 hours, according to commissioner McCreadie. McCreadie also gives us the time of 15:57 for "SOG tasked and proceeding," and 16:04 for "2nd SOG tasked and proceeding."⁹⁵

However to confuse matters, McCreadie then gives us different times under section 9 of his report. In it McCreadie says this: "The Special Operations Group was called out at 13:47. Three members flew to Taranna by helicopter arriving at 15:33 and nine members travelled by road. They arrived on site at 16:12. A holding area was first established at the PFCP⁹⁶ and a cordon was placed around the Seascap cottage by 17:12."⁹⁷

In this part of the story of the massacre, there are many **things that do not fit together**, and the most obvious difficulties are the times. Another problem is that constable Hyland has gone missing. It is obvious that the two police vehicles that were blocking the highway outside Seascap were those of constables Hyland and Whittle, but Hyland has no further mention in this story. Even Whittle takes a back seat, and constable Allen gives us the story.

We are told that they were unable to move because they were in range of Bryant's guns. This is what constable Pat Allen said:

1. "I stuck my head up and it was shot at";
2. "I only did it once";
3. "It was coming towards dark and someone on the radio said that they'd seen him on the roof and they needed to identify him. They needed to ID him so they could kill him if they had to";
4. "They gave me the option to stick my head up and I did. I went to look under the wheels, to have a look at Seascap to see if I could see him and a shot went through the bumper bar and bounced somewhere on the road"; and,
5. "He knew where we were."⁹⁸

Now here is a conundrum. The gunman is spotted on the roof of an adjoining building. One cop out of the many surrounding Seascap raises his head so he might be able to see by looking from under the police car. The policeman is fired upon before he can even take that look. Now how did the gunman know which target he was required to shoot at, at that precise time? Another conundrum is, where did the shot come from? Was it the roof, or was it from the cottage?

⁹⁴ Luppo Prins. *Port Arthur emergency response - police operations centre*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 27.

⁹⁵ Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur: An overview of the police response* (part 1). Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 6.

⁹⁶ Police Forward Command Post.

⁹⁷ Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur: An overview of the police response* (part 1). Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 9.

⁹⁸ Whinnett Ellen. *The officer under fire*; The Mercury; 26 November 1996.

MY DAY – SUNDAY 28th APRIL 1996

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur; 2001-4: pp. 295-297

MY working life has been a career in tourism. This has stretched over twenty years, in various aspects of employment within the Port Arthur Historic Site. I enjoyed my employment as manager of visitor services, and had a good rapport with my staff who were very committed to their work. The visitor services department employed about thirty staff members to cater for over 250,000 visitors to the Port Arthur Historic Site for day and night activities. On 28th April 1996, a completely unexpected event occurred. It irreparably shattered our lives and cast many of us into a wilderness that remains today.

At 11:00 a.m. that day, 10 managers and supervisors left the site on their way to a conference at Swansea. This was the first time in my **twenty years**, that I am aware of, where all senior management had been involved in a conference/training session away from the Port Arthur Historic Site which required an overnight stay, Sunday through to Monday.

We had just arrived at a Japanese restaurant, *Kabuki by the Sea*, which is about 16 km from our destination Swansea, and a good two-and-a-half hours drive from Port Arthur, when we received a phone call at 1:50 p.m. The chief executive officer took the message then called to me and asked if it could be a hoax. He said: "They are saying there is a madman at Port Arthur shooting people and that 12 people are dead." This was such unbelievable news, that our peaceful setting at Port Arthur where friends and staff worked, and visitors from all around the world came to holiday, was the scene of such carnage. As two people known to me had given this report, it could not be ignored.

The chief executive officer immediately directed us to return to Port Arthur and, in my case, to account for all my staff on duty that day and assist visitors in distress. We were unable to make phone contact with Port Arthur to clarify further details until we reached Orford, a small seaside town approximately one hour 15 minutes from the site.

Communications to the Tasman Peninsula were overloaded, so we relied on the car radio for information, which was sketchy in detail, except the number of persons murdered or injured was increasing with each announcement. Finally, when we were able to contact the Port Arthur Historic Site, it was then that my worst fears became a reality. At a phone box on the side of the road, I learnt that my niece and cousin had been murdered in the Broad Arrow Café massacre but further details were limited, as the gunman's whereabouts were unknown.

The three cars carrying managers and supervisors continued to Taranna where several police had set up a police car barricade across the road that directly continued through to Port Arthur. It was now 3:40 p.m. We were directed by police via Nubeena to Port Arthur and arrived at approximately 4:00 p.m.⁹⁹

(cont.)

⁹⁹ See the Map of roadways on the Tasman Peninsula. The route described by this author – Taranna, Nubeena, Port Arthur – is the route that Tasmania Police could have, and should have, taken to reach the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS). The road would have been considered unsafe at Seascape cottage, but there was no need to pass by that place of the SOG siege. The PAHS staff avoided it and so too could have the police. The staff arrived at the site at about 4:00 p.m. It took the cops another **3.5 hours** – a little dereliction; willful neglect – to serve the public a shocking number of which then laid dead and wounded at the historic site while police had a sausage sizzle up the road. On the members.iimetro.com.au website, it asks this in the article *Port Arthur massacre*: "Who ordered the armed police to stop at Taranna, [see Map] where they had a barbecue?" Are we supposed to believe Martin Bryant arranged a BBQ too? But Martin would have been far too busy with the siege at Seascape, and *Mick*, and *Rick*, plus a night-vision scope, and bits of rope, and smashing glass to leave weapons out in the grass, and firing at choppers then reading a script, as he acted out *Jamie* telling Terry not to hit – their "main man." It sure was one hell of a complicated **66-1Q plan**. And it went on all through the night, with tasty snacks so they were alright. Lights on lights off, down there in the dark, with a 43-weapon arsenal it was one big lark. Like *Mick* (or was it *Rick*?) Dyson, it seems you need a "passion" for such things.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

On entering the Site through the back entrance at the Port Arthur Motor Inn, we met staff who had been traumatised, through loss of family and the massacre. They were directed to be together in a safe haven at Clougha, an administration building.

I could not at this stage identify any police officers controlling the situation. To me everything was in slow motion, just like a slide show, as slide after slide, imprinted in my memory the events of what was taking place and trying to grapple with my responsibilities in the unfolding of what had happened. I met Wendy Scurr in the car park outside the Broad Arrow Café. I firmly believe that Wendy saved me from further trauma, by stopping me from entering the café on that day. She told me: "There is nothing you could do for the people in there. They're all dead."

I accounted for my staff and assisted with visitors in distress. By 5:30 p.m. it had become quite dark. Staff and visitors comforted each other in small groups in and around the car park area near the information office. An alarm was given over the site communications by radio that the gunman had doubled back. Over 50 persons including staff members, SES [State Emergency Service], visitors and volunteers were walked some 10 minutes away to Clougha, and occupied the offices for our personal safety.

Gunshots were heard and we were told to turn off the lights, lie on the floor away from windows and doors and be quiet. Many of the people in Clougha had already experienced the shooting at the café or assisted as volunteers and they were again being re-traumatised. The two local doctors were counselling people who had lost family and friends, amidst the confusion and fear of those locked in the dark.

Some became angry and demanded police protection over the radio, some screamed, some shook uncontrollably, some cried quietly, as we waited in the dark. Waited for what? I remember thinking – *my husband is going to be really, really angry that I had got myself into this situation*. It was after 7:30 p.m. when six policemen escorted us on foot in small groups to the youth hostel near the Port Arthur Motor Inn where everyone involved was gathered together in these two areas.

It was some two hours later, that I was picked up by friend from the youth hostel and finally reunited with my husband and son soon after. I have been unable to work since the massacre, and am diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. It is less than a thousand words *My Day*, but the day of 28th April 1996 will remain with me for the rest of my life. **I am very disillusioned with the present system which is denying survivors of this tragedy the opportunity of presenting their testimony [during a public trial] in the cause of truth and justice.**

Robyn Cooper

former manager – visitor services
Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority
(original italics; added emphasis)

Truth & Justice
*are jokes in
the corrupt
Australian
legal system
played on
the people
– decent,
long-suffering
people.*

So here is the third conundrum. Why is the gunman on the roof of an adjoining building? Launceston's newspaper The Examiner gives us the answer. In a front-page report, it states: "When holed up in a house after driving 5 km from the original shooting site, he began firing at helicopters taking victims to hospital."¹⁰⁰ Then in the Time Australia magazine this statement appears: "AFTERMATH: Survivors of the shooting, top right, faced more danger as bullets were fired at air ambulances."¹⁰¹ The only way for the gunman to fire upon overhead helicopters was to have a shooting platform. He couldn't shoot at helicopters **from inside Seascope cottage**. This explains why the gunman was on the roof of the adjoining building.

The coroner Ian Matterson who attended at Port Arthur presented this information to the EMA: "It was agreed that I would arrange for my coronial staff to travel to the scene by helicopter at 17:00 hours"; and, "Travel arrangements for myself and my two police officers changed at 16:55 when we were advised that air travel in the region of Port Arthur was being jeopardised by continued shooting and that the area had still not been rendered safe by the police."¹⁰²

What Mr Matterson has just told us is that it was considered unsafe for helicopters to be ferrying people to Port Arthur. This corroborates that the gunman had been shooting at helicopters. It is also rather obvious, that if a person were on the roof of a building shooting at passing helicopters, he would have to be armed. Again The Examiner tells us: "Police said the man was armed with a number of guns including an M-16 combat weapon."¹⁰³

For the police to be able to identify the weapon used, they would have to sight it. The only opportunity for a cop to sight the "M-16" was with the SOG marksman who initially spotted the gunman on the roof. The M-16 and the Colt AR-15 are almost identical except for one difference. The M-16 is a fully automatic weapon, while the AR-15 is a semi-automatic. However if one considers Dutton's article, he alleges that the AR-15 and the FN had both been interfered with to make them fire on fully automatic. This gives us another problem. It is virtually impossible to adapt the Colt AR-15 to fire on full automatic. So was the weapon used to fire at the helicopters a fully automatic M-16 firing volleys of shots or was it the AR-15 which could only fire one shot each time the trigger was pulled?

Finally there is deputy commissioner Richard McCreadie's interview on the *Today* show at 7:51 hours on the 29th April 1996, in which McCreadie informs the listeners that the gunman had fired over 18 volleys of shots during the siege, which was still ongoing at the time of the interview.

The events would have transpired in this manner – the rescue helicopter taking the wounded to Hobart flies over Seascope and is fired upon. Constables Whittle and Allen may also have witnessed the shootings at the helicopter(s), but only being armed with a Glock pistol and a Smith & Wesson revolver, neither policeman could act to stop the gunman. The pilot immediately warns the other

¹⁰⁰ The Examiner; 29 April 1996.

¹⁰¹ Tim Blair. *Death in the ruins*; Time Australia; 13 May 1996: p. 21.

¹⁰² Ian Matterson. *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: pp. 90.

¹⁰³ The Examiner; 29 April 1996.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

helicopter crews, and informs the ambulance service via their radio. The ambulance service informs police headquarters via telephone, and police headquarters passes on the information again via telephone to the PFCP at Taranna. There the SOG marksman would have been dispatched posthaste to remove the danger. The SOG marksman spotted the gunman on the roof of an adjoining building at Seascope. He required confirmation that it was the gunman on the roof before he could take him out. Constable Allen in the ditch offered to be the guinea pig and raised his head to have a look from under the police car and a bullet was fired into the bumper bar of the police vehicle.

If the gunman had seen the SOG marksman, then he would not have put a bullet above his head as he did to Constable Allen. The most likely reason why the gunman didn't take out the SOG marksman was because the gunman couldn't see the SOG marksman, but he did know who and where constable Allen was. The only way for the gunman to know this was if he was monitoring the police radio transmissions. So who was it that fired the shot at constable Allen? It was not the gunman on the roof of the adjoining building who was armed with the Colt AR-15. So there had to be **another gunman inside Seascope cottage** who was also monitoring the police radio transmissions. The SOG marksman had the person on the roof of the adjoining building under observation. Had this gunman fired the shot at constable Allen, then he would have been identified, and the SOG marksman could have taken that particular person out.

We are given two further pieces of information. Mr Perks states these words from the official document: "And a bullet that struck Constable Whittle's vehicle, a close-up view of that at Photograph 352, was later determined by ballistics evidence to have been fired from an SKK semi-automatic rifle."¹⁰⁴(sic)

However, in sergeant Gerard Dutton's report we are told that all weapons except the Belgium FN which was found on the roof of the adjoining building, and the Colt AR-15, which was found on the periphery of the main Seascope building, had been totally destroyed by the fire. Dutton stated, "It was obvious that Bryant had placed at least one firearm in each room of the guesthouse for easy access."¹⁰⁵ These included a 12 gauge self-loading shotgun, a .30 M1 carbine, a 7.62x39mm Norinco self-loading rifle and bolt and lever action rifles."¹⁰⁶ The SKK semi-automatic rifle mentioned here is the 7.62x39mm Norinco self-loading rifle. It is now fair to state that the shot fired at Allen that struck Whittle's vehicle, was fired from inside Seascope, whilst a gunman was on the roof of the adjoining building. However the shot was fired **from inside the cottage**. This was entirely unexpected by all police members and their subsequent radio communications displayed that surprise.

Tasmania Police now thought they had a terrorist situation, which is why calls were made to the Victoria Police for assistance, and then to the national crisis centre in Canberra, which dispatched the ASIO tactical support team. Luppó Prins the assistant commissioner states the following in his report to the EMA Port Arthur Seminar:

¹⁰⁴ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: p. 176.

¹⁰⁵ Dutton's statement is deceptive. In relation to the ongoing siege, he knew nothing with certainty about what took place inside the cottage. For Dutton to claim anything was "obvious" is nonsense. An opinion is a fact. But, no matter how much it is repeated does not convert Dutton's opinion into a truth.

¹⁰⁶ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal, December 1998: p. 215.

"The Commissioner of Police also communicated with the Crisis Policy Centre in Canberra. The deputy prime minister was advised of the incident and he in turn advised the prime minister (John Howard). The PSCC provided assistance with the provision of transport of Technical Equipment for use by the Technical Surveillance Unit."¹⁰⁷ The PSCC is the Protective Security Co-ordination Centre which is an *intelligence agency*.

The Australian newspaper also gives us some information in an early article it which this is stated: "One report on police radio said, 'He's got some police officers down there, and he's shooting at them, and we also believe that the people that are in Seascope are returning fire at the offender'."¹⁰⁸

This is corroborated by superintendent Barry Bennett in a journal article published by the South Australia Police Association. It reveals: "There was some suggestion that there may have been two gunmen or some people or hostages at Seascope were exchanging gunfire with the gunmen as there appeared to be shots coming from two separate buildings."¹⁰⁹ Of course with Glenn Pears' body having been found [allegedly] with two sets of handcuffs¹¹⁰ on, and the body of David Martin wearing a gag, it would appear to have been rather difficult for these two persons to have been shooting at a gunman outside the cottage. Again, the police belief and concern about the hostages also points to a different scenario than persons inside Seascope resisting the gunman.

¹⁰⁷ Lупpo Prins. *Port Arthur emergency response - police operations centre*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 28.

¹⁰⁸ Bruce Montgomery. *Hostages in final siege*; The Australian; 29 April 1996.

¹⁰⁹ Jenny Fleming. *Forward command at Port Arthur*; Police Journal (Police Association of South Australia); March 1997.

¹¹⁰ Two pairs of handcuffs are mentioned by officials. However, no associated images or the actual cuffs were ever made public. The constant suggestion being that Marin Bryant obtained them (from where?), then used them on Glenn Pears. This was **never proved with any evidence**, and facts strongly suggest Pears died inside the BMW, not inside the cottage wearing handcuffs. All there has ever been is unproved assertions by official scum. Note the handcuffs do not appear on any list of alleged evidence.

¹¹¹ State Emergency Service.

¹¹² Police Operations Centre.

However there was another aspect of this particular incident. The SES¹¹¹ members – who had been monitoring the Tasmania Police communications – also realised the implications, but believed that those police no longer had the gunman confined. They (SES) immediately radioed warnings to their associates at Port Arthur. The driver of one of the local fire trucks in attendance at Port Arthur passed on this drastic news to other members and staff within the historic site. News that the gunman was no longer within police confines created more terror for the survivors huddled at the site, especially as there was no protection for them in the form of police or any other armed guards.

There is one other aspect of this whole scenario. It was **the gunman who was in absolute control of the situation**. He was able to do this because the police negotiators and the SOG were split. There was no proper and reliable communications between them. Whether there were **57** phone calls made between the gunman and the police negotiators as stated in The Mercury report, or **six** as revealed in the EMA report, or **seven** as noted in the court document, it doesn't really matter. Another interesting aspect is that both the police negotiator Terry McCarthy and Dr. Ian Sale state it was the **gunman who normally initiated the phone calls**, not the police negotiation team. So again, **the gunman was in control**.

This situation is clearly explained by superintendent Barry Bennett when he stated this during his presentation at the EMA seminar: "The negotiators operating from the POC¹¹² and not being readily

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

accessible to the PFC¹¹³ caused some concerns because access to information gathered by negotiators was not fully available to the PFC or indeed the SOG personnel at the incident site. The communications difficulties exacerbated the flow of intelligence. This is a clear example that negotiators are a resource for the PFC and should on all occasions be situated at or near the PFCP¹¹⁴ to enable all intelligence or information be available to make the tactical decisions required.”¹¹⁵ (*sic*)

There is some confusion in relation to the actual time when the SOG marksman spotted the gunman on the roof. Police negotiator Terry McCarthy is quoted by Mike Bingham as implying that the SOG was spotted because of a small red light on a radio on the SOG marksman's back, and that would put the time as sometime after dark. However, we are informed that at the time, constable Pat Allen was prepared to have a look to see if he could identify the gunman, so this gives us the fact that it was still during day light hours.

These are two different occurrences.

It is now time to again study what Tasmania Police commissioner McCreadie informs us in his report. In his paper to the EMA seminar, McCreadie states this, under section 9 of his paper: “The Special Operations Group was called out at 13:47. Three members flew to Taranna by helicopter arriving at 15:33 and nine members travelled by road. They arrived on site at 16:12. A holding area was first established at the PFCP and a cordon was placed around the Seascope Cottage by 17:12. The offender was only loosely contained at that time.”¹¹⁶ (*sic*)

The Tasmania Police SOG would have been extremely competent in containing a single gunman within Seascope cottage. Every report up to that particular stage stated one gunman only, so why would there suddenly be an urgent entreaty (17:15) to the Victoria Police for assistance? Why notify (17:19) the National Crisis Centre for a single gunman? Why would the National Anti-Terrorist Plan be implemented for a single gunman at a siege at Port Arthur?

The answer would be that the SOG marksman, who spotted a person matching the description of the gunman on the roof of the adjoining building, also noted that the shot came from inside Seascope cottage, which meant that there was more than one gunman. This would have altered the situation entirely, with many unknown quantities now having to be considered. What this also tells us is that it was at this time that the Tasmania Police became aware that they had a terrorist situation on their hands.

There is one last piece of the jigsaw puzzle to complete this picture. Craig Coombs, the CEO (Chief Executive Officer) of the Port Arthur Historic Site in his report in to the EMA Port Arthur Seminar states: “At about 17:00 a report came through that it was feared that Bryant may have broken out of Seascope and was heading back to the site. Shots were then reported as coming from across the site.”¹¹⁷ Coombs went on and said: “At this stage (about 17:30) the day was drawing to a close. We were assured that there was a group of SOGs

¹¹³ Police Forward Commander.

¹¹⁴ Police Forward Command Post.

¹¹⁵ Barry Bennett. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 2); Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 21.

¹¹⁶ Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 1); Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 9.

¹¹⁷ Craig Coombs. *Port Arthur Historic Site management authority response*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 40.

arriving by helicopter to secure the Site. I hoped this would help to settle people down and give them hope. I felt at this stage a strange feeling that I was not going to be shot, a feeling shared by other staff members. I moved out in the open and without fear commandeered 3 four-wheel drive vehicles and had them ready to transport the SOGs to secure the Site. Driving the vehicles to the edge of the oval, we waited for the helicopter to arrive. The helicopter contained 2 young policewomen who had come off the beat in Hobart."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁸ Craig Coombs. *Port Arthur Historic Site management authority response*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 40.

¹¹⁹ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: p. 118. The problem with statements like this is it is **hearsay**. Bingham himself did not see anyone at Seascope during the siege. He had to rely on what police told him, and their integrity must **always be doubted**. Thus, the logical question arises, how do the cops who were at that siege know a person seen there was Martin Bryant? Well none of them did. He is the person they were told would be there. But the evidence reveals Bryant was not alone at Seascope.

¹²⁰ Standing Advisory Committee for Commonwealth/State Cooperation for the **Protection Against Violence**.

¹²¹ With their high-powered weapons and all their training, plus the fact the gunman was sighted by well-armed SOGs, they were not permitted to do their job for one simple reason. If they shot the gunman and it turned out he was **not** Bryant – which is what so many hard facts strongly suggest – then no part of the incident at and near Port Arthur could be blamed on Bryant. The SOGs were stopped from what they were supposed to do because if they killed the real gunman it would have exposed the official set-up in which **Bryant the patsy** was to take all the blame. The gunman had to be protected and Bryant had to be left to die in the burning cottage. That he was drugged is most likely, given his confusion and nonsensical statements which he made after he came out all aflame from the burning cottage.

¹²² Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: p. 119.

The SOGs who Craig Coombs was waiting for had been diverted from the Historic Site to Taranna, as they were needed to assist at Seascope due to the change in events there. There were no back-up crew for the historic site, and the only assistance available were the two young **unarmed** policewomen.

In *Suddenly One Sunday*, author Mike Bingham writes these words: "At times, Bryant was caught in the sights of some of the marksmen, but there was never a suggestion that he be shot. There are National guidelines for the use of force, and every State is a signatory to those guidelines. Officers cannot kill anyone unless their life is in immediate danger, or the lives of others are in immediate danger."¹¹⁹

Apparently just merely shooting at the police is no longer a threat to their lives, nor is it a danger, according to this interpretation. These guidelines originate from Canberra, via SAC-PAV,¹²⁰ but as the police have already been shot at, and there was every reason to believe that they would continue to be shot at, then this is **not** the reason why the police were not permitted to shoot the gunman.¹²¹

There is also a discrepancy in relation to the number of shots fired by the gunman. Newspaper reports state **250** shots were fired, and other reports state **150**. The then deputy commissioner, Richard McCreadie, informed the **Today** interviewer Steve Lieberman on Monday the 29th April 1996, that **18** volleys of shots had been fired by the gunman.

In his book, Mike Bingham wrote: "After dark, for a short time they believed there *were* more than one gunman, as firing came from beside the chimney of another building on the property. Then a marksman spotted Bryant running between it and the main house. He had another ploy, which was to switch on a light in a room on the bottom floor, then run upstairs and fire random shots.... In all, Bryant fired some 250 rounds from his own two guns and from the weapons he found stored in Seascope."¹²² (original italics)

What Bingham has done here is to [attempt to] scotch any possible rumours that the SOG were facing more than one gunman in a terrorist situation. Consider that we are being asked to believe that one person would be talking to the police negotiators, shooting from the main cottage, and then moving outside and continue to shoot from the adjoining building, and all with absolute impunity from the best trained police in Tasmania.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Bingham also writes: "Only the flash of the muzzle blast could be seen as he fired a few rounds, put the gun down, crawled along to the next gun, and fired again."¹²³ This raises questions. Why would the gunman inside the cottage leave one weapon after shooting it and then crawl to another? Should something go wrong, then he would have been caught halfway between weapons, and unarmed.

Yet this person displayed good military perceptions with all aspects of the defence of the building he was occupying. Instead of acting like somebody who had picked up some military tactics, could this person possibly be two gunmen, both military trained? Another consideration is that of night vision. If a shooter subjects his eyes to light at night then his vision is destroyed. So, why would one person firing volleys of shots at police use such tactics?

And there is another aspect, of this particular scene described by Bingham. None of the police would have been able to see inside the cottage. So, the idea that the gunman crawled from one weapon to the other **is a presumption**. If there was only one person firing the various weapons then it may be fair enough. However if there is a team inside the cottage, then the opinion formed by the trained SOG members that there were **at least two gunmen inside** the cottage is very correct.

Furthermore, the police negotiators claim to have spent over two hours talking via telephone to the gunman. Officially, negotiations with the gunman commenced at around 3:30 p.m. The last conversation ended between just after 9:00 p.m., or 9:30 p.m., or 9:37 p.m. There are different statements from police on this time, which were taped, with very precise times attached, but that should not cause too much concern if we consider hours of chatting with negotiators between 3:30 and 9:30 p.m. which is six hours, and so almost half of that time the supposed lone gunman was unable to keep an eye on the surrounding police, or even shoot at them. However, constable Pat Allen of the accident investigation squad states otherwise – there was a team of **three men inside Seascapes cottage** during the police siege.

In *Suddenly One Sunday*, Mike Bingham in writing about the police negotiator states: "He again became very agitated at the start of their next phone call, claiming he had spotted a police marksman. McCarthy guessed it was probably a small red light on a radio on the SOG marksman's back – a light which is normally taped over during operations. 'Ask him to move on – he's going to shoot, he's trying to shoot – I'll blow this – you know, you know what's going to happen if....' – McCarthy agreed to have the officer moved back. Bryant accepted the assurance, but warned that if it was not completed within ten minutes, the hostages would die. Moments later he stepped up the pressure: 'If you don't call him off in five minutes, man, they're all dead'."¹²⁴

On Monday 11th October 1999, the channel 9 television network aired the following part of the communications between the gunman and sergeant McCarthy.

¹²³ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: pp. 118-119.

¹²⁴ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: p. 114. These statements made by a *Jamie* were made after sunset – before midnight and certainly when it was dark. Note the threat about the hostages, **plural**: "they're all dead." Yet earlier in the middle of that afternoon, a *Jamie* made a reference to "the hostage," **singular**. So what was going on? Did those at Seascapes cottage forget the number of hostages they had? Or did two of them adopt the role of *Jamie* for those different phone calls? Note two different people spoke with a *Jamie* on those two occasions: 1st, afternoon – **Alison Smith**; & 2nd, evening – **Terry McCarthy**.

*Serious analysis
of what is
alleged to have
taken place at
Seascape
confirms the entire
thing was a
smoke-&-mirrors
event set up by
corrupt officials
– it would all be
humorous
except at least
**three people
were killed.***

IS THERE A SMOKING GUN?

PEOPLE who are new to the case will probably find themselves wondering if there is a smoking gun, a single piece of evidence that proves that the massacre was the product of a conspiracy, or that Bryant was a patsy. There are, in fact, **dozens of smoking guns in this case.**

A fact that should be better known is that, when Bryant staggered out of the burning Seascape guest house on the morning of April 29, his words were: "**Don't shoot. I am the hostage.**" So we have known since April 29, 1996, that he (Bryant) was the hostage, not the gunman. (It is interesting that Bryant spoke in the singular. Since he was probably drugged for most of his time inside Seascape, he would almost certainly not have known that the gunman had taken a number of other hostages.)

It is astonishing that the bias in favour of Bryant's guilt has been so deeply entrenched for so long that no one has yet grasped the significance of the fact that, when he emerged from Seascape, he felt the need to clarify to the police who he was. At this stage, of course, Bryant could have had no idea that **the police had already decided that he was the gunman.**

A second smoking gun is a startling piece of information betrayed by the Hobart Mercury reporter Michael Bingham in his book *Suddenly One Sunday* (1996), the **lightweight narrative** of the massacre and its sequel at the Seascape guest house that is probably the only book about the case that has been reasonably widely read.

According to Bingham, the first Special Operations Group (SOG) personnel consisting of three people arrived in Taranna by helicopter from Hobart at about 3:15 p.m. on April 28. The second set of SOG personnel arrived in Taranna by land at 4:12 p.m. "The first of them (*i.e.*, those who had arrived at about 3:15) moved forward to Seascape just before 4 p.m." (p. 106) Unbelievably, Bingham goes on to mention that when the first police arrived at Seascape, which was shortly before 2 p.m., an SOG man (whose name is not given) was already present at the scene: "As they approached Seascape, they saw a vehicle on fire. They stopped and spoke to an SOG member, who told them that there were wounded people at the Fox and Hounds Hotel up the road, and that police were needed there as soon as possible."

In other words, an SOG man – or, at least, someone with SOG identification – was on the scene at more or less **exactly the same time** that the car was set on fire, which was first reported, according to Bingham, at 1:57 p.m. (p. 100).

Numerous questions have to be asked about this SOG man, who must have been outside Seascape by 1:55 p.m. at the very latest. First of all, what was he doing at Seascape before 2 p.m., when the first SOG party did not even arrive at Taranna until

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

3:12 p.m. and at Seascap until "just before 4 p.m."? Second, his early presence strongly suggests that **he was already at Seascap when the gunman arrived there from Port Arthur.**

If so, how did he know that the gunman was going to go there? And, if he was there before 1:55 p.m., why didn't he try to apprehend the gunman as he exited the stolen BMW and entered the guest house? And why was his priority to deflect the next set of police to arrive on the scene (the constables Pat Allen and Perry Caulfield) to the Fox and Hounds Hotel 800 metres away?

An explanation that makes sense is that **the SOG man¹²⁵ WAS the Port Arthur shooter.** After arriving at Seascap, he would have ditched his wig and his ear muffs inside the BMW before setting fire to it (thus eliminating the evidence of his impersonation of Martin Bryant inside the Broad Arrow Café). He would have been present at the location, with his SOG identification, when the first police, including Allen and Caulfield, arrived outside Seascap a few minutes later.

At this stage, his overwhelming concern would be to send police to another location as a means of buying more time for his next step, his transformation into *Jamie*, the gunman inside Seascap who was subsequently (and erroneously) identified by the authorities as Martin Bryant. Certainly, he was inside the house, and speaking with ABC reporter Alison Smith, when she rang the Seascap number between about 2:20 and 2:30 p.m.

portarthur
forums.joeuser.com
5 October 2004
(amended; added emphasis)

*As soon as Martin Bryant ceases to be the focus of attention, other suspicious things that went on during the incident begin demanding more attention. What were those two people from the BMW at the tollbooth doing **sitting inside that yellow Volvo?** They did not know Martin Bryant, but everything suggests they knew the gunman well enough to wait for him. What happened to constable Chris Iles¹²⁶ from Dunalley? It seems he was not sent to the Port Arthur general store. But he arrived there, then he **mysteriously disappeared** never to be mentioned in any police statement or report. He either passed that gold-coloured BMW sedan on his way to the store. Or if he arrived there via Nubeena, then two questions arise: **i.** What was he doing so far out of his area? & **ii.** Why did he not go to the historic site where witnesses (James Laycock, Yannis Kateros) must have told him people had been shot? Then we have a member of SOG at Seascap cottage **before 2:00 p.m.** It is extremely suggestive. That Andrew Mark Fogarty burnt the BMW there, killing Glenn Pears in the boot, is more plausible than Martin Bryant taking Mr. Pears inside Seascap to attach him to something imaginary with imaginary handcuffs – two pairs of handcuffs which **mysteriously disappeared** and which were never on any list of (alleged) evidence. And which were never proven to have belonged to, or to have been purchased or obtained by, or in the possession of, Martin Bryant. – ed.*

125 It is not clear in this statement whether **SOG man** means a person who is member of the Tasmania Police SOG, or whether it means a person who is being controlled by or working with the SOG.

126 If you know or meet this Chris Iles, or Paul Hyland, **confront them** about their behaviour at Port Arthur on 28 April 1996. Ask them why they **failed to perform** their sworn duty to those who were going through hell – **the people who pay them.** Alternatively, email me their addresses so they can be outted to the nation: martinbryantisinnocent@gmail.com

TELEPHONE CALL

McCarthy: Jamie?
Jamie: Yes. Hello. How are you?
McCarthy: I'm very well thanks Jamie. Yourself?
Jamie: Well, I'm well up to now. The past few 20 seconds. What I've actually found out man, is that one of your boys is right outside, northeast I'd say, with an infra-red scope. Would you just ask him to move on?
McCarthy: Right, we'll do that, we'll do that now.
Jamie: 'Cause he's going to shoot, he's trying to shoot, he's going to **shoot your main man.**¹²⁷
McCarthy: No, I can guarantee.
Jamie: I'll blow this, umm these you know, you know what's going to happen.
McCarthy: I don't want to see anyone hurt, alright.
Jamie: You just move him on.
McCarthy: Okay, I'm organising that now. I can also assure you that it's not our intention to hurt you or see anybody else hurt, okay.
Jamie: Really.

However a copy of the transcript presented to the supreme court has this version of the conversation:

TRANSCRIPT

McCarthy: Jamie?
Jamie: Yes. Hello. How are you?
McCarthy: I'm very well thanks Jamie. Yourself?
Jamie: Uh well I'm well up 'til now and the past few twenty seconds. What I've actually found out man is that one of you boys is right outside North East I'd say, with an infra-red scope. I've got one up here that I've found from this persons own um owns this property,¹²⁸ he's shining right towards me. If he doesn't leave can you just ask him to move on.
McCarthy: Alright, we'll do that, we'll do that. Now
Jamie: cause he's gonna shoot he's trying to shoot he's gonna shoot and make me man, I mean
McCarthy: Oh, oh I can guarantee
Jamie: I'll blow this um these you know you know what's gonna happen if
McCarthy: I don't want to see anybody hurt, alright.
Jamie: You, you move him on
McCarthy: Okay, I'm organising that now somebody's organising now
Jamie: If that light. I mean I've got one here would you like me to name the sort, I'll just get the um infra-red of this blokes¹²⁸Inaudible
McCarthy: Okay, okay
LONG BREAK IN CONVERSATION
Jamie: Ya there.
McCarthy: Yes Jamie, I'm here.
Jamie: Good, good, good, good. Um now the name of this scope is a laser scope. Laser devices now it's the **[cont.]**

¹²⁷ One of the **most significant** statements made by any person who was involved with the case. The gunman was not speaking about himself or about the hostages who the cops say they never saw. The gunman was referring to **a person who was with him inside Seascope** cottage. And in addition, the gunman **told the police negotiator** that the person inside the cottage was their "main man." Nothing could be clearer – **the gunman was not alone.**

¹²⁸ There is not a shred of evidence that those who owned and occupied Seascope cottage (David and Sally Martin) ever bought or had in their possession an **infra-red scope**, or a **laser scope**. Nor did Bryant. Based on the many revelations within the written police documents, the gunman inside the cottage did have such a device, and this tells us the siege at the cottage was a staged event. *Jamie* said he "found" such a device inside Seascope. But neither it nor the burnt remains of it were ever found in the cottage after the fire. All the facts strongly suggest the declared device was removed from Seascope by the "main man" of the police when he fled the cottage before the burning Bryant staggered outside on the morning of 29 April 1996.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

same sort of red dot I've noticed so can you ask your young man to move on.

McCarthy: Has he, has he moved at this stage, can you see him now?

Jamie: Well there's no doubt he's moved forward

McCarthy: No no, look I, I

Jamie: Has he got a walkie talkie or has he got them ear plugs

McCarthy: I've I've got no idea Jamie I've got no idea, but I can assure you um that we are doing our best to move him at this moment. I can also assure you that it's not our intention to hurt you or see anybody else hurt, okay.

Jamie: Really. But can you actually ask him to move 'cause I can see him in the dark.

McCarthy: I, I can't physically ask him to move, but um, we're organising getting him moved. Whereabouts exactly is he?

Jamie: He's at the front of the actual property at Seascape Guest House.

McCarthy: Right, it's the front

Jamie: behind the

McCarthy: Is that's, that's obviously facing out onto the road is it?

Jamie: Onto the road, yeah

McCarthy: It is onto the road?

Jamie: Yeah facing onto the road toward you look down from the road and you see the front of the house and he's behind some bushes near the front door of the Seascape Guest House yeah.

McCarthy: Right, near the front door of the Seascape Guest House?

Jamie: If that infra-red doesn't go in say ten minutes the hostages die so

McCarthy: Well I, I don't, I don't want, I don't want it, I don't want it er that to happen.

Jamie: Of course you don't sir.

McCarthy: and and look I can assure you

Jamie: Yes

McCarthy: that there is that that it is not our intention in anyway to hurt you. There's no need for you to hurt anybody.

Jamie: No, I, I, I, not going to but all I want to know is um hhhhave you talked to the helicopter

McCarthy: Ah you know we didn't finish our conversation last time ah about the helicopter and as I said we were talking about flight plans and ah perhaps ah using that helicopter in the morning and um I've got to know exactly for sure I've got to be able to give um Civil Aviation People ah names of persons that are going to be on board the aircraft then we've got to find er a pilot who's prepared to fly the aircraft and a suitable aircraft that will you know convey you and whatever equipment or things that you might need to take with you. So

Jamie: Inaudible

McCarthy: I need you to make some decisions for me. Are, are you, are you able to do that for me now or?

Jamie: I'll tell you what, it's colliding with one infra-red scope to another I mean this man, I've had plenty of **[cont.]**

*It had
no credibility
to the
cop negotiator
Terry McCarthy
who thought
Jamie,
the alleged gunman,
was play-acting and
speaking
scripted lines.*

experience with guns and scopes, is if he wants to die it's up to him if he

McCarthy: Well

Jamie: If you don't call him off in five minutes man he's, they're all dead.

McCarthy: Okay, just take it easy Jamie

Jamie: *small laugh* Alright

McCarthy: Just take it easy alright. I don't want to see

Jamie: I'll get back in touch with you in twenty minutes. Bye.

McCarthy: Well, okay. I want to know whether he's moved, okay, so how about us talking while and then hopefully while we're talking um

Jamie: Yeah, yeah

McCarthy: We'll, we'll be able to say that he's actually moved, alright.

Jamie: Okay.

McCarthy: It's no good if I, if talk to you in twenty five minutes cause I don't know what's going on. You're down there, you're the man on the scene.

Jamie: Twenty minutes you've got, right.

Why use the threat of killing the hostages? The answer to the threat to kill the hostages was to demonstrate pressure put on the negotiation team. This demonstrates that terrorists were conducting the siege. Furthermore, how would *Jamie* know the SOG marksman had been moved back? Only by monitoring the police radio communications, the special SAC-PAV radio communications, which would have been used to detect just exactly where the SOG marksman was. The SOGs wear black, and would have been extremely difficult to see at night even with night vision equipment. Again, it would also be difficult to source exactly where any little red laser dot originated from.

Furthermore, this particular person had supposedly a few hours before murdered 33 innocent persons, but now he's baulking at shooting an SOG marksman.¹²⁹ We are now also aware that this *Jamie* person is reasonably adept in the use of firearms. However, there is no evidence at all that Martin Bryant was skilled in the use of all the various aspects that *Jamie* has illustrated.

Again, where one would expect that McCarthy would sidetrack a Martin-Bryant-type person, *Jamie* has ignored McCarthy. *Jamie* also knows the ropes in hostage negotiation. How would Martin Bryant have known and then personally acquired these skills? So what happened at about 9:30 p.m. that may have influenced the disruption of the communications between the police negotiators and the gunman inside Seascope cottage? According to McCarthy, the gunman had initiated most of the previous calls and had promised to ring back at 10:00 p.m. but failed to do so.

Well, there was the fact that Bryant's mother was by that stage attending police headquarters at Hobart, and this information would have been passed onto the PFCP at Taranna. There was however a more significant move made by the police. Their negotiators' vehicle had arrived at the PFCP at Taranna, which meant that the police

¹²⁹ With all the weapons and ammunition which the cops said were inside Seascope, plus the night-vision device, the gunman could have killed at least several of the cops who were near the cottage and who he could see. But apart from shooting one bullet at one police car and putting lots of bullets through the trees and bushes, but not one cop was hit. If a gunman and/or Michael Charles Dyson was/were inside Seascope, this is exactly what could have been expected.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

units were no longer divided and could not be played off against each other. This meant that the gunman inside Seascope would have lost his command over the situation had he continued with the communications. To cover this loss of communication, the police blame poor simple Martin Bryant who let the batteries of the cordless telephone he was using run down. But this particular telephone was an extension of the main telephone within the cottage, and there were **other telephones that could have been used.**

A newspaper article states: "Bryant was given the phone number of the Police Commander's room and police believe he was trying to phone them when the battery in the Seascope cordless phone went dead at 9:37 p.m. Police had no further contact with him although they kept trying until 2:19 a.m. until they handed over to the crew at Taranna."¹³⁰ And McCreddie told Steve Liebermann: "We did have some communication with him through the night, ahh, by using a phone, but at the moment the indications are that that's continuously engaged, but we can't, we can't say with any authority why that's the case."¹³¹ Flat batteries on a cordless phone do not cause the base telephone to give out a continuous engaged signal.

There is another problem. Dr. Ian Sale was part of the negotiation team at police headquarters in Hobart. He has made several comments regarding the person at Seascope with whom they were communicating. However in his interview with ABC's Judy Tierney, Dr. Ian Sale states that he attended with other police at the Clare Street home of Martin Bryant at about just after 10 p.m. on Sunday the 28th April.¹³² This then suggests that the negotiation team at Hobart had already broken up, as they were anticipating the role being continued from Taranna. Dr. Ian Sale was also supposedly at Taranna assisting Superintendent Bob Fielding in the early morning hours of Monday the 29th April 1996.

It is now time to look at the police role at Seascope cottage. Two uniformed constables (Garry Whittle and Paul Hyland) attended at Seascope. They saw the burning, stolen BMW and radioed back to Hobart. The backup for constable Whittle was to be constable Pat Allen from the AIS¹³³ and he would have taken about an hour from first receiving his instructions to attend at the Tasman Peninsula. He would have done a *light-and-siren* driving as fast as possible. It would have taken over thirty minutes before constable Allen could attend to the task of backing up constable Whittle.

From then until the SOG arrived, it would have been the duty of these two uniformed police to ensure that the gunman stayed inside Seascope cottage. This they were able to do. Mind you, it was also the idea of the team inside the cottage to remain inside, so as to draw all the police attention to the cottage, so they could then make their escape, leaving behind just one person to take the rap.¹³⁴ According to the SES volunteers who were monitoring the police communications, the warning was continuously stated that the gunman was not to be harmed, as he possibly was part of a "Terrorist Team." So the police thinking was that it was a team inside the cottage. Furthermore, all information relating to the siege

¹³⁰ Whinnett Ellen. *Fifty-seven calls to a calm, contradictory killer....*; The Mercury; 26 November 1996.

¹³¹ *TODAY Show*; 29 April 1996.

¹³² This fact appears on several websites. However, the editor has been unable to locate the transcript or audio record to confirm the wording, which seems to be taken from an interview conducted by the journalist **Judy Tierney** for the ABC (possibly *7.30 Report*) and which was broadcast in April or May 1996.

¹³³ Accident Investigation Squad.

¹³⁴ This person is Martin Bryant. Note he has no middle name, as erroneously appears in some places. In her book *My Story*; 2010: p. 42, his mother Carleen Bryant says the following: "Contrary to many later incorrect media reports, neither of my children was given a middle name." The pseudonym *Jamie* has been associated with Martin Bryant. But note that officials have not released any documentation of a forensic analysis to prove all the spoken words attributed to *Jamie* where spoken by Bryant. Words could have been, and seem to have been, attributed to *Jamie* which Martin Bryant did not speak.

PORT ARTHUR SHOOTING INCIDENT

Gerard Dutton

Australian Police Journal; December 1998: pp. 207-228

THE Australian Police Journal (APJ) is a serial – that is, it comes out periodically; four issues per year in 2013. (Its profile in 1998 is not known by this editor.) It is a magazine and in no way can it be considered an academic journal. In fact, the APJ describes itself as a magazine on its own website, and according to that website: "Since its inception in 1946 the APJ has been a publication with the philosophy of being '*written by police for police*'." That the APJ has no peer-review system for assessing submitted articles condemns it to its magazine status. Any claim of it being a learned journal is an attempt to deceive.

In December 1998, an article by Gerard Dutton of Tasmania Police appeared in the APJ: *The Port Arthur Shooting Incident*, having the super-heading BALLISTICS EVIDENCE which appears on every page of the article, which itself is absolute nonsense – biased, inaccurate, spurious nonsense. Because this alleged *expert* was the "Officer in Charge of the Tasmanian Ballistics Section since early 1995" (p. 228), does not necessarily mean that what he claims in his article is ethical and accurate. In fact, **his article is deceptive**.

In various ways, the expert's unreviewed article repeats the corrupt official narrative of the Port Arthur case – the narrative for which there is **not a shred of hard proof** confirming the endless official assertions about the patsy Martin Bryant who struggled to live day-to-day life with his **66 IQ**. But to keep the real truth of the case hidden, there had/has to be a *monster* for the uninformed public to hate. Regardless of the fact that it was **never proved in a trial** that Martin Bryant did anything criminal at or near Port Arthur, this so-called *expert* gave Bryant (educational level of grade 6) a wordy working over.

The so-called *expert* Gerard Dutton mentions the name Martin Bryant (or just Bryant) **52 times** in his article.* Did you get that? **On every page**, Dutton wrote the name Bryant or Martin Bryant an average of c.**2.5 times**. On one page, the devious Dutton mentions the name **9 times**. The *expert* was determined to bludgeon that name into the heads of readers, to ensure it was associated with the shooting at Port Arthur: Bryant; Bryant; Bryant; Bryant. Get it! This article purporting to be about ballistic evidence is nothing more than an APJ hit-piece on an *11-year-old boy who cannot defend himself* verbally or in writing. (* article is 22 pages, 21 of which are text)

Writers who have ballistic knowledge and experience have studied Dutton's words. He does not even know the difference between class and individual characteristics. He does really – but he hopes you don't know because his claims about the firearms he examined **do not stand up to peer-review**. He presents **no proof** that the firearms he associates *ad nauseam* with Bryant were ever owned or fired by him. Like the whole official narrative, the words of the so-called *expert* are nothing but **deceptive and devious assertions**.

Please see all the articles and inserts in this book which detail the many things about the *ballistic expert* Gerard Dutton now of 11 Moodys Road, Allens Rivulet, Tasmania 7150.

POSTSCRIPT

■ On 3 February 2013, the editor wrote Dutton and asked him to clarify a finding which suggests **Dutton concocted a person** (James F. Taylor) who Dutton claims worked at Colt Manufacturing, Connecticut, USA. As of 3 December 2013, Dutton had not replied.

■ On the Internet, there are several references to an educational gathering in the USA during which Dutton is alleged to have admitted there is "**No**" evidence linking Bryant to the Broad Arrow Café shooting. It seems Dutton has never denied making the statement.

■ In his Paper on Gerard Dutton's *Statutory Declaration* (9 September 1996), Andrew S. MacGregor clearly identifies, **with references**, Dutton as having committed **perjury**. It seems Dutton has never denied having committed this perjury. (see Part 6) – **ed**.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

at Seascope supports the Terrorist-Team scenario. However to be left simply with Martin Bryant, requires the police to be left with egg on their faces, or a complete change of the scenario. With the media already heavily involved, the possibility of admitting the offenders had eluded the police would have diminished greatly. Also consider that if the police admitted that they were unable to contain and capture a small terrorist team in Tasmania, then what would be the outcome of such an attack at the Olympic Games at Sydney?¹³⁵

This then would also explain why the whole SOG team was required at Seascope, and why none of them were available to attend at the Port Arthur Historic Site to give security and comfort to the victims there. It also explains why the Victoria SOG were called in to assist. It would be **completely ludicrous** to consider that one person, mentally-handicapped and suffering from a schizophrenic disorder would require the whole of the Tasmania Police SOG to be contained.

McCreadie also states in his EMA report: "One of the first priorities for the SOG after establishing a cordon around the stronghold, was the extraction from danger of two uniformed personnel pinned down by the offender's gunfire. They were in a ditch, behind a marked police vehicle at the driveway entrance of Seascope. The police vehicle had its emergency lights flashing, making it an easy target for the offender who fired several shots in its direction throughout the night. These officers had a hand-held radio with them and they were constantly reassured until two SOG members belly-crawled 300 metres along the mud and leech-infested ditch and safely extracted them by 23:00."¹³⁶ McCreadie goes on: "The holding area for the SOG was moved three times in order to establish a communications link between the SOG Commander and his personnel. The final holding area was set up **300 metres** from the stronghold."¹³⁶ (the Simmons residence) And the PFCP commander, superintendent Barry Bennett, says this in his EMA paper: "The SOG staging area was initially established at the PFCP, however this was moved on three occasions during the night, finally to a location on the Tasman Highway approximately **500 metres** from Seascope."¹³⁷

It was McCreadie who stated the following: "At 07:30 on 29 April, several SOG members heard the offender shout from the Seascope Cottage, 'Come on, come on,', or 'Come in, come in' which indicated that the offender was enticing police to storm the building. At 07:47 smoke and fire were noticed coming from the top storey. The fire quickly took hold. At 08:21 a male person believed to be the offender emerged from the building appearing to fire indiscriminately from a handgun and his clothing appeared to be on fire. He disappeared from view for several seconds and then reappeared naked. The police forward commander gave the order for the emergency action to proceed resulting in the offender being arrested at 08:35."¹³⁸

PFCP commander Barry Bennett's statement is at a slight variance to his superior. He says: "Around daylight on Monday 29th, Superintendent FIELDING was advised that the building at Seascope was burning.... The suspect BRYANT eventually came out of the burning house with his clothing ablaze, and he was taken into custody."¹³⁹

¹³⁵ The Olympic Games which were held at Sydney, News South Wales, Australia, in 2000.

¹³⁶ Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 1); Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 9.

¹³⁷ Barry Bennett. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 2); Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 21. **correction:** It was the Arthur not Tasman Highway.

¹³⁸ Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 1); Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 9.

¹³⁹ Barry Bennett. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 2); Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 20.

Superintendent Fielding also informs us during the *A Current Affair* special¹⁴⁰ on the incident that when Bryant emerged from the cottage, **he was wearing black**. What happened to the white jumper [pullover/sweater/windcheater] and dark green length coat that the gunman was wearing the day before during the massacre at Port Arthur is not known. There is also the videotape taken by a 9 Network news camera of Bryant staggering out of Seascope, **dressed all in black**, and then falling to the ground. It was good photography, as the camera was positioned at Andersons Road, on the other side of Long Bay.

In his book, Mike Bingham says: "Finally, Bryant emerged from Seascope at 8:24 a.m., his clothing alight. At first it was thought that he was armed with a handgun and firing it."¹⁴¹ There is no mention of any handgun during the two police interviews with Bryant. (There is no other mention of a handgun being found at Seascope, so it must be concluded that the handgun was non-existent.) There is no mention in Bingham's book of Bryant stating that he was the hostage.

There appears to be some disparities with the various times. The police requested that the local fire brigade be standing by at about 07:00 hours, and it was duly stationed at the Fox and Hounds Hotel, just some kilometres up the road from Seascope. At 07:47 hours, smoke was seen coming from the roof of the cottage. We are told the fire quickly took hold within the building. This is to be expected of this type of building, which was basically old pine and hardwood.

Then at 8:21 hours, Martin Bryant was seen to emerge from the building. That is 34 minutes after the building was seen to be on fire. Police were then able to descend on Seascope and they arrested Bryant at 08:35 hours. That is 14 minutes after he was first seen emerging from the burning building. By this time there was little for the fire brigade to do, but to hose down the smouldering remnants of the cottage.

What is extraordinary is **the Tasmania Police requested the fire brigade attend prior to the fire starting at Seascope cottage**.

How did the police know that the fire was going to erupt? We are aware that the people inside had communicated with the police negotiator the night before, but there was never any actual hint that the building would be set ablaze. We are told that it was Bryant who started the fire, yet Bryant has never confirmed this. In fact, he is at a loss to explain how the fire started. Mind you, the police interview never touches on this topic. What was really a major jolt though was when a member of the Tasmania Police task force, in conversations with various witnesses informed them quite openly and in all honesty, that **it was the police at Seascope who not only set fire to the BMW, but also to the cottage itself**.¹⁴²

The task force member said that the SOG set fire to the BMW so as to deny Bryant a means of escape. That member also stated that the SOG used a **phosphorus grenade** launched from a rifle to set fire to the BMW. The same means was then used to set fire to Seascope.

¹⁴⁰ 22 November 1996.

¹⁴¹ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: p. 121.

¹⁴² See *WE FORCED THE GUNMAN TO COME TO US* at Part 5.

see following page

¹⁴³ Recall that many of the upper windows of Seascope cottage had their glass smashed outward during the siege. These open windows would have allowed any incendiary device to be fired into the cottage from outside, without any obstruction or any noise of pane-glass being broken. Having the glass smashed out of the windows would have also ensured the fire was not starved of air/oxygen.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The grenade was fired through an attic window on the roof of the cottage that was facing towards the Arthur Highway.¹⁴³

This information is in **direct conflict** with what both McCreadie and Bugg¹⁴⁴ have told us. So there must be questions asked as to where the task force member obtained this information?¹⁴⁵ How accurate was this information? And, if this information is correct, why was Bryant charged with offences that police knew were not correct?

If this scenario is correct then it would explain another clue that comes from the Melbourne Herald-Sun journalist John Hamilton who was on the tour arranged by the Tasmania Police at about midday on Monday the 29th April 1996. The first part of this tour was at the still smouldering Seascope cottage where Hamilton described the scene as being littered with items of furniture and other objects that had been thrown out of the cottage, and were there littering the ground in front of the still smouldering building.

The clue is the litter, light furniture and other objects including bottles of wine. What was this litter doing at Seascope cottage? We are told the only living person inside Seascope was Martin Bryant, so it must be assumed that Bryant was responsible for this litter. So consider just when and how this litter came to be in front of the burnt cottage?

It is fairly obvious that this litter did not occur during the previous afternoon, what with the gunman being on the roof of the adjoining building shooting at passing helicopters. Or, whilst the gunman was inside supposedly shooting at police, and speaking with the police negotiator. Nor would it be likely that it was done after dark, as it would have left the gunman vulnerable to apprehension by the SOG at that time, and furthermore there is no mention by the Tasmania Police of such actions occurring. There is though, a very strong possibility that these items were placed in front of Seascope cottage during the fire there, in fact it is the only plausible explanation.

We now have Martin Bryant trying desperately to save items from the burning cottage, when he realised that it was on fire. So why would a person who deliberately set fire to a building try and save these articles that littered the scene of the fire?

There are also documents that claim Bryant was heard goading the police during the fire with shouts of: "Come on, come on," or "Come in, come in." Is it highly likely that a person trying desperately to save some furniture and other possessions like bottles of wine from a burning building would call out for assistance, with such words as, *come on, come on, can you give us a hand.....* or words similar.

It is the injuries Martin incurred from the fire that also raises concerns. He received **third degree burns** to his back and buttocks.¹⁴⁶ He was apparently not burnt on his arms, face or hair. The fire was first reported at 7:47 hours with smoke coming from the top storey. Thirty-four minutes later Martin Bryant was seen to emerge from the building. Again considering the time it took him to emerge

¹⁴⁴ Damian Bugg, then director of public prosecutions in Tasmania.

¹⁴⁵ Martin Bryant was questioned on 4 July 1996. For over five weeks (39 days) prior to that date, he was **kept isolated** – a mental *softening-up* process which was essential to the State. It could not accept a plea of innocent* because that would have necessitated a trial. But the State **could not prove Martin Bryant was guilty**. Any low-level lawyer would have demolished the whole concocted case submitted by Bugg & Co. of the State. The questioning was by two inspectors of Tasmania Police – Ross Paine and John Warren. They did it without Martin's guardian or legal counsel being present. They actually told Martin they had the approval of **David Gunson** who was the 2nd lawyer assigned to Martin. This was a **police lie**. It became obvious that Martin intended to submit a **plea of innocent**, which is the truth. Read the interview transcripts. From what has not been deleted, it is clear Paine and Warren were determined to corner Martin, not determine the truth about Port Arthur. The truth which Martin did not know because he was not there. He was isolated for **another four months** (120 days), and eventually his third defence lawyer John Avery **browbeat** Martin into allowing Avery to plead guilty. With his 66 IQ, plus the permanent absence of his legally-required guardian, Martin was an **easy patsy to be set up**. (* Martin did not have to submit any plea. If he did not, the court would have entered a not guilty plea for him, which would have required a trial. But there had to be no trial, because **the State could NOT prove guilt** and it did not want its criminal involvement in the **mass murder** exposed. This is why State-paid Avery badgered Martin. **It was not to protect the families of victims**. There is no proof Avery told Martin that a plea did **not** have to be submitted.)

¹⁴⁶ A fire accelerant might have been applied to his back, perhaps while he was face-down on the floor where he might have been lying drugged and semi-conscious. He had no damage to his hearing or his hands. This confirms he did not fire any explosive hot-rounds in any firearm to prevent ballistic examinations.

BUNKUM, GEMS, DISCREPANCIES

MORE bunkum is the statement that the gunman killed 12 victims and wounded another four in the first 15 seconds. This statement is supposedly supported by the Wilkinson videotape which recorded the sound of the shots by themselves. Another video camera recorded the shots fired for 25 seconds as being 21 shots, which according to the government prosecutor, Damian Bugg, leaves only eight shots to be fired in the next 69 seconds – that is, one shot every 8.5 seconds. This is not what the witnesses tell us. They all say that the shots continued at about one shot every second or two. So how accurate is the evidence from the videotapes. They accurately report the sound of the shots alone, but do **not** report on the status of these shots – whether or not these shots killed, injured, or missed a target. Furthermore these videotapes do **not** record the entire shooting scene....

The next piece of bunkum is that only 29 shots were fired inside the café. Mr. Bugg continually reinforces this statement claiming it is supported by the ballistics and forensic evidence. But, the Tasmania Police ballistics expert, the sergeant Gerard Dutton, says otherwise.... [H]e argues that it is not accurate to count the number of shots fired simply by the means of the fired cartridge cases alone, especially as the crime scenes were not protected until after sunset, and many of the fired cartridge cases had been souvenired. Especially at the car park where only four cases were located by the police, two .223 and two .308 cartridges, with another case being returned by a bus driver. How many shots were fired inside the Broad Arrow Café during the massacre? I have calculated a minimum of **41 shots**, using the *Court Document* and witness statements.

So why were these deceptions put into place? And, why have they been so strongly promoted within Australia? These lies have nothing to do with any federal government implementation plans. But rather, they have to do with a **cover-up by the Tasmanian government which owns the Port Arthur Historic Site**. And especially in relation to a supposedly *locked* fire escape door. You see, there was a fire exit door within the giftshop area of the Broad Arrow Café that was supposedly locked. But just how do you lock a fire exit door? This was the door that prevented many people who were inside the giftshop area from escaping the gunman. Some were murdered there. People lost partners and loved ones because that door was inoperable. [see Part 8; *THAT BLOODY DOOR*]

The next little gem is the *Prince* sportsbag, or I should say the two *Prince* sportsbags. You see, the gunman was lugging about a very heavy *Prince* sportsbag and a large video camera both of which were found left on a table inside the Broad Arrow Café after the massacre. The problem is that several witnesses also saw the gunman carry the *Prince* sportsbag out of the café and place it in the boot of the Volvo. This placement was even captured on the video of James Balasko. **Why did the gunman need a video camera? Why did he need two *Prince* sportsbags?** Also consider that there were live .308 rounds found on the floor inside the café. The only rifle used inside the café was the AR-15 which uses .223 ammunition, but in the boot of the Volvo was several hundred .308 rounds, so how did these .308 rounds end up inside the café?

...A *Current Affair* program showed a person running down the road towards the buses, and inferred that this person was the gunman. Nothing could be further from the truth. This person is running, but the gunman never ran [in that direction]. This person is **dressed completely differently** to the gunman, and is carrying blankets from the information centre to the wounded at the buses. In all probability, that person is Mark Kirby one of the many at the site who assisted so admirably after the massacre.

Andrew S. MacGregor
Conspiracies & Coverups
Inverell Forum
23-26 March 2001
(amended; added emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

from the building and the burns he had received it is obvious that Bryant had not been in the top storey of the cottage, but rather on the ground floor part of the building. However, Martin Bryant was not the only person in the area when the fire ignited. We are well aware of the police presence, but what has not been so open has been the presence of ASIO¹⁴⁷ and/or the Tactical Support Unit of the PSCC¹⁴⁸ which arrived at Seascope cottage in the early hours of Monday (29th April) morning.

The ballistics expert Gerard Dutton tells us that all of the firearms that had been stored in Seascope cottage by the owners were found inside the remains of the cottage and were **absolutely destroyed**. However the FN and the Colt AR-15 were not: "Bryant's two murder weapons were also found at Seascope; both extensively damaged but fortunately had not been destroyed beyond salvation. The FN had been smashed and was lying in the gutter of a nearby outbuilding. The Colt was found in the ashes at the periphery of the guesthouse foundations; luckily it had not been exposed to the extreme heat in the centre of the fire as the other firearms and it did not appear too badly affected by the heat. In any case, the two rifles were obviously not in working order in their present conditions."¹⁴⁹

Ohh, by the way, according to local knowledge, before the police found the FN on the roof of the outbuilding, two firemen found it in a ditch. That really doesn't matter, as what must be raised here is the fact that the FN was located outside Seascope. Dutton also claims: "Interestingly enough, the trigger and selector lever mechanisms in both rifles displayed alterations that indicated an attempt had been made at some time in the past to convert to, or function the rifles on fully automatic operation. However, I doubt that this was Bryant's doing as he would not have had the ability."¹⁴⁹

Damage done to the FN was that the barrel had been bent, and the stock broken. Damage to the Colt AR-15 was that the pistol grip had been broken off, and there was a spent cartridge jammed in the breech. An accidental excessive pressure in the breech may have caused this damage, or it may have been deliberate, with an obstruction in the barrel. This was the damage done to make both rifles inoperable prior to the arrest of Martin Bryant.

So what we have is one rifle located outside the cottage, and the other at the periphery of the foundations of the cottage. Since the fire at Seascope was first noticed by police at 7:47 hours, and 34 minutes later, at 8:21 hours, Martin Bryant was seen to emerge from the building, with his clothes burning, and that he appeared to be firing a handgun, there must be problems as to how the FN rifle levitated itself up onto the guttering or wherever it was found.

With the burns on his back, Martin Bryant certainly would not have been able to toss the rifle up onto the outbuilding at that stage. Furthermore, with the videotape of Bryant emerging from the burning cottage, and then falling down, there is no way that he could have tossed the FN onto the adjoining building. **He emerged on the other side of the cottage.**

¹⁴⁷ Australian Security Intelligence Organisation.

¹⁴⁸ Protective Security Coordination Centre.

¹⁴⁹ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal, December 1998: pp. 207-228.

This whole matter of the alleged knife was part of the official set-up – no member of the public ever saw it, and any DNA allegedly on it does not prove it was used to kill anyone.

As for the Colt AR-15, Bryant certainly wasn't carrying that rifle either, as the SOG would have been well prepared for such a scenario. So how did both weapons come to be outside Seascope before Martin Bryant emerged on fire? How was it that both weapons were severely damaged? Consider this part of the negotiation tapes where the discussion is about *Jamie* taking a helicopter ride out of Seascope (then, according to officials, to mainland Australia and on to Adelaide – why Adelaide?):

McCarthy: Now are you planning on taking firearms with you?
Jamie: Um
McCarthy: I need to know that
Jamie: Oh I (inaudible)
McCarthy: for for safety reasons
Jamie: Not not really
McCarthy: Sorry
Jamie: Um I'm actually gonna have the knife I've got a really good knife
McCarthy: Okay
Jamie: and um actually got a couple on um to the let when I let Sally in the back I'm gonna actually have it next near the pilot's ribs.
McCarthy: Oh yeah okay. Why why
Jamie: Just as a
McCarthy: Do you want to do that?
Jamie: precaution that ah
McCarthy: O right
Jamie: to make to make sure that everything's gonna go that everything's gonna sail alright
McCarthy: Okay okay. Now no so
Jamie: (inaudible)
McCarthy: Can I take it that you won't have any firearms with you then?
Jamie: That's correct.
McCarthy: O, right.
Jamie:Inaudible..... they'll all be destroyed.
McCarthy: You're gonna destroy the firearms?
Jamie: Yes, break them up.
McCarthy: Okay. What are you going to do with them after you destroy them? You going to throw them outside so that we know they're all outside before you go to the aircraft or
Jamie: I can do that. Yeah. Would you like me to do that?
McCarthy: Well that, yeah, it'd probably so that we know exactly where they are um
Jamie: Good, good, good, good
McCarthy: Yeah, that would be a good thing to do.
Jamie: Good idea
McCarthy: Um so if you broke them up and, and um
Jamie: I'd I've got a good knife
McCarthy: perhaps throw them out of the door or what have you
Jamie: I've got a good knife on me, if I miss um good hunting knife so I hope they're not gonna try anything with....

(end)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

It is quite apparent that the damage to both firearms was deliberate and intentional. This tends to oppose the comments made by Dutton when he states: "Both the FN and Colt rifles were obviously in normal working order when Bryant had discharged them. Why he then damaged them is unknown. It could have been an attempt to thwart later scientific examination of them, but if that were the case they would have been better off left in the guesthouse fire"¹⁵⁰ and, "What an interesting end result to the examination of the Colt rifle. As a faulty cartridge was responsible for jamming the AR-15 and preventing any further discharge, perhaps Bryant flew into a rage and smashed it further due to its faulty condition, not to mention the fright at having the weapon virtually explode in his hands."¹⁵⁰

It can now be demonstrated that both rifles were deliberately damaged and that this was in accordance to what *Jamie* had informed the negotiator and his team. Apparently this information had not been passed on to the ballistic expert, Gerard Dutton.

Now, if we also consider the knife – "I've got a really good knife" – and the implications of that. The only knife mentioned in the court document, or in fact in any other part of the Port Arthur massacre was by the director of public prosecutions Damian Bugg. He states: "Your Honour, the bag was left by Bryant in the café after he departed and I would tender that, along with a towel which was found to be in it. There was also some clothing, but I won't tender that, your Honour, the Crown places no relevance on that. There was a towel, a hunting knife – sash cord rope in two lengths. While they are being tendered, your Honour, I will just say that subsequent DNA analysis of the hunting knife and deposits that were observed on it disclosed that there was blood on the knife of a DNA type matching Mr. David Martin."¹⁵¹

So, were there two knives or only one? What happened to the knife that *Jamie* [claimed he] had at Seascope? Had the knife been found on Martin Bryant, or had it been left inside the cottage, or the surrounding area, then it should have been located. There is no such mention of that occurrence. Could the knife that *Jamie* had have been the same knife found in the bag, which had been left at the Broad Arrow Café? If we also consider that David Martin had been gagged, which means that he would have also been constrained in some other manner so as to impede him from removing that gag, this then must **raise serious doubts** as to when the Martins were actually murdered – and, who actually killed them.

There is one last comment to make. As Martin Bryant fled from the burning Seascope cottage, the 9 Network news media was there to capture those moments on television cameras. Contemplate on that for a moment. **Only that particular network**, which has a contract with the American CNN network. ■

(amended; added italics; original & added emphasis)

¹⁵⁰ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal, December 1998: pp. 207-228.

¹⁵¹ *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*, 1996: p. 76. The statement made by Damien Bugg is far from complete and it is deceptive. The gunman was seen returning to the carpark where he placed a sportsbag into the rear of a yellow Volvo. However, on the *police training* video, a sportsbag can be seen on the table where it was placed by the gunman when he entered the café to commence shooting. For this to be so, there had to have been **two sportsbags**, one inside the other it would seem. This confirms the leaving of the sportsbag in the café, and whatever was in it, were part of the whole **set-up**.

ENDING

THOSE who only have a superficial understanding of the 1996 incident at Port Arthur in Tasmania could have difficulty comprehending what is presented here. And never forget, anyone born after 1986 – a whole generation ago – probably has no recollection, or very little at all, of what is commonly but inaccurately said to have taken place.

What is presented here not only goes against what those who have some knowledge of the incident hold in their memories, but it also goes against what most people believe the Australian legal system allows. Probably the majority of Australians think nothing as extreme as the Port Arthur incident could be an official set-up. Naive people believe that police, lawyers, and judges, would never allow something as heinous as mass murder to be undertaken to achieve the political purpose of control. Others will argue the incident necessitated dozens if not scores of people to be implicated/involved (not true), and would also require them to remain forever silent (not true). Many such arguments are raised by those who refuse to think, and by those who do not realise their ignorance of how things work in our evil world.

But beliefs, opinions, thoughts, *etc.*, are something different to true facts. Not facts like allegations, assertions, claims, presumptions, *etc.*, but hard facts proved to be true by indisputable evidence. The incident at Port Arthur is overloaded with official allegations, assertions, claims, presumptions, *etc.* for which indisputable evidence **has never been presented**. The gall of it all is that officials present their spurious claims as if they must be believed because some cop, or lawyer, or jackass judge has declared them.

There is a phrase associated with the determination of legal guilt. It is relevant to the incident at Port Arthur and most readers know this phrase: **beyond reasonable doubt**. It is brought to the attention of jurors who must deliberate in trials cases involving juries. The Port Arthur incident is such a case. But **there was no trial** – one was **deliberately prevented by the State**. This means all those allegations, assertions, claims, presumptions, *etc.*, which officials and the media spewed out (and continue to spew) *ad nauseam* with no hesitation, were **never assessed** and evaluated as is required by law. Many doubts were never weighed publicly on the scales of *Justitia*.

Given all the victims who were killed or wounded in 1996, plus the number of those who since have caused their own death, as well as those who continue to suffer, the Port Arthur cover-up is the worst in modern Australian history. The criminal police involvement, the legal sham, and judicial nonfeasance, are embedded forever in the annals of State corruption as benchmarks for the new-world order.

What is presented within this book conflicts with the official narrative of the case. If this conflict bothers you, it is recommended you put this book away and read another. Those who accept the official narrative ignore **documented true facts**. They have trouble seeing beyond what they are told. (Those who need to be told, will be.) But if you read this book with an open non-judgemental mind then think, what will hit you hard is that **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!** ■

THE PATSY

5



CONCERN

The incident in April 1996 at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, was so big and complicated (many actions both planned and spontaneous) it was far beyond Martin Bryant's mental, physical, and emotional limits.

CONTENTS		PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS		201
■ INTRODUCTION		203
■ THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE	Wernerhoff	205
JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY		
OUR CORRUPT LEGAL SYSTEM	Image	
GENIUS OR PERFECT PATSY?		
ROLE OF THE JAMIES		
MICHAEL CHARLES DYSON	Image	
PAHS MEMORIAL GARDEN BROCHURE		
EYES THAT SHAME AUSTRALIAN....	Images	
■ WAS MARTIN BRYANT FRAMED?	Baxter	251
LETTER OF MATTERSON....		
DEMONIZING ARTICLE....		
LETTER TO KEN MORONEY		
■ WE FORCED THE GUNMAN....	MacGregor	267
MARTIN BRYANT IMAGES	Images	
LETTER TO SUPREME COURT		
WHO TORCHED THE BMW &....		
PLUNDERING OF....		
■ MY STORY – CHAPTER 16	Bryant	285
MY STORY	Image	
BRYANT CHARGED WITH MURDER		
■ ENDING		294

COUNTS

Images 9, Inserts 11, Notes 192, Pages 96

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

FORETHOUGHTS

■ "Martin Bryant was the patsy.¹ Never in a million years could he have organized and carried out this complex horrendous event. The public should know ALL the facts...this was the mass murder that had to happen to disarm the Australian public." (original capitals)

Farmgirl of South Burnett

Mum tells of life with Port Arthur gunman Martin Bryant
couriermail.com.au
5 December 2010

■ "MARTIN IS INNOCENT. AUSTRALIANS – What are YOU DOING TO HELP MARTIN ??? Tell your friends, GET ANGRY, Ask your local crooked POLITICIAN – DEMAND ANSWERS. Martin Bryant is AN INNOCENT AUSTRALIAN POLITICAL PRISONER! THREATEN ACTION – MARCH, SHOUT, DEMAND AN INQUIRY NOW! MILITARY VETS – CALL TO ACTION – We need the RSL's² SUPPORT on this NOW!" (original capitals)

FreeMartinBryant

Port Arthur massacre BA Cafe shooter?
youtube.com
28 November 2012

■ "[P]eople just wanted Martin Bryant to 'rot in hell' because they read it in the paper and saw it in the news that he was the killer and that was that. I would not be surprised that, if asked, most people at that time couldn't have cared less if he had a trial or not, they just **wanted him dead or behind bars for the rest of his life.**"³ (added emphasis)

■ "The expression 'innocent until proven guilty' never applied to Martin Bryant at any time. He was never '**the alleged killer**' but instead, as every Murdoch and Packer medium in the country described him before his hearing, 'the killer,' 'the murderer,' 'the sadistic slayer of 35 people.' Only one day after Bryant was captured his face was on all the major newspaper front pages in the country in every state under the headings 'FACE OF A KILLER' and 'THIS IS THE MAN'...he was in custody at the time but **not found guilty by any court of law.**" (added emphasis; original capitals)

Kita

Port Arthur massacre the disarmament of Australia
prisonplanet.com
5 September 2010

■ "Anyone with half a working brain cell knows that Bryant could never have carried out this atrocity.... The fact that there was NEVER any investigation or trial of this event...is a blatant travesty and indictment of our country's justice system.⁴ The number of unanswered questions from Port Arthur are just astounding.... John Howard's call for no trial to save further grief to relatives was a disgraceful abuse of the process...."⁵ (original capitals)

Mick of Perth

Massacre victims' families outraged over mum's book....
perthnow.com.au
5 December 2010

1 see DEFINITIONS

2 The Returned Services League (RSL) in Australia is a conservative association, of former military personnel and their supporters, which takes a stand on matters for which it believes military personnel served.

3 The same behavior that was/is exhibited in relation to Bryant was exhibited during the *dingo-baby* case. In that case, which began in August 1980, Lindy Chamberlain was vilified and viciously cruel statements were made about her by Australians. But several years after she was imprisoned for killing her 9-week-old baby (Azaria) near Uluru, NT, evidence was found which proved the baby had been taken by a dingo as described by Chamberlain. Although her whole story was not then known, officials and members of the public **bayed for her blood**. The same behaviour has occurred and continues to occur now toward Martin Bryant. People make similar ill-informed and cruel statements about him, even though evidence confirms and suggests that he is entirely innocent.

4 There is **no** system of justice in Australia. What exists there is a legal system, which was set up by lawyers for the benefit of lawyers. Seeking the Truth is **not** the primary focus, thus Justice is **not** guaranteed. The Australian record of miscarriages of justice is long and terribly tragic.

5 John Howard was the prime minister of Australia at the time of the incident. He had no authority to interfere in matters of Tasmanian law. However, it seems that Howard did not make a public call for no trial. What he did say publicly was this: "...at Hobart on the 3rd May 1996, after the special church service for the Port Arthur Victims, of which the Port Arthur survivors were inexplicably not invited...the Prime Minister, that man of steel, who is a lawyer by trade, interfered with both the State of Tasmania's constitutional rights and the judiciary's when he stated, 'Now that the perpetrator has been apprehended there is no reason to hold a Coronial inquiry into the matter.'" (Stewart K. Beattie) This mongrel of a lawyer (*sic*) John Howard described Martin Bryant as "the perpetrator" even though there had been no trial.

6 During all the amiable conversations Bryant had with the police negotiator Terry McCarthy, Bryant said he was preparing a meal or snacks for those inside Seascope cottage. So while the SOG siege of the cottage was full on, Martin was cooking up bacon and egg sandwiches or whatever it was he prepared. Bryant says this on the negotiation audiotape. Officials want you to believe that what happened at Seascope was an authentic full-on siege by the SOG (Tasmania Police) against a *heavily armed short-order chef*.

7 Bryant's girlfriend before and at the time of the incident. Several spelling variations of her name exist.

8 Images with falsified eyes making innocent Martin Bryant look maniacal appeared in newspapers across the nation: *The Advertiser* (SA); *The Australian* (national); *The Age & Herald Sun* (VIC); *The Courier-Mail & Sunshine Coast Daily* (QLD); *The Daily Telegraph* (NSW); *The Mercury* (TAS); *The Sydney Morning Herald* (NSW); *The West Australian* (WA); *etc.* Such deceptive, gog-eyed, coloured images were also broadcast by electronic media. **The public was duped and still is today.** Of course these images continue to incite hate via the internet. This hate toward Martin Bryant has been added to the corrupt official narrative. And these false images of Martin Bryant with manipulated demonic eyes are still being used by cruel editors, publishers, writers, *etc.* today – all with the **consent of the Australian Press Council** which has taken no action against any single publication in Australia for inciting hate and the killing of Martin Bryant. see *SUBMISSION TO AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL* in Part 1.

9 The number of weapons allegedly found in Martin Bryant's house is **totally unbelievable.** (see Part 6) It took the cops several visits to his house in Hobart before they just happened to find (set up) the colossal arsenal which they alleged, with no proof whatsoever belonged to Martin Bryant. It was **another State LIE.**

■ "Martin Bryant never fired a shot. Guaranteed. How is it possible that our special forces failed to take out 1 lone simple gunman whilst he talked on the phone and cooked up bacon and egg sandwiches?⁶ You can even hear shots being fired by the REAL gunman when he WAS on the phone. Anyone who thinks Bryant wasn't set up is an idiot and hasn't read the FACTS!" (original capitals)

ms of oz

■ "How could someone with the intellectual capacity of an 11-year-old be permitted to plead guilty to murder?"

v of b

comments:

Mum tells of life with Port Arthur gunman Martin Bryant
couriermail.com.au
5 December 2010

■ "A question I would like to leave the readers with is whether such an **extensive campaign of personal vilification** as that which was waged after the massacre against Martin Bryant...would have been necessary if there had actually been some evidence that he had in fact been its perpetrator?" (added emphasis)

Social Democracy Now

The Port Arthur massacre: ten years ago
despatch.cth.com.au
3 May 2006

■ "Bryant is so retarded he might know what guilty means but he would not have a clue as to the implications of a guilty plea."

Lloyd T Vance, Steve Johnson

The truth about Port Arthur
scribd.com
9 December 2012

■ "Martin has never been violent towards me or Carleen [Bryant]. He has never verbally abused me.... The Martin I know is gentle."

Petra Willmott⁷

Witness Statement
28 April 1996

■ "[O]utrage against this [boy-]man was akin to the old wild west lynch mobs. I just couldn't forget the trouble that the media went to profile Bryant, from enhancing of his photograph to make him look like a wild-eyed Manson maniac⁸ to the innuendoes that his house was an arsenal for military weapons.⁹ All of this made finding an impartial jury almost impossible – perhaps that was the idea.... Martin Bryant's trial was not by jury but rather by media. When he pleaded 'not guilty' at his [plea] hearing, the commotion that this caused indicated to me that this was not what the judicial system had in mind. In fact his plea was refused. **He was, in actual fact, REFUSED A TRIAL.**" (amended; added emphasis)

Ned Wood

The Port Arthur massacre conspiracy
members.iinet.net.au
2 September 2012

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

IF you search the internet you will find comments like those above are not few and far between. Deplorably, you will also find the brainless and vindictive words of those who have not thought, or who are unable to think analytically about the case. And worse, you will find words from those who are unqualified to make the claims they have. Claims not supported with any credible reference. (see Insert *DEMONIZING ARTICLE*....) It is obvious the State and media have aided and abetted the demonization of Martin Bryant. And they have discouraged doubt about the Port Arthur incident. Unthinkingly, they keep propagating a corrupt official narrative – never seriously and openly investigating any of the long-standing major concerns.

Those who reveal disturbing facts of the case are said to be callous toward the families of victims. But nothing is further from the truth. This editor has not found one seriously negative comment about victims, or about their families. But he has found many disturbing comments attacking Bryant and his dear mother Carleen Bryant who now endures the torment of watching her innocent son being killed slowly in Risdon prison for crimes it has never been proved he committed.

This appalling injustice is ignored by unthinking people. Because the crime is heinous, it seems that to most people the whole concept of proof can be disregarded because, well, *everyone knows he did it*. They just know. And because of this, officials gave themselves the right to take the most punitive steps and put the alleged perpetrator **in prison for life**. This is what has been done. If capital punishment was still on the books in Tasmania, Martin Bryant would have been taken to the gallows years ago – because, *everyone knows he did it*. For those now annoyed who raise the issue of the guilty plea, such pleas can be dangerously inaccurate and unreliable. Given the seriousness and complexity of the crime, and given the manner in which the so-called guilty plea came into being, no person who thinks objectively dismisses the life of Martin Bryant when there are so many unanswered questions, troubling concerns, unproved assertions, *etc*.

That there was a process in the supreme court of Tasmania does not prove that a right and proper process played out. It proves the entire legal system of Tasmania is complicit in setting up Martin Bryant. This editor has not been able to find one public document from a member of the judiciary, Tasmanian or Australian, which presents or raises an alternate argument in relation to Bryant's alleged guilt. In relation to the Port Arthur incident, Australia's legal thinkers went dumb the day (29 April 1996) he was arrested. It very much seems that because *everyone knows he did it*, the judiciary and the legal profession think they are not bound to speak out against the charade presented in a supreme court as a legal process. But ethically, they are.

More people are now speaking out. Justice has **not** been done and it has been seen **not** to be done.¹⁰ And there are those like Kathy of Victoria (see Part 9) who say that the judiciary and legal profession in Australia have completely failed to address, since 1996, the case of Martin Bryant – the "**greatest injustice in Australian history**." (see Insert *MASSACRES IN AUSTRALIA* in Part 3)

¹⁰ In the *Law Reports King's Bench Division* vol. 1; 1924: p. 259, these wise words of Gordon Hewart (1870-1943) appear: "A long line of cases shows that it is not merely of some importance that justice should not only be done, but should manifestly and undoubtedly be seen to be done." In the Port Arthur case, the exact opposite occurred – **justice was not done and justice has been seen not to be done**. And the State took steps to ensure justice was not done because the outcome of justice being done would have detrimental to the State.

Two things related to the incident which are raised in the manner of evidence are Martin Bryant's hair and his Volvo sedan. His hair, which is blond and which at the time of the incident was long, is taken, not as a similarity but as proof he was the gunman because the gunman also had long blond hair (or might have worn a wig). All essential cautions about similarities being misinterpreted as certainties are ignored. A blond long-haired man became Martin Bryant because, well, *everyone knows he did it*. Written statements by eyewitnesses are ignored to keep this similarity the **sham certainty** it is said to be.

Then we have that Volvo sedan. It is referred to as if it was the only Volvo at the Port Arthur Historic Site. Again with total certainty, the only one of a defined colour with a surfboard attached to roof racks on it. But, that there was a Volvo of a certain colour at the site does not prove it was the vehicle belonging to Martin Bryant. Nor does it prove he drove it there. Nor does the fact there was a surfboard on racks on the roof prove it was Bryant's car and that he, and no other person, drove it into the site. Logic might suggest to you that it was Bryant's Volvo sedan and he was there because, well, *everyone knows he did it*. But Martin said he was not at the site. He said that many times to several people. Martin has a 66 IQ and it is doubted he could fool many people. He would not know how to.¹¹

¹¹ Investigators who have studied the Port Arthur incident and who acknowledge all associated elements, recognize the complexity of it all: the conception; the planning; the preparation; the training; the execution; and, the siege. Everything about the incident is not something some 11-year-old boy could put together into a killer of a plan. Whoever organized the incident at and near Port Arthur involved state (Tasmania), interstate (Victoria), and national participants, which clearly Bryant could **not** have done. Unthinking people make statements about how easy it is to pull a trigger, but such people do not have a complete understanding of the entire tragic incident. As declared elsewhere, Martin Bryant is a *boy-man*. He could **not** have arranged everything without receiving considerable assistance, and there never has been an official claim that he had such assistance. Tasmanian officials tried to coerce Terry Hill (see *NAME INDEX*) to make dishonest statements about selling a weapon to Martin. But this gun store owner refused to lie. For his **highly commendable moral stand**, Mr. Hill had his legitimate business in Hobart closed by immoral mongrel cops. What people do is imagine how easy or difficult something would be to do. But they err by using their own competence and experience as the measuring standards. They fail to acknowledge Martin is mentally-handicapped. Thus, he could never have brought about the whole Port Arthur incident. His own mother said this: "[H]e didn't have the brains." (Julie-Anne Davies. *Making of a monster*; The Bulletin; 4 April 2006.)

Even though he could not drive any vehicle with a manual gearbox, Martin said he carjacked the BMW at Fortescue Bay north of Seascope. Officials claim Martin said this to an interrogator. (Why would he have said that?) And officials say Martin carjacked the BMW near the tollgate. (How did he conduct the carjacking of a BMW in two places?) Were there two Martin Bryants? No, you say because his Volvo was driven from the site and left at the tollgate. But this still does not prove it was Martin at the wheel of either vehicle. (There was a similar Volvo at the site that day. see *SUBJECT INDEX*) Recall, an eyewitness who knew Martin personally saw the gunman at the general store and said in writing that the gunman **was not Martin Bryant**.

What is it that makes people lose all sense of their own ignorance of all the facts of any case? What is that makes people condemn another person even when they themselves know little or nothing about her/him? What is it that leads people to react in the most unintelligent way taking their lead from unthinking people and other sources filled with false facts, fiction, and foolishness? What is it?

What we have learnt from Martin Bryant are not the details of the Port Arthur incident. He is not aware of those details, contrary to what stupid officials insist. What we learn again from Martin is that the worst of human behaviour arises when people cease to think and thus are absorbed into the dull and deadening mass of humanity in which subjectivity and belonging are everything. Martin Luther King said this about that mass: "Success, recognition, and conformity are the bywords of the modern world where everyone seems to crave the anesthetizing security of being identified with the majority."

So, there is a clear choice. Either it is the ignorant mass, or thinking. With the latter, you will conclude Martin Bryant is innocent. – **ed.**

THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE
Was Martin Bryant Framed?

Carl Wernerhoff

loveforlife.com.au

May 2006

*Authorities continue to ignore concerns that
there is no hard evidence
to implicate Martin Bryant as the gunman.¹²*

AUSTRALIANS reacted with horror and outrage when, on the evening of Sunday 28 April 1996, they learned that over 30 people had been **murdered** and many others **injured** in an orgy of violence at the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS), Tasmania, one of the nation's most venerable historic sites, and at adjacent locations.

I. NO EVIDENCE

The alleged perpetrator – a young Caucasian male with long blond hair [then], named Martin Bryant – was apprehended by police the following morning after he emerged from a burning tourist guest house, Seascape cottage, which was just a short distance from PAHS.

Bryant instantly became the **most vilified individual in Australian history** and was rapidly enlisted in the serial killers' hall of infamy as the world's second-most-lethal gunman.¹³ However, the case – which **never went to trial** – is full of clues, direct and indirect, which suggest Bryant, a 29-year-old [intellectually handicapped] man with an IQ of only 66, was **framed**. However, even today, the case is regarded by most people as so delicate that it is considered insensitive to discuss it at all – **the perfect means of perpetuating a cover-up**, if ever there was one.

Strikingly absent from the recent media coverage of the 10th anniversary of the most traumatic event in modern Australian history was evidence to support the official claim that Martin Bryant had been responsible for the massacre. The matter of whether Bryant had really been the perpetrator was only touched upon in an interview with Bryant's mother, Carleen Bryant, which was published in The Bulletin: "She likes to talk about her boy's hair. It's another reason she thinks he has been framed. 'He had beautiful, shampooed soft hair.' Carleen wants to set the record straight. 'The guy who did it had dark, greasy hair and pocked skin. My Martin has lovely soft baby skin'."¹⁴

The writer of the magazine article, Julie-Anne Davies, of course does not raise the subject of whether Carleen Bryant has any evidence to support her claims, simply observing **patronisingly** that

¹² Opening lines of this article by Carl Wernerhoff: loveforlife.com.au.

¹³ It is uncertain who Wernerhoff believes the most lethal gunman is/was. According to The Independent, 29 April 1996: "In April 1982 an off-duty South Korean **police officer**, Woo Bum-Kon, went on a drunken rampage in Sang-Namdo **killing 58*** people and wounding 38 before blowing himself up. The death toll was so high because he used grenades as well as automatic weapons." (added emphasis) But regardless, Martin Bryant should not be on any such list as there is no hard evidence he shot anyone at/near Port Arthur in Tasmania. (* includes himself allegedly; numbers of killed and wounded vary in related literature)

¹⁴ Julie-Anne Davies. *Making of a monster*; The Bulletin; 4 April 2006.

Mrs. Bryant “lives in a state of denial.” As I will show in this report, however, it is Julie-Anne Davies who is living in a state of denial – as are all Australians who think that Martin Bryant was responsible for the tragedy. There is simply no hard evidence to support this belief.

Most Australians, when confronted by the heretical idea that Bryant might not have been the gunman, **respond in knee-jerk fashion**: “Of course he was! People saw him do it!” In fact, it has never been proven that Bryant was the man who people saw do it. It was the police and the media, not the eyewitnesses, who identified Bryant as the gunman. As we shall see, **only two eyewitnesses have ever specifically identified Bryant as the perpetrator, and both of them gave their statements a month later – after they had been influenced by the publicity given to Bryant in the media.**

If you ignore the media propaganda and study the details of the case, what becomes readily apparent is that there is no evidence that Martin Bryant – alone and to the exclusion of all other young men with long blond hair – executed the massacre. What’s more, there are compelling reasons to believe that **Bryant could not have done it.** As Carleen Bryant told *The Bulletin*: “He didn’t have the brains.” Above all, he didn’t possess the shooting ability.

AGE

Of the 40-odd persons who survived the shootings inside the Broad Arrow Café, only a few provided physical descriptions of the gunman. In these, his estimated age is 20 or less. Karen Atkins of Sydney told the national newspaper that, very soon after the shootings, she had spoken to a woman who had met the gunman in the café. According to this woman – who can be identified as Rebecca McKenna, on account of the content of the conversation she had with the gunman – he was: “...a young fellow, about 18 or 19. He looked like a surfer. He arrived in a Volkswagen and he walked into the cafeteria carrying a tennis bag.”¹⁵

This description could perhaps be dismissed on the grounds that it is second-hand. However, it tallies with the description given by Carol Pearce. According to Pearce, the gunman, whom she passed on her way into the Broad Arrow Café, was: “...between 18-20 years of age; he had really blonde [*sic*] hair which was collar length; it was fairly straight with a bit of a wave in it. He was clean-shaven, he was average in height and build.”¹⁶

¹⁵ *The Australian*; 29 April 1996. See *SUBJECT INDEX* (Volkswagen, gunman in a) for details about how a gunman arrived at the Port Arthur Historic Site in a Volkswagen.

¹⁶ Carol Pearce. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

¹⁷ On page two of his *Witness Statement*, Collyer uses the imperial word **feet**, thus it is reasonable to conclude the missing word is **inches**.

Pearce’s description is invaluable, as it was given on 28 April 1996, the day of the massacre. Like the woman to whom Atkins spoke – Rebecca McKenna, as mentioned above – Pearce therefore could not have been influenced by the media **campaign of vilification** against Martin Bryant. No picture of him had at that time been published.

The same age-range is specified by former Royal Air Force (UK) officer Graham Collyer, who was shot in the throat inside the café. In his untainted witness statement taken on 7 May 1996, Collyer described the gunman thus: “He seemed somewhere about 20. He had long blonde [*sic*] bedraggled hair, about 3-4 [*inches*]¹⁷”

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

below the shoulder. He looked like he might have had a lot of acne. A pitted face. He had scraggly trousers; I don't remember what colour." Collyer is a valuable witness because, in his statement from a second interview on 8 May, he noted: "I still haven't seen anything in the media about the person who shot me. I have been sedated or sleeping since the shooting."

On 10 May, Jim Laycock, who was the co-owner of the Port Arthur Motor Inn at the entrance to the PAHS, told police that the man was in his "low twenties." Another witness, Joyce Maloney, told the police: "I thought he was about 18-22 years old, only a young lad." Betty Davies described him as a "young male person."

Of the individuals who gave their statements to the police before the barrage of images of Martin Bryant appeared in the media, Carmel Edwards, who held the door open for the gunman as he left the café to eat his lunch on the balcony, and Justin Noble,¹⁸ a member of the New South Wales police force who said he saw the gunman exiting the café after the shooting, gave the oldest age estimates. Edwards described him as "22-23 years old." Noble described him as "20-25 years of age."

Thus no actual witness to the shootings at Port Arthur cited an age above twenty-five. The only witness who did so (Justin Noble) cited the figure as the top end of the range, and would be equally comfortable with twenty. It would therefore be accurate to say that all actual witnesses said that the man was in his **late teens or early twenties**.

Yet at the time of the massacre, Bryant was a few days away from his **29th birthday** and could not reasonably have been mistaken for anyone under about twenty-seven.

This much is clear from a photograph which shows Bryant together with the woman we have been told was his girlfriend: Petra Willmott. Since the pair reportedly only became romantically involved in February 1996, the photograph had to have been taken within three months of the massacre. Despite its poor quality, it shows Bryant's face unframed by hair, and so gives a very good idea of what he looked like at the time. It's obvious from this picture that Bryant was by no means "a young lad."

It is also obvious that those who saw the gunman at close distance and who gave their descriptions before anything about Bryant's appearance had been made public are to be considered by far the most reliable. The only eyewitnesses who estimated the gunman's age in the upper 20s are witnesses like Yannis Kateros, who only saw him from a considerable distance, and most of them gave statements to the police **a week or more** after the shootings when the matter of Bryant's age had already been established by the media.

Kateros, who gave his statement on 10 May, estimated the shooter's age as 28. Is it only a coincidence that this is the same age the media were citing for Bryant?

¹⁸ This mongrel who seems to have willingly participated in the official plan associated with the killing at and near Port Arthur is no relation of the editor. See comments related to his *Witness Statement* at Part 7.

*Martin Bryant
is the patsy
on whom the State
lays the blame for
the entire incident
at and near
Port Arthur
– no thinking
is required.*

FACIAL FEATURES

But there were more than years separating Bryant and the Port Arthur gunman. Only one witness, Rebecca McKenna, got a good look at the man's face. (Most witnesses saw very little on account of the long blond hair.) Although there are major problems with her statement – what kind of physical description omits a reference to the person's age? – McKenna's *Witness Statement* (28 April 1996) description of the gunman's appearance makes disturbing reading for anyone who thinks the gunman was Bryant: "I would describe this male as follows: Approximately 173 cm tall. Slim build. Blonde [*sic*] hair, past his ears, wavy with a part in the middle. Unshaven dirty looking." and, "His eyes appeared to be blue.... He appeared to be German looking. His eyebrows appeared to be blonde [*sic*] and bushy. He appeared 'dopey' looking, his eyes appeared to be blood-shot. His facial skin appeared to be freckley [*sic*] and he was pale. His face seemed skinny and withdrawn. His ears were fairly large...."

It is interesting that while McKenna's account of the man's conversation was widely quoted – he talked about European WASPs and Japanese tourists – her description of his face was not. Perhaps this is because in no photo [image] does Bryant seem to have bushy eyebrows or prominent ears.... Bryant's most memorable facial characteristic is, in fact, a broad nose with a somewhat bulbous tip – a feature which is obvious from the photos, but never mentioned by any witnesses.

Although McKenna's description is uniquely detailed, it is at least partly corroborated by that of Graham Collyer who, as we saw, said that the shooter's complexion was acne-scarred. However, Bryant's complexion is perfectly smooth, as all available photographs show. In particular, the photos taken at Richmond by Petra Willmott before the massacre show a healthy, ruddy face.

McKenna's description of the gunman's height is certainly odd: she makes an estimate of the gunman's height that gives an exact figure ("approximately 173 cm"). It would be interesting to compare this most precise *estimate* with Bryant's real height, except that nowhere on record can one find his height specified. If McKenna's figure of 173 cm is correct, though, this would surely raise questions about whether McKenna had been influenced by police during the course of giving her statement.

HAIR

Another problem for the official story is raised by Bryant's hair. The photos taken at Richmond show it was wavy throughout, not "fairly straight with a bit of a wave in it" as Pearce stated. Yet most witnesses said that the gunman's hair was straight, with a wave only at the bottom. Witness statements fluctuate between those that said his hair was collar-length and those that stated that it went **down to his shoulders**.

The aforementioned photos of Bryant taken at Richmond raise questions about his hair colour. According to one witness, a Mr. Woods, the gunman stood out by virtue of his "white surfie hair and clothes."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Yet in the 25 April 1996 portrait of Bryant that was featured on the cover of *Who Weekly* magazine on 2 November 1996, Bryant's hair is very clearly brownish with blond highlights and streaks. Further doubts about the whiteness of Bryant's hair are raised by the news footage showing Bryant arriving at the Royal Hobart Hospital. In frames from this video footage – the last images of the accused man ever captured – it is apparent that he had brownish hair with blond streaks, rather than white or “really blond” hair. (It is also obviously collar length.) One possibility is that the real gunman had simply peroxided his hair in an effort to emulate Bryant's hair, which may have looked white or blond in very strong sunlight.

IDENTIFICATION

In terms of the allegation that the witnesses have identified Bryant as the man they saw shooting at the PAHS, the most serious difficulties are raised by Jim Laycock in his statement. Laycock is of outstanding importance in this case. **He is the one and only witness who observed the gunman in the act and who actually knew Bryant.** In his police statement [10 May 1996], Laycock – who got a good enough look at the man to be able to estimate his age (“low twenties”) – said that he **“did not recognise the male as Martin Bryant.”** [added emphasis] He stated only that he saw “a blonde [*sic*] headed person” shoot Zoe Hall and take Glenn Pears captive.

Another witness, Yannis Kateros, said he had **never seen the gunman before.** Yet Kateros had lived at Port Arthur since 1991, and, according to Laycock, Bryant had visited the PAHS on about a dozen occasions in the five-year period between about 1991 and 1995.

At least two other witnesses have also stated that Bryant was not the gunman. These are PAHS information centre employee Wendy Scurr, who, according to one report, saw the gunman inside the centre immediately prior to the attack, and Vietnam War veteran John Godfrey, who was waiting outside the centre when the shooting commenced. Godfrey viewed the gunman twice. He saw him drive by and saw him put a [sports] bag into the boot of his car. “In my opinion the picture I saw in the newspapers **was not the same person,**” [added emphasis] he stated in his police statement of 7 June 1996. Wendy Scurr has changed her mind on the subject; she no longer believes that Bryant was the man she saw that day [28 April 1996].¹⁹

So when people tell me that everyone knows that Bryant “did it” because people saw him doing it, I tend to wonder which witnesses they can possibly be referring to. To my knowledge, the only witnesses who positively identified Bryant as the gunman were Linda White and Michael Wanders, both persons whose statements were taken **a full month after the shooting,** after they had been exposed to plenty of media coverage about the case.

On 27 May 1996, White viewed the 14 May police photoboard and decided: “Photograph no. 5 in this folder [*i.e.*, Bryant] is the male who shot us near Port Arthur.” However, White's only reason for selecting

19 “I noticed it was said I saw the shooter inside the centre prior to the shooting, this is not correct. As I walked toward the café after leaving the ferry *Bundeena* to buy my lunch in the Broad Arrow Café, I noticed a chap with long blond hair looking at me as I approached the outside balcony of the café. He was sitting at a table. As I drew closer to him he was watching me intently. I did not take any notice of this person, but thought he may have known my son who was a keen surfer and always had young men at home who were surfers. I nodded at him just in case I was supposed to know him and proceeded inside the café to get my lunch. It wasn't too long after that that he arrived in there and started shooting. By then I had left via the side exit door of the café. I really didn't make any definite decision as to who it was I saw, in fact this person was doing nothing, to me he was just another visitor and I do believe he was interested in me because I was in uniform. I first suspected that Bryant was **not** the shooter when I saw the photo in the newspaper 2 days later. He was much better looking than the shooter and had nice hair. Really all I can remember of the shooter was that his hair looked like he didn't look after it and in general **looked a lot different** to what Martin Bryant's did. [Michael] Beekman and [Rebecca] McKenna told me in the motel that evening that they were talking to the gunman before he went into the café. From that time on I thought that I had actually viewed the Port Arthur gunman on the balcony. This made me determined to get a seat in court for the 30th September plea hearing. There were only about 3 staff allowed in the courtroom and I had to win a vote of my fellow workers to get there. I would say that when I saw Bryant in the flesh I immediately knew **this was NOT the man I saw on the day of the shooting.** He wore an open necked white shirt and a beautiful light grey suit. A very nice face.” (original capitals; amended; added emphasis; Wendy Scurr. email to editor; 2 January 2013)

photo no. 5 seems to have been because of the fact that, in photo 5, Bryant appeared to be wearing a top that was “very similar” to that worn by the gunman. “It could even be the same top,” she said.

Unfortunately, White’s statement is of **no value** whatsoever. An identification can scarcely be based upon an item of clothing, which can obviously be worn by another person. (Indeed, someone seeking to impersonate Bryant would have taken care to acquire an item of his clothing, or at least a very similar item.) What’s more, no previous witness recalled the gunman wearing the same top as that worn by Bryant in photo no. 5. White was clearly basing her identification entirely upon a photo she had seen in the media.

As for Michael Wanders, in his statement taken the same day as White’s, he picked Bryant out on the police photoboard as “the person who shot at Linda and I on 28/4/96.” Unfortunately, Wanders’ identification is also of **no value**. On 28 April 1996, he told the police: “I would not be able to identify the person who shot at us.” In his statement a month later, he admitted that he hadn’t been able to “get a good enough look at the male to see how old he was or what he was wearing.” His statement suggests that, really, all he had seen was a male with long blond hair. Yet, somehow, his original statement did not deter him from picking Bryant out from the police photoboard **a month later** as the man who had shot at him. It is hard to credit the positive identification of Bryant a month after the attack by a witness who, on the day of the attack itself, told the police explicitly that he would not be able to identify the gunman.

White’s and Wanders’ statements prove that the laws prohibiting media organisations from publishing photos of accused persons before they have been tried are sensible ones which ought always to be **rigorously enforced**. [In the Port Arthur case, the law was blatantly flouted but **not one publisher was prosecuted**.]

In view of the fact that no serious efforts were ever made to prevent the media from publishing photos of Bryant, the question has to be asked whether the police ever wanted the gunman properly identified, or whether they **colluded with the media** in the release of these photos in a **deliberate effort to taint the pool of witness testimony**. Certainly, they seem to have done their best to avoid placing Bryant together with eyewitnesses in the same room. Graham Collyer, who was on the same floor as Bryant in the Royal Hobart Hospital on the day his witness statement was taken, was never given the opportunity to look at him. On this occasion, a positive ID²⁰ could have been obtained in a matter of minutes, if the police officers taking his statement had really wanted one.

In this regard, it is striking that none of the witnesses who showed a tendency not to identify Bryant as the gunman was given the opportunity to pick him out from the police identity board – not even NSW police officer Justin Noble, who said that he thought he could identify the man if shown a photo of him taken from the appropriate angle. The fact that Noble was never asked to view the photoboard implies that Tasmania police anticipated a negative response.

²⁰ By positive ID, Wernerhoff means an **accurate identification**. He does not mean Bryant would have been positively identified as the gunman.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A related issue is the uncertainty that surrounds the matter of the gunman's clothing. In no context of which I am aware did the allegations against Bryant ever raise the matter of the items of clothing that the gunman had been seen wearing. It is striking that there is **no consistent evidence** as to the colour of the gunman's clothing; one can only wonder whether witness statements were tampered with to prevent a clear picture from emerging, for fear that it would raise the question of whether there was any proof that Bryant had ever owned the items.

It is only when one realises that Bryant has never been positively identified as the PAHS shooter that one begins to **understand why a court trial was never held**. If a trial had been held, the authorities would have been in an extremely awkward position if some witnesses had either **denied that Bryant was the man or expressed serious doubts about the identification**. That a trial was avoided means that such problems were never permitted to arise. It is hard not to see why the legal strategy took the form of coercing Bryant into pleading guilty to all 72 charges against him – a process that took seven months – rather than risk the case going to trial.

ABSENCE OF FINGERPRINT & DNA EVIDENCE

Martin Bryant is adamant that he never visited the PAHS on the day of the massacre. Most Australians – if they knew of this denial at all – would probably dismiss it as a lie. One fact that should deeply unsettle them is that neither Bryant's fingerprints nor his DNA has ever been found at the PAHS.²¹ This much has effectively been conceded by sergeant Gerard Dutton, officer in charge of the ballistics section of Tasmania Police, in an article he wrote about the case which was published in the Australian Police Journal (December 1998).

There is no good reason why no evidence of this kind exists. An obvious source of fingerprints and DNA would have been the food tray (with a can of Solo soft drink, a plastic Schweppes cup, food items and eating utensils) that Rebecca McKenna saw the gunman eating from immediately prior to the shooting. We know that the tray was recovered by the police, because it is shown in a police **training video** that turned up in a second-hand shop in September 2004. Although the tray would have contained fingerprints, thumb prints, palm prints, saliva, sweat, skin and possibly hair from the shooter, **there is no evidence that it yielded anything that came from Martin Bryant**. The only reason we have heard nothing about forensic evidence of this kind, surely, is that none of it incriminated him.

It is true that Damian Bugg is on record as giving the impression that a sample of Bryant's DNA was found on a large knife that is suspected of having been used to murder David Martin at Seascope, a few kilometres from the PAHS. Bugg said the knife was subjected to a "very refined test"²² which allegedly yielded "a DNA sample which was unable to be identified initially but it has now been identified as being consistent with that of Martin Bryant."²³ The public has never been told what the source of the DNA was – whether it was blood, for example, or some other substance. If it was Bryant's blood, this would imply that Bryant was a victim rather than a villain.²⁴

²¹ What does all this mean? Well, if the cops did not look for DNA and fingerprints they did not do their job. If they did look for DNA and fingerprints and found none, they failed in their job. And if they did look for DNA and fingerprints and found them this means they are covering up a crime because if DNA and fingerprints were found the results have never been made public.

²² Either the director of public prosecutions, Damian Bugg, knows little or nothing about DNA analyses, or he was attempting a deception. No "very refined test" means the results of that test are always accurate, interpreted correctly, or are replicable.

²³ This is more Bugg bull. All DNA has consistencies. That a sample of DNA is "consistent with" does **not** prove 100 percent that the person who provided the sample is guilty, or innocent. Bugg should have been reprimanded for making such a deceptive statement. But given there was no trial, he could say and do anything he wanted. And he did.

²⁴ Allegedly it was a knife belonging to Bryant. So his DNA would have been on it before the 28 April 1996. And regardless of where that knife was allegedly found and what other DNA was allegedly found on it, the fact that Bryant's DNA was allegedly found on that knife does not mean he killed anyone with it, or, in fact, that the knife was used to kill anyone. DNA evidence is easily misinterpreted and DNA samples are easily corrupted, advertently or inadvertently. Cops, lawyers, and DNA are **a highly dangerous combination** – be warned.

JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY

Last week, I had an intellectually challenged tweet (obviously influenced by the media) tell me "but Bryant admitted he did it!" I asked the mental whiz how he came to that conclusion and the reply was "in court, he said he was guilty."

Perhaps I was a bit too harsh on that individual, after all most of the Australian population have fallen for that argument. In any case, the fellow can't be any more intellectually challenged than Bryant himself. Bryant's intelligence places him in the lower 1-2 percent of the population. He is so slow that this bit of conversation took place during the Seascope siege:

McCarthy: Now if you don't want to tell me your name that's fine but how about giving me your passport number and we can do a check on that?

Jamie: I think it's H02 4967 if I can remember it 'cause I travelled quite a lot overseas and most of the travel agencies know me around town me around Hobart I should say so.

So this is the so-called mastermind of the Port Arthur Massacre, how brilliant! When Bryant is asked to give his name in order that airline tickets can be purchased for him – he refuses to give his name, but he gives his passport number. Like I said, a bit slow.

So let's look at this "guilty plea" a bit more. In the record of interview, Martin Bryant does not admit to the Port Arthur massacre, nor did he in court say "I did it." What he said was "guilty," a formal pleading in the **artificial environment known as the law**. Other legal jurisdictions have other pleas and other verdicts – in Australia we are stuck with just "guilty" and "not-guilty." Since Bryant pleaded "guilty," we need to look at **why** he pleaded guilty.

Bryant's first* lawyer was David Gunson QC. You may recall when Bryant made his first appearance to plea to the charges; he pleaded "Not Guilty." Shortly thereafter Mr. Gunson withdrew from the case. There had been lots of speculation about why he withdrew, but that is all it is – speculation. However, it is curious. (* second; Deborah Rigby was first – **ed**.)

Now let us look at what Martin Bryant's second* lawyer has to say about how he proceeded with Bryant's "defence." Mr. John Avery was the new lawyer and he has been quoted many times about "having to do right by the community, as well as Martin Bryant." (* third – **ed**.)

However, it is in a Hobart newspaper The Mercury clipping of 22 November 1996 that we get a much better inside view of what was going on in the cell block. I quote from that article and the underlines are mine [Schulze]:

1. "I am not at liberty to divulge that, of course, without his express instructions but, yes, he's potentially aware of what he did."
2. "The one different thing about this case to any other, if one puts aside the magnitude of what the conduct was, was getting into this man's head to a degree that he would feel confident that you could do something for him, and that wasn't easy."
3. "There were days obviously where I came away frustrated but it was simply a case of continuing to talk at his level, and try to have him see, given the overwhelming weight of evidence against him, that the proper course was one he ultimately embarked upon, namely a plea of guilty."
4. Speaking on ABC radio's AM program, Mr. Avery said Bryant came to a gradual realisation over a few weeks that this course was the course for him to adapt, and it would have been worthless to bully or coerce him into pleading guilty.

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Now let's go back and dissect the comments in those four paragraphs. The first one is that Bryant was "potentially" aware of what he did. "Potentially"? What the hell does that mean? The impression I get from that statement is that Avery is saying that Bryant was still denying he did it, but because of Bryant's mental incapacity he just didn't *understand* that he did it.

The next paragraph shows the confidence game that Avery was acting out. Avery talks about "getting into his head" and making Bryant "feel confident that you could do something for him" and that the task of getting Bryant's confidence "wasn't easy."

The third paragraph refers to the constant wearing down of Bryant. Initially, Bryant refused, day after day, which frustrated Avery with the task of "try(ing) to have him see" "that the proper course" was "a plea of guilty."

Finally, in the last paragraph Mr. Avery states that it took him a few weeks of gradual work for Bryant to "adapt" the course of the guilty plea. (Which is a bit ambiguous and I expect the article meant "adopt," however the word "adapt" does mean to modify or alter.) However, the last sentence is a beauty – "and it would have been worthless to bully or coerce him into pleading guilty." Yeah right – can't use thumbscrews, so we will have to be a bit more subtle about it.

If anyone can take those statements from the lawyer who represented Bryant as being an admission that Bryant did it, then they would have to have a lower IQ than Bryant himself. I do have to hand it to Avery though, during the Lindy Chamberlain case, nobody was able to wear her down and get her to plea guilty to killing just one little baby – heck, Avery managed to get Bryant to plea guilty to killing 35 people. The guy's just got to be good.

The Police thought he was good too, and that was well before he "defended" Bryant. In May 1996 the gun dealer Terry Hill had volunteered information to Police about Bryant bringing the AR-10 (.308) into his shop and how he [Hill] had **retained possession of the firearm**. By June, the Police and the same solicitor, John Avery, were **trying to coerce Terry Hill** into admitting he sold firearms to Martin Bryant. (You do remember the stuff-up with the AR-10 and the substitution of the SLR for the massacre don't you?) Well, here was Avery drafting up an "indemnity against prosecution" if Terry Hill would just say he sold the firearms to Bryant that were used in the massacre. You see, the prosecution had a big problem with where the SLR came from and **Terry Hill was going to be the patsy**.

Terry Hill resisted the intimidation and refused to cooperate – which then resulted in him being **put out of business**. Avery on the other hand continued to work with the Police (at the same time he was visiting Bryant in prison) right up until 31 October, at which time it was announced that one week later, on 7 November, Bryant's pre-trial hearing would be heard – it was then, with John Avery looking on, that Bryant pleaded guilty.

Read again the words in the newspaper article [above], see what Avery said; then imagine someone with an IQ of 66 and a psychological age of 11 (and who was in solitary confinement for more than 6 months) sitting there listening to the soothing words of "his" smooth-talking lawyer. Bryant never admitted that he did it, he just did what his lawyer wanted.

Terry Schulze
retired barrister
Sydney, NSW
email to editor
3 October 2012

(amended; original underlining; added emphasis)

It is, however, a mystery how Tasmania Police came by this knife. According to the official story, the knife was found inside a Prince sports bag that was discarded by the gunman inside the Broad Arrow Café. However, after the gunman exited the café, several witnesses looked inside the bag and none of them observed a large knife there.

What's more, *Jamie*, the perpetrator of the subsequent siege at Seascapes cottage (by the way, the official claim is that Bryant was *Jamie*²⁵), mentioned having a large combat knife²⁶ in his possession during the course of a phone call with police interrogator Terry McCarthy on the evening of 28 April. If this is the knife Bugg is referring to, then it could only have emerged from the Seascapes fire in a condition that rendered it useless for forensic purposes.

The mystery over the knife may explain why Bugg's terminology verges on the devious. The DNA on the knife, he tells us, is "consistent with" that of Martin Bryant. However, DNA either is or is not a match. If the DNA matched Bryant's, Bugg should have been able to say so. The term "consistent with" is semantic sleight-of-hand designed to encourage the misperception among those who know nothing about DNA testing that the DNA had been Bryant's. In fact, the term "consistent with" means little in this instance. It could plausibly refer to DNA sequences found in every one of us. It is entirely possible that the DNA sample to which Bugg is referring is also "consistent with" both your DNA and mine!

²⁵ See following Insert *ROLE OF THE JAMIES*.

²⁶ This knife seems to have been introduced into the case for no reason other than to raise the level of fear felt by the public. If a knife actually did exist, the description of it varies and it must be noted that no member of the public ever saw it. As the author Wernerhoff rightfully points out, if it had been through the fire at Seascapes cottage, its evidential value forensically was zero. It is alleged that one of the *Jamies* spoke about a knife. But we must note that if this *Jamie* was Martin Bryant, he might have been stating words from a script which is what the police negotiator said was his belief.

²⁷ See notes 21-24. Again, given there was no trial, this alleged knife and the alleged DNA sampling and analyses results were never presented and proved before a jury. Everything we know about this alleged knife comes from either the cops or from the DPP. No member of the public ever saw a knife, and as Wernerhoff rightly points out, the unethical DNA-related claims by Buggs are devious nonsense which clearly the DPP stated to demonize Martin Bryant.

In any case, it is obvious that the presence of Bryant's DNA on the knife would do nothing to prove that he was the Port Arthur shooter. Even if his DNA had been found on the knife, and we were so rash as to draw the conclusion that the presence of his DNA proved that he had killed David Martin (which of course it doesn't), this does not constitute evidence that Bryant was the Port Arthur shooter. The man who did stab David Martin could have been party to a conspiracy to frame Bryant. He could have stabbed both David Martin and Martin Bryant with the same knife, for instance. If so, the relevant question is whether anyone else's DNA was on the knife, in addition to that of David Martin and Bryant. The real killer's DNA could have been all over the knife, but we will never know because Tasmania's director of public prosecutions was only interested in telling the public about a sample that was "consistent with" Bryant's DNA.²⁷

Everything to do with the knife is **extremely suspicious indeed**. Since David Martin was murdered by being shot twice rather than by being stabbed, the sole point of stabbing him would seem to have been to plant a sample of his blood on the knife. The only reason for *Jamie* at Seascapes to specifically inform sergeant McCarthy that he had a large combat knife in his possession would have been to link Bryant to the murder of David Martin. So *Jamie* appears to have been trying to frame Bryant. This is very hard to explain if we believe that Bryant was himself *Jamie*. Why would Bryant have wanted to incriminate himself? And even if Bryant had been perverse enough to want to incriminate himself by leaving the knife he had used to stab David Martin some place where the police would be able to find it later, why did he subsequently deny murdering him?

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Abundant examples of Bryant's fingerprints and DNA **should have been** retrieved from the Volvo driven by the gunman into the Port Arthur Historic Site, but **no such evidence was recovered** from the vehicle – a circumstance that seems most difficult to explain. Nonetheless, there is an explanation – one that, understood in its true light, amounts to evidence that the yellow Volvo used by the Port Arthur shooter was not Bryant's.

A little-known fact about the case is that the Volvo was left in the open air, at the tollgate, for the night of 28-29 April. It was still there at the tollgate at 9.00 a.m. on 29 April, when Peninsula resident Michael Copping, a witness to movements of the Volvo on 28 April, saw it while on his way to collect PAHS worker Steven Howard from Port Arthur.

By the way, Copping didn't identify Bryant as the driver, although he said in his statement (10 May) that he had known him "through casual contact." With the vehicle's rear passenger-side window missing (the gunman presumably removed it as a means of minimising the noise/blast effect of shooting from the driver's seat), fingerprints and DNA inside the vehicle would have been vulnerable to the effects of night dew/moisture. In fact, according to police, the overnight moisture eliminated all traces of fingerprints and DNA.

The question inevitably has to be asked of why the police did not take due care to ensure the preservation of whatever fingerprints and DNA were inside the car. At this stage – and recall here that Bryant was not taken into custody until the morning of 29 April – fingerprints and DNA inside the car represented essential proof of the perpetrator's identity.

As darkness descended on the Tasman Peninsula on 28 April 1996, the only reason to connect the massacre to Bryant was a passport which reportedly was found inside the Volvo at around 4:30 p.m. by a detective. At this time, the fingerprints and DNA from the Volvo therefore represented **the most reliable means** of determining whether the greatest homicidal maniac in Australian history had really been Bryant, as the presence of the passport suggested, or someone else. [Note the passport proves nothing significant. – ed.] It would have been absolutely critical to preserve them in as perfect condition as possible for use during future criminal proceedings.

The fact that a major portion of the evidence required for the purpose of identifying the perpetrator vanished overnight invites only one sound conclusion: **the police wanted it to vanish.**

Unless the police had a reason not to want the massacre connected to Bryant (I know of no evidence that would invite such a possibility), the outcome is consistent with only one conclusion: **Tasmania Police did not want evidence to survive that would have proven that Martin Bryant had not been the person using the car that afternoon.** The Port Arthur shooter therefore has to have been someone other than Bryant whose identity the police were anxious to protect.

*Evidence
does not lead to
Martin Bryant,
who eyewitnesses
and true facts
confirm was not
the gunman at
Port Arthur
Historic Site.*

CONCERNS

The lack of evidence for the identification of Martin Bryant as the Port Arthur shooter is a matter that should concern all Australians today. Only a few determined individuals have been brave enough to **raise the matter in public**. At a meeting of the Australian and New Zealand Forensic Science Society held at Griffith University in Queensland in November 2002, Ian McNiven raised the subject of the lack of forensic evidence incriminating Martin Bryant. The presenter, who was apparently sergeant Gerard Dutton, of the ballistics section of Tasmania Police, grew angry and had university security threaten McNiven and effectively evict him from the meeting. McNiven was **not wrong** to raise the question of the lack of hard evidence against Bryant.

Tony Rundle, who became premier of Tasmania six weeks before the massacre, has effectively admitted that the evidence in the public domain is insufficient to support the official determination that Bryant had been the gunman, except that Rundle tries to explain the fact away: "Rundle still wonders whether the recovery might have been hastened if Bryant had stood trial. At the time the view was a trial could do no good for the victims and their families. 'Now I think maybe that wasn't the case. If all the evidence was heard, then maybe it would have provided some closure and stopped the proliferation of conspiracy theories that sprang up over the years,' he says."²⁸

A question to Mr. Rundle: given that a **great many Australians** are sceptical of the claim that Bryant was responsible for the Port Arthur tragedy, can it ever be too late to release "all the evidence"? If he is so concerned by the proliferation of "conspiracy theories," perhaps he should contact Fiona Baker, executive producer of the popular TV program *Forensic Investigators*, which deals precisely with the subject of how the police use evidence to identify suspects. So far, Baker has not done a program on Port Arthur. I'm sure she would be delighted to make her program a vehicle for the first public presentation of the evidence for which Australia has been waiting for 10 years. [said in 2006; now people of Australia has been waiting **17 years**]

²⁸ Julie-Anne Davies. *Making of a monster*; The Bulletin; 4 April 2006.

²⁹ Transcripts of all the audio-taped interviews have **not** been made available, in their entirety, to the public. The State does **not** want you to know what was said during all those interrogations. So if Martin Bryant really was the gunman at Port Arthur, what did he say that officials do **not** want you to know? It seems it is the opposite which applies. Bryant was **not** the Port Arthur gunman, so the State has to keep you from knowing what Bryant said during those interrogations. Wernerhoff lists the substantial portions of the transcripts which are withheld, and this confirms the **cover-up** by officials of the State. And also note what is in an official transcript is the third generation communication: 1st the dialogue; 2nd the audio recording; 3rd the transcript. All three are subject to corruption.

Author's Note

I thank Noel McDonald (now deceased), author of *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident* (2001), for his valuable work in scrutinising the case and, in particular, for culling some extremely significant information from the witness statements. Most of the unattributed information in this article is sourced from his book. – **Carl Wernerhoff**

II. POLICE INTERROGATION

On 4 July 1996, two Tasmania Police officers were appointed by superintendent Jack Johnston to handle the Port Arthur investigation. Those detective-inspectors, Ross Paine and John Warren, interviewed Martin Bryant about the case at some length.²⁹ Despite the extreme seriousness of the crimes for which he was being held responsible, Bryant was interrogated **without legal counsel present**. This outrageous circumstance is exposed in the interview record which begins with Bryant being told that his lawyer (David Gunson) had "no problem" with the interview taking place without his participation.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- Paine: Look Martin, you've obviously got a, a, an interest in firearms as well?
- Bryant: Well, I have had an interest in firearms.
- Paine: How many guns do you own?
- Bryant: I own, umm, a shotgun and a semi-automatic and another semi-automatic. Three altogether.³⁰
- Paine: Where'd you get those guns?
- Bryant: Oh, umm, I can't really say, I haven't got my lawyer here, so.
- Paine: Well, we have spoken to your lawyer and he knows that we're talking to you.
- Bryant: He knows, he knows.
- Paine: And aah, has no problem with that so, aah.

As we shall see, this was an extremely devious means of approaching the Port Arthur issue because, at this stage, Bryant still had no idea of the charges that were about to be foisted upon him and therefore had no idea that the interview concerned the subject that would determine his entire future.

In fact, on 5 July, the very day following the interview, Bryant was officially charged in the Hobart supreme court with 69 criminal charges arising from the Port Arthur incident. Prior to that, the only crime with which he had been charged was the murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott, who had been a victim of the shootings in the Broad Arrow Café. According to the official record, Bryant was charged with her death in a bedside hearing on 30 April 1996:

- Paine: Do you know why you're here?
- Bryant: Know why I'm here, well inspector Warren was saying in the Royal [Hobart Hospital] that I was on one murder count.


Given the incredible magnitude of the allegations that were presented to Bryant for the first time during the 4 July interrogation, a lawyer should certainly have been in the room. In such circumstances, the intellectually challenged Bryant was obviously no good judge of his own interests. Furthermore, **Bryant had been placed under a guardianship order in 1994³¹ and was therefore not competent to decide whether a lawyer ought to have been present or not.** Only a legally appointed guardian had the right to make that call.

To compound the sins of the Tasmanian criminal justice system,³² the interview was most unprofessionally conducted. The equipment frequently malfunctioned and the conversation was constantly interrupted. The result is said to be **atrocious**. However, there was no necessity to conduct the interview on 4 July and it could easily have been – indeed, should have been – postponed to such a time as the equipment was working properly. After all, the Port Arthur massacre was the biggest murder case in Australian history. Such adverse conditions therefore had to have been created deliberately. The unprofessional conduct of the interview also suggests that both Paine and Warren knew that Bryant would never be properly defended and even that the case would never go to trial. As a Tasmania Police

³⁰ Bryant did own three weapons and he never denied it. But it was never proved in a court that he and those three weapons were at or near Port Arthur and Seascope cottage on 28 & 29 April 1996. In fact, one of the weapons Bryant owned was, at that time, **in the possession of the Hobart gun shop owner Terry Hill**. Officials told lies about Martin's weapons being used by him at and near the historic site and at the cottage at Seascope.

³¹ In the literature, there are references to two guardianship orders: **Nov 1993** (financial); **Apr 1994** (medical). But here, the exact date is not the significant point. What is significant is that the order(s) existed long **before** the Port Arthur incident and thus long **before** Martin Bryant was illegally questioned by the cops Ross Paine and John Warren. The judge William Cox would have known of the guardianship order(s), which were proof Martin Bryant was mentally-incompetent. But that did not stop Cox from sentencing the 66 IQ *boy-man* Martin Bryant to prison for the term of his natural life.

³² It is a legal system **not** a system of justice. A book by Evan Whitton on this subject is essential reading: *Our Corrupt Legal System*; 2010.



bookfinder.com

Whitton was acclaimed a *Journalist of the Year* for his "courage and innovation" exposing the widespread **judicial corruption in Australia**. (also see justinian.com.au)

officer has admitted in an email to researcher Noel McDonald, the videotape was of such poor quality that “the defence would have had a field day if it had been presented” in court.³³ Why would Paine and Warren have persisted in such a long interview if there was a high risk of Bryant’s lawyer objecting to the tape’s presentation in court?

On account of the deliberate negligence by which the videotape was made and the fact that the tape itself has never been released, we **cannot be certain that anything attributed to Bryant in the printed record of the interrogation matches what he said.** The transcript also omits a great deal of what he did say, as **a very substantial portion of the conversation has been withheld:** transcript pages 1-9, 18, 23, 32-35, 40, 44-46, 79-81, 92-97 and 116-41 were deleted in their entirety, while most of pages 10, 91, 142 and 145 and parts of pages 17, 31, 36, 39, 41, 43, 47, 74, 78, 98, and 115 were also deleted.³⁴

Even the pages that were released cannot be trusted entirely. No less than **80** of Bryant’s comments have been rendered as “inaudible.” Since there is a suspicious tendency for “inaudible” responses to appear in crucial parts of the conversation – particularly parts where Bryant’s version of events contradicts that of his interrogators – it is hard to resist the conclusion that the material was excised as a means of withholding exculpatory material, *e.g.*, references to potential alibi witnesses. In addition, it may have contained important clues as to how his movements and actions **were manipulated** prior to the massacre as a means of making him the scapegoat for it. If the official account of the massacre is true and the killings were perpetrated by a lone nut inexplicably run amok, there can be no good reason to withhold any sections of the transcript from the public at all.

Despite its massive shortcomings, the interrogation transcript remains invaluable as a record of Martin Bryant’s side of the story. It is a great pity that Australians have condemned him without ever taking on board what he had to say on the very first occasion on which he was confronted with the accusation of having perpetrated the Port Arthur massacre.

For those convinced of Bryant’s innocence, the transcript also sheds a great deal of light on the devious processes by which he was framed. A careful reading of the transcript establishes beyond doubt that the police manipulated him into a situation in which the most heinous allegations could be raised against him, and he had absolutely no means of challenging them – no means, that is to say, other than his own extremely limited intelligence, which psychiatrist Ian Joblin states is roughly equal to that of an 11-year-old.

Most Australians will be astounded to discover that in this interview Bryant not only denied carrying out the massacre but also related an entirely different narrative of the events of 28 April 1996 than that which has been presented to the public by the authorities.

³³ Noel McDonald. *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident*; 2001: p. 173. “Admittedly, ‘an edited version of this interview’ – two hours long – was played in court on 19 November 1996. However, this was in the context of a sentencing hearing, not a trial (McDonald; 2001: pp. 174, 176). That day, Bryant’s second [third actually] lawyer, John Avery, told the judge that he was ‘not troubled’ by the decision to play the tape – a statement which raises questions about Avery’s unethical view of his obligations to his client.” (Wernerhoff)

³⁴ Noel McDonald. *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident*; 2001: pp. 175-76. (Wernerhoff) **On all these pages which have been deleted, in whole or in part, Martin Bryant makes exculpatory statements which prove he was not the gunman.** But the State had to have Martin guilty, so officials just threw out all those pages and statements which prove Martin is completely innocent. No worries mate. And the criminal lawyer John Avery never gave a toss. He never even bothered to object to the manipulation of the evidence. **That Martin Bryant was set up is proved, without any doubt, by the very documents which the State presented.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

According to the official story put to the Hobart supreme court by Tasmania's director of public prosecutions, Damian Bugg, Bryant had set his alarm clock for 6 a.m., left his house in Clare Street, New Town, Hobart, at 9:47 a.m. precisely (the time he allegedly activated his house alarm), and drove to Seascope guest house, making stops at Midway Point (to buy a cigarette lighter), Sorell (to buy a bottle of tomato sauce), Forcett (to buy a cup of coffee) and Taranna (to buy petrol).

[**According to the official story**], when he arrived at Seascope, he murdered the two owners, David Martin and his wife Sally, and loaded the building with firearms and ammunition that he had presumably brought with him in his car from Hobart. Bryant then proceeded to the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS), stopping to chat for five or 10 minutes with a neighbour of the Martins, Roger Larner, and to buy a small amount of marijuana on the way.

Bryant, on the other hand, told inspectors Warren and Paine that he did not set his alarm clock at all that morning and that he rose at 7 or 8 a.m. He left the house around 11 a.m. – “when the sun came up and it got a bit warm” – without turning on his house alarm, which he had last done on the previous occasion he went to Melbourne. He then drove to Roaring Beach on the western side of the Tasman Peninsula, stopping only once along the way – at the Sorell Bakery, where he bought a cappuccino. He **emphatically denied** having stopped at Midway Point to buy a cigarette lighter, and at the Sorell service station supermarket to buy a bottle of tomato sauce – “Why would I want tomato sauce for”³⁵ he asked inspector Warren – or at Taranna to buy petrol (he says the Volvo's tank was already full when he left Hobart).

Bryant says that after stopping at Sorell he proceeded via Taranna to Roaring Beach, where he surfed for about 20 minutes and noticed two other people bodysurfing in short wetsuits at the other end of the beach. After drying off in the sun, he went to Nubeena where he stopped for coffee and a toasted sandwich at “a little shop near the school.” After this, he says he drove past the PAHS to visit the Martins at Seascope cottage.

Everything that happened after he set out for Seascope is extremely obscure. Indeed, after Nubeena, Bryant's narrative of the day's events dissolves into what seems more of a nightmare sequence than anything else, for Bryant implicates himself in criminal acts which, as we shall see, **he cannot possibly have carried out** in reality, including an act that we know was actually perpetrated by someone else.

As we have already seen, Bryant's recollections of his doings on the morning of 28 April 1996 are not implausible; what's more, they are almost certainly true. There are no witness statements from staff at either the Sorell Bakery or the “little shop” in Nubeena contradicting Bryant's claim to have been there that day. It is also difficult to envisage a motive for Bryant to lie about the stops he made between Hobart and Roaring Beach. What would he have had to gain by

35 This question (see transcript no. 2 of the interrogations conducted by the cops Ross Paine & John Warren) posed by Martin Bryant has **not** been answered credibly by any official. It is easy to see Bryant was being set up as his impersonator, most probably the gunman (wearing a wig?), went about leaving a trail of stops and purchases all of which officials later said were made by Bryant. Though he is mentally-handicapped, it has been said Bryant has/had* a good memory and he relied on it to say that he did not do any of the things which officials accused him of doing. Things like making a separate stop to buy a **bottle of tomato sauce** when he was on his way to go surfing at Roaring Beach. This trail of stops and purchases is additional proof of the setting up of Bryant. (* By now, Martin Bryant's mind has probably been completely destroyed at Risdon Prison. No doubt this is what officials want. With his situation being incomprehensible to him; with the numbing monotony week after week, month after month, with no prospect of ever getting out; with mind-manipulating drugs he is being fed – Martin Bryant **has been turned into a shambolic wreck, a zombie.** *To see him obviously framed, couldn't help but make me feel ashamed, to come from a land where justice is a game. Now all the lawyers in their coats and their ties, are free to drink their beers and watch the sunrise, while Martin sits there all set up in a little cell – an **innocent boy in a living hell.** (apologies to Bob Dylan & Jacques Levy – *Hurricane*)*

*That the
State case against
Martin Bryant
is a bold-faced lie
did not matter to
his criminal lawyer
John Avery
who did not raise
any objection on
behalf of his client
who had complete
(misplaced) trust
in him.*

denying that he had stopped at Midway Point, Forcett and Taranna? Whether he made four stops or just the one at Sorell made no difference to the allegations against him. Why would he lie about where he stopped to buy a coffee? His statement contradicts that of Gary King, a casual employee of the Shell service station at Forcett, who told police that he sold a coffee to “a young bloke” with “long blonde [*sic*] curly hair” who was driving a Volvo with “a surf board on top.” But what does it matter whether Bryant bought a coffee at Sorell or Forcett? No matter where he bought it, it sheds no light on his alleged responsibility for the massacre.

Bryant also told inspector Warren that he had paid for his coffee with gold coins from the glove compartment of his car. Yet Gary King says the man paid in five- and ten-cent coins. Another discrepancy is that Bryant told Warren that he had had no more than \$10 to \$15 with him that day, and all the money was in gold [coloured] coins in the glove box of his car. Yet according to service station attendant Christopher Hammond, the “Bryant” who bought petrol at Taranna paid \$15 in two notes. Why would Bryant lie about these trivial matters?

But if it is hard to see what Bryant had to gain by lying about his trip from Hobart, it is easy to see what a **Bryant impersonator** would have stood to gain by making four stops along the way to Port Arthur. While Bryant stopped just once, which is not at all unusual for a trip that would only have taken an hour and a quarter, the impersonator would have wanted to attract as much attention to himself as possible within this short period. Thus he made pointless purchases [such as the tomato sauce] – items that he could easily have brought with him from Hobart if he needed them – and paid for three out of four of them with small change in order to increase the likelihood that shopkeepers would recall the incidents afterwards.

The multiple stops were necessary to ensure that after the massacre, a body of evidence existed that seemed to confirm that Bryant had travelled to Port Arthur that morning. The theory that an impersonator made four stops on the way to Port Arthur makes a good deal more sense than the idea that it was necessary for Bryant to conceal having made those [four] stops.

Two further circumstances invite the conclusion that the stops were those of a Bryant impersonator. First, one of the four witnesses, Angelo Kessarios, who sold *Bryant* a cigarette lighter at Midway Point, recalled being perplexed that *Bryant* did not recognise him. The most plausible explanation is that Kessarios had encountered an impersonator. Clearly, Kessarios did not know Bryant so well that he could avoid being taken in by a double, while the double did not know Bryant's background so well that he knew he ought to behave more familiarly. Second, Gary King said in his statement that the *Bryant* he encountered on the Sunday morning commented that he [King] served him “a nice cup of coffee” the previous Tuesday. King did not confirm that he'd had a previous encounter with *Bryant*. Whether or not this is a memory lapse on King's part, there is nothing on record to suggest that the real Bryant visited Forcett on that Tuesday [23 April 1996].

GENIUS OR PERFECT PATSY?

IF one accepts the official Tasmania Police and DPP line Martin Bryant can only be regarded as a GENIUS – displaying the skill and cunning of a criminal mastermind unparalleled in world history.

1. He got the Tasmanian authorities to have a 22-body morgue truck available for his handiwork; **2.** He organised for senior Port Arthur staff to go away on a work seminar so they wouldn't get hurt; **3.** He managed to get Royal Hobart Hospital to have their emergency plan in place two days before the massacre so things would run smoothly; **4.** He managed to get that hospital to have a trauma seminar timed to end at the exact moment he started shooting so they could patch up all the wounded quickly; **5.** He arranged for helicopter pilots – usually unavailable – to be available that Sunday; **6.** He managed to kill the Martins of Seascope with a firearm when he was at a service station 57 kilometres away; **7.** He decoyed the local police to be at the opposite end of the peninsula [Saltwater River; see Map] at the exact moment the shooting began; **8.** He managed to fool staff at the historic site into believing he arrived at 1:15 p.m. when in fact he was there at 12:45 p.m.; **9.** He managed not to look like himself by wearing a wig. **10;** He wore a face mask making his face look pockmarked when shooting in the café; **11.** He arranged for a suspect black van to appear outside the Broad Arrow Café afterwards so people wouldn't think it was him who did it; **12.** He managed to get Sally Martin to run around Seascope naked that afternoon and make it appear she had been killed that morning; **13.** He managed to shoot a rifle from upstairs at Seascope when he was downstairs talking to police on the phone; **14.** He had infrared night vision eyes; **15.** He managed to shoot from two Seascope buildings at once during the night of the siege; **16.** He managed to stay in a heavily burning building shooting and yelling at police and get severe burns only on his back; **17.** He managed to have the world press to have a convention in Hobart on the 30th April so there were plenty of reporters on hand so he would get better than usual media coverage; **18.** He managed to make it appear ASIO was behind the incident; **19.** He managed to make it appear Tasmania Police had fabricated and tampered with evidence; **20.** He managed to get the Tasmanian DPP to lie about his activities; **21.** He arranged for the media nationwide to display his photo to witnesses to influence them; and to print false stories about him and get Channel Nine to fabricate a video – all while in custody; **22.** He fired three shots at 6:30 p.m. at the historic site while he was under siege by police at Seascope; *etc.*

It is impossible for any reasonable person to come to the conclusion Bryant was behind this incident - that it was him doing the shooting³⁶ and that others weren't involved and that a set-up and cover-up hasn't occurred. Bryant is the Perfect Patsy.

Lloyd T. Vance, Steve Johnson

The OzBoy File The Truth About Port Arthur Massacre Part 1

8 December 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

36 There have been many comments about the shooting which took place in the Broad Arrow Café. Officials make claims without any hard evidence, claims which put the gunman in the Olympic category for shooting accuracy. This is more evidence that confirms Martin Bryant was set up. He was an amateur shooter who had only shot at static targets and only on a few occasions. Bryant also shot from his left shoulder, **not** as the gunman did from his right shoulder and right hip. Because officials wanted semi-automatic weapons banned in Australia, they concocted a story that semi-automatic weapons were fired by the gunman who killed many people in a short time. But like most everything else official in this case, **the hard evidence does not confirm the false claims made by the State.**

A bizarre twist in Bryant's narrative begins: "At the Fortescue Bay turnoff, just, ohh, about three or four minutes away from the Martins' farm" on the Hobart side of Seascap³⁷ Bryant confessed: "unfortunately I held up a car, I took ahh, I saw this car I liked and got, umm, held up the person in the car and kidnapped him." The car was "a nice-looking BMW" occupied by three people, a male, a female and a child. Bryant says he ordered the man inside the boot of the car and made the female and the child get inside his Volvo. Why did he take the man hostage? "I was a bit worried that if he didn't go, he'd go off in my car," Bryant explained. After commandeering the BMW solely because he "liked" it (he states that his intention was simply to take it for a drive), Bryant sped off towards Seascap at 140 km/h.

What is striking about this story is that it combines elements from two different events that took place shortly after the massacre inside the Broad Arrow Café: the PAHS gunman's hijacking of a gold-coloured BMW sedan belonging to Sidney Kenneth and Mary Rose Nixon and his subsequent taking of a hostage, Glenn Pears, who had been the driver of a white Corolla with a female passenger, Zoe Hall, outside the Port Arthur General Store. Bryant is not simply being forgetful here:

Warren: Do you remember seeing a white, ahh, small Japanese car, like a Corolla?
Bryant: Corolla, no. Not at all.

But if Bryant's story about hijacking a car at the Fortescue Bay turnoff does not resemble any one incident in the official narrative of the massacre, it matches perfectly an incident discussed by *Jamie* – protagonist of the Seascap siege – in a telephone conversation with police negotiator sergeant Terry McCarthy which took place shortly after 5 p.m. on 28 April:

McCarthy: Now you were talking just a little bit about the, um, Rick having come from Fortescue Bay. Can you just enlighten me as to what happened there?
Jamie: Yeah, yeah, I got him and managed to get him, his wife, she, he wanted to participate, um, in the kidnapping in, instead of his wife. I thought alright, quick...get in, get into the car and I've got him as a hostage.
McCarthy: Okay, okay, now you were in your, your car there, were you?
Jamie: Yes.
McCarthy: Right. You're in your car and you wha, what, pulled them up? They were driving along in a car, is that correct?
Jamie: That's correct.
McCarthy: Alright, and and what, how did you stop them, *Jamie*?
Jamie: Had to get a rifle.
McCarthy: Oh I see, right, so you, you, you were standing on the road, they drove up and you pointed...
Jamie: Yeah.
McCarthy: ...the rifle at them and they stopped.

³⁷ "Since Bryant's intention after he left Nubeena was to visit David & Sally Martin at Seascap, there was no reason for him to go past Seascap as far [north] as the turnoff to Fortescue Bay. This means that Bryant must have driven from Nubeena to the Fortescue Bay turn-off via Taranna. But this contradicts Bryant's recollections elsewhere in the same interview of having driven **past Port Arthur without stopping**. This contradiction is the first clue to the fact that the whole story is imaginary." (Wernerhoff)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Jamie: Oh yes.
McCarthy: Is that right?
Jamie: Yes, that's correct.
McCarthy: Okay, an, and what did you...you were planning on taking these people hostage?
Jamie: That's right.
McCarthy: Right. Why, why Jamie? Do you want to tell me why?
Jamie: Oh man, ya [inaudible]³⁸... You, that's what you're getting paid for, I me...
McCarthy: Well, I'd like to hear it from you.
Jamie: No, na, na, no.
McCarthy: Is there any... reason why you took these particular people?

Although we never learn the reason, it is subsequently established that the name of the male hostage was Rick, a 34-year-old man from (Fort) Lauderdale, Florida, United States of America [note there is a Lauderdale in Tasmania], that his wife was a very highly educated woman with a good job, and that the child was only a year old:

McCarthy: Now Jamie, we were talking earlier on about, ar, Rick and the fact that you kidnapped him from Fortescue Bay.
Jamie: That's correct. Yeah.
McCarthy: Do you want to tell me about that?
Jamie: Not really, no.
McCarthy: Well, you talked about, you talked about, ah, his wife and, er, his child and, um, we're having difficulties locating his wife and child.
Jamie: Yes, she's only 12 months old, the little child, I found out from him.
McCarthy: Right. What, from him?
Jamie: Umm.
McCarthy: Right. What about his wife? Do you know anything about his wife?
Jamie: Um, sh, yeah, I do.
McCarthy: Right.
Jamie: I know...
McCarthy: Can you tell me something about it?
Jamie: I know how high up in things she is. Yeah.
McCarthy: I'm sorry?
Jamie: I know how high up she is in the different areas.
McCarthy: How, how high up? What do you mean by that, Jamie?
Jamie: In work, higher than what you are...
McCarthy: The...
Jamie: ...the intelligence and everything, university and everything.
McCarthy: Oh right, is she, she's only, she, er, a university, er...
Jamie: Oh, she's passed that; she's got full-time work, but I'm not going to let you know.

When the conversation returned to Rick – who *Jamie* told McCarthy was a lawyer – *Jamie* launched into the **most bizarre statements**, one of which implies that *Jamie* actually knew Rick's wife:

38 Police prepare these transcripts. So whenever the word **inaudible** appears, or any other word confirming an omission, note the likelihood is that **the cops do not want anyone to know what exactly was said**. The only way to be certain is for the original audiotape/videotape to be obtained and examined. But, even doing that does not always lead to the determination of the true words spoken on the tape. Once a freedom-of-information is received, corrupt cops will manipulate the tape(s) or misplace (lose) them to stop you from learning what they do not want you to know. **Perverting the course of justice** is a common police practice. There is a substantial body of literature on this subject – some of which is written by former police.

McCarthy: we're having problems locating Rick's wife.
Jamie: Where is she?
McCarthy: Well, we don't know because we're not real sure who Rick is.
Jamie: Oh I don't know, she went round to, um, to Fortescue Bay.
McCarthy: How do you know that, er, Jamie?
Jamie: She headed round that way.
McCarthy: She headed around that way?
Jamie: Yeah. Couldn't get...
McCarthy: Right. Well (cough)
Jamie: ...away quick enough.
McCarthy: Well (cough), if, if, um, if Rick's there, would you mind asking...
Jamie: Well...
McCarthy: ...him what his surname is if you don't know?
Jamie: ...apparently, um, she's had a pretty hard life until she met, um, thingamabob...
McCarthy: She...
Jamie: ...here.
McCarthy: Yeah.
Jamie: Rick and, um, he's great, she's a great lady, they're both professional people.
McCarthy: Right. What do, what does, ah, what does she do?
Jamie: Um, well, I can't tell you that.
McCarthy: Why not?
Jamie: Cause I don't know.

Whatever we think about the astounding number of bizarre things Jamie told McCarthy over the phone on the evening of 28 April, the above excerpts establish that the incident cannot be connected with the massacre at Port Arthur. For *Jamie* – whether he was Bryant or not – clearly cannot have been hijacking the Nixons' gold BMW or taking Glenn Pears hostage near the Port Arthur General Store at **the same time** that he was hijacking a BMW and taking *Rick* hostage at the Fortescue Bay turnoff.

Did the Fortescue Bay turnoff carjacking really take place? Given that the incident at the Fortescue Bay turnoff is described by both *Jamie* (on 28 April) and Martin Bryant (on 4 July), it is striking that there is no record anywhere of a 34-year-old man from Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and his family being the victims of a carjacking that day. The likelihood, therefore, is that the incident never took place and that Bryant very largely imagined his own participation in a scenario whose outlines he could only have learned about from others. Most people are aware, due to the unprecedented wave of false accusations of rape and child abuse that swept the United States in the 1980s, of the existence of false memory syndrome. Elizabeth Loftus, professor of psychology then at the University of Washington, writes in *The Myth of Repressed Memory* (1994): "**We can easily distort memories for the details of an event that you did experience.** And we can also go so far as to **plant entirely false memories** – we call them rich false memories because they are so detailed and so big."³⁹ (added emphasis)

³⁹ This quotation is actually from: Laura Spinney. *We can plant entirely false memories*; The Guardian; 4 December 2003. The book referred to by Wernerhoff – *The Myth of Repressed Memory* – was co-authored by Katherine Ketcham.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Less well known is the fact that pseudomemories can emerge in self-incriminating forms. The textbook case is that of Paul Ingram, an American accused of sexual abuse by his two daughters, who in the late 1980s “produced an astonishing series of self-incriminating *memories*” relating to his alleged membership of a satanic cult which had supposedly sacrificed 25 babies.⁴⁰

According to John Frow, what is striking about the Ingram case is the “breathtaking readiness on the part of its major players to form lasting *memories* on very slight provocation”: not only Ingram and his daughters but a son, his wife and two of his colleagues implicated in the supposed satanic cult and in ongoing abuse of the daughters, either at some time recalled major and almost certainly non-existent crimes or at least suspected their own complicity even if not remembering it; and Ingram *remembered*, and came firmly to believe in, a pseudomemory suggested to him by a sociologist working as a consultant for the prosecution.⁴¹

People of extremely low intelligence – as well as those with certain types of mental illness – are probably even more capable of persuading themselves to believe that they have done terrible things which in fact they have not done, than people of average intelligence. According to Richard Ofshe, a sociologist at the University of California, Berkeley, **obtaining confessions from mentally-disabled people** “is like taking candy from a baby.”⁴²

That such persons have generated false, self-incriminating memories that have led to their being imprisoned or even executed is a documented fact. Two examples are given in Bob Woffinden’s⁴³ 1987 book *Miscarriages of Justice*, including those of Timothy Evans, who confessed to killing his wife, and Margaret Livesey, who confessed to the murder of her son. Neither was guilty. Thus, with respect to Bryant’s admissions regarding the Fortescue Bay turnoff carjacking, we would seem to be looking at a classic case of the mentally-deficient person confessing to a crime that he believes he must have committed, even if he doesn’t actually remember doing so or know why he would have done such a thing.

It is possible to reconstruct the laborious mental process that would have led the hapless Bryant to believe that he had actually perpetrated the Fortescue Bay turnoff carjacking. When the interview with inspectors Warren and Paine began, Bryant knew no more than that he was being detained on a single charge of murder. He had no idea what had happened, who had died or why he was being held responsible. Building an explanation on the basis of certain facts that must have been leaked to him about the case, presumably by a doctor and *security guards* (who may in fact have been intelligence agents feeding him carefully selected tidbits of information), he finally believed himself to have commandeered a BMW at gunpoint and taken the male driver hostage. Although Bryant knew that the man he thinks he took hostage had subsequently died, he did not admit having killed him intentionally. He stated that, as he was knocking on the door of Seascope cottage, he heard the vehicle explode. His assumption was that his hostage had died in the explosion:

⁴⁰ See Lawrence Wright. *Remembering Satan: A tragic case of recovered memory*; 1994.

⁴¹ John Frow. *Recovering memory*; Australian Humanities Review, December 1996. (available online at: lib.latrobe.edu.au/AHR/archive/Issue-Dec-1996/frow.html)

⁴² religioustolerance.org/false_co.htm

⁴³ Born in 1948, Bob Woffinden is a British investigative journalist. He works on miscarriages of justice and has written about many high-profile UK cases like those involving: Jeremy Bamber, Philip English, Barry George, James Hanratty, Charles Ingram, Sion Jenkins, Jonathan King. In 1999, he was instrumental in winning a major case against the UK home secretary which established the right of prisoners in the UK claiming wrongful conviction to receive visits from journalists. Until that time, wrongfully convicted innocent people had little or no chance of getting anyone to assist them in their plight. States are never in any haste to right miscarriages of justice cases. Each time one is righted, it confirms errors were made by the State and it opens up the possibility of financial compensation having to be paid to the **innocent victim(s)**. States are generally content to let innocent people rot and die in prison rather than admit miscarriages of justice.

*Never forget
that each time
Martin Bryant
was questioned,
an 11-year-old boy
on his own
was being savaged
by experienced
police interrogators.*

Warren: Do you, you've already said that you remembered me going to see you at the hospital?
Bryant: Ohh yes. Mmm.
Warren: And that I told you that you were being charged with...
Bryant: A murder count.
Warren: A murder.
Bryant: Yeah.
Warren: What recollection have you got of that?
Bryant: Must've been the hostage, the bloke in the BMW must've died.

Although Bryant did not recall having set the vehicle on fire, he realised that the explosion had to have started somehow. After concluding (erroneously, as we shall see) that only he could have started the fire, he tried to imagine what he would have to have done to have caused it. He decided that he must have transferred "two or three" plastic drums of petrol from the Volvo to the BMW, tipped the petrol all over the car, and then lit it using a match (or a lighter) that he must have found inside his jacket pocket.

Having decided that this is how he had set fire to the car, Bryant seized upon the fire as an explanation for his burns: "I must've been in the car when it went up, 'cos I got burnt." He reasoned that the whole mess that had landed him in gaol had been the result of "a bad thing," by which he meant "playing with fire" as he had done when he was 10 years old. [age not confirmed; see Images – **ed.**]

The problems with Bryant's story are immediately apparent. First, there is the matter of where he was when the explosion took place. If the vehicle exploded while he was knocking on the door of Seascape, how can the explanation for his burns be that he was in the car when it ignited? How can he possibly not remember where he was when he "got burnt"? Second, there is the problem of how the explosion started. Bryant told inspectors Warren and Paine that he had not been carrying anything with him that he could have used to start a fire. So how could this non-smoker happen to find himself carrying something in his shirt pocket that proved useful for precisely this purpose? And how can he possibly not recall whether the object was a set of matches or a cigarette lighter?

Clearly, Bryant was floundering for an explanation that would account for the burns to his body and his subsequent loss of liberty. Since he was not trying to evade responsibility for the carjacking and the subsequent explosion, he found himself in the dilemma of a person who accepts that he is guilty but is having great difficulty envisaging the precise circumstances in which he committed the offences. Thus Bryant's recurring use of *must have*: he "must've" played with fire, he "must've" transferred petrol drums into the BMW, the hostage "must've" still been in the car when it exploded. In short, Bryant was desperately hypothesising. If he had really been responsible for the explosion and not seeking to deny it, how can he possibly not remember what he had done to cause it? If he was suffering from post-traumatic amnesia, how is it that he was able to recall everything clearly enough that had happened prior to the carjacking?

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Between his arrest on 29 April and his interrogation on 4 July, therefore, Bryant seems to have performed mental cartwheels in an effort to devise a scenario that would explain how his misfortunes had come about. By this date, he had confabulated⁴⁴ a scenario in which he had commandeered a BMW and set it alight. As we saw, the scenario bears only superficial similarities to the gunman's actual capture of the Nixons' vehicle – an event that was viewed by several witnesses including Jim Laycock, who knew Bryant but did not recognise the gunman as Bryant.

Although the real gunman seized the Nixons' BMW near the PAHS tollbooth, Bryant believes he hijacked a BMW at the Fortescue Bay turnoff. Since he cannot even get the location right, his confession to having captured the vehicle and taken a hostage has to be dismissed as sheer fantasy. However, on account of its resemblance to the scenario recounted to McCarthy by *Jamie*, its key elements (the BMW, the hostage, the petrol drums, the explosion) had to have been suggested to him somehow. The question is: How?

What I propose is that, once they were in total control of Bryant's environment – and after his arrest, Bryant was subjected to weeks of virtual solitary confinement – government agents specialising in mind control convinced Bryant that, due to the traumatic nature of the events in which they alleged he had been involved, he was suffering from psychogenic amnesia (memory blockages). They would have offered to help him *recover* his lost memories.

Psychiatrists known to have worked with Bryant who may have been involved in such a memory recovery program would include doctor **Fred E. Emery**, of the notorious brainwashing specialists at the Tavistock Institute, who died on 10 April 1997, that is, only a year after Port Arthur – a fact that might well be regarded as suspicious – and professor emeritus **Ivor Jones** of the University of Hobart, who headed the two floors of Royal Hobart Hospital which were devoted to psychiatric studies **at the time Bryant was being detained there.**

The best explanation, therefore, is that we are looking at a case of artificially induced memories. Bryant would have been subjected to the whole arsenal of coercive psychological techniques that are used to break down resistance and enhance suggestibility. Techniques likely to have been employed for the purpose of making him receptive to pseudo-memories would include sleep deprivation, electric shock treatment, hypnosis, *deep-sleep* therapy, torture and the administration of beta-blockers like Propranolol.⁴⁵

By such methods, Bryant's suggestibility would have been elevated to the point that he was fully capable of mistaking a mere narrative for authentic memories. Such a program would probably have been supplemented by a short video portraying the events themselves. I conjecture that an individual disguised as Bryant – presumably the Port Arthur gunman himself – perpetrated the Fortescue Bay turnoff carjacking, but that the episode was a mere charade performed for the benefit of a video camera.

⁴⁴ As used here, confabulate means to relate imagined experiences to fill in gaps within the memory. (*Taber's Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary*; 1977: p. C-103.) Bryant was not deliberately lying. He was struggling honestly to answer questions for which he did not have a complete answer. Between the facts he knew, he confabulated by relating actions/events which he thought must have taken place. Note that confabulation, if not recognized as such, can be accepted as the truth and be very misleading.

⁴⁵ Also sold under the brand name Inderal.

46 One of the items the gunman visibly carried to (**but not from**) the Broad Arrow Café was this large video camera. Allegedly, it belonged to Martin Bryant. But given Bryant was not the gunman, that camera was either not his, or it had been taken from his home by the cops to be used as a prop by the gunman. (It helped to set up Bryant.) In the police *training video*, this camera is visible **on a table inside the café**. What images it contained could have been extremely useful. And if Bryant had been the gunman, his fingerprints would have been all over it. But this camera **disappeared**. The same thing happened to the handgun which was reported* being fired at the Seascope cottage – it too just **disappeared**. And the night vision equipment which was used inside Seascope also **disappeared**. You see Reader, whatever evidence did/does not fit the official narrative, it conveniently **disappeared** and was not mentioned by the cops and/or the corrupt DPP, Damian Bugg. (* see the *Witness Statement* of 14 August 1996 submitted by the Tasmania Police constable Simon Goninon, plus the *Witness Statement* of 1 May 1996 submitted by the Victoria Police constable Timothy Michael James.)

47 “The idea that videotapes were used to persuade Bryant to accept responsibility for the Port Arthur massacre and the murders at Seascope is not a far-fetched one. Later in this article, I examine a videotape which seems to have been fabricated months after the massacre for the purpose of convincing Bryant that he had been present at Port Arthur that day.” (Wernerhoff)

48 No empty fuel drums or containers were reported in or near the burnt BMW vehicle, by the police. Note there is also no hard evidence that Martin Bryant ever purchased fuel in containers which he then took with him on Sunday 28 April 1996. Petrol had been purchased on Sunday morning, but it was pumped into the fuel tank of a Volvo, not into containers. Whether it was Bryant’s vehicle and whether he was the driver (or was it his look-alike?) has never been credibly clarified to the public.

The entire sequence of events would have been filmed for the purpose of brainwashing Bryant into believing that he had been the actual perpetrator, that he was the man shown in the film. The video camera was then taken by the gunman to the PAHS, where it was abandoned in the Broad Arrow Café as a means of ensuring that it reached the police.

If Bryant was subjected to repeated viewings of such footage while under the influence of the appropriate psychoactive drugs, he would have wound up believing quite sincerely that what he had seen portrayed so vividly on the screen had in fact been his own memories.

This theory helps explain a hitherto obscure circumstance: the fact that the Port Arthur gunman, despite being sufficiently burdened already with a heavily stuffed sports bag, was also lugging around with him a large black video camera. Although the camera was discarded at the café and is known to have **been recovered by police**, it has not been heard of since.⁴⁶

As it is most unlikely that the gunman would have encumbered himself with this object for no reason, the camera had to have played a role in the drama. Although I cannot prove that the camera contained footage of the Fortescue Bay turnoff incident, it might well have contained footage of some kind. If it didn’t, it’s hard to see why the official narrative of the case entirely **glosses over** the matter of whether there was anything on the camera.⁴⁷

Although Bryant’s confabulated scenario failed to match the official account of his alleged deeds, it was serviceable enough for the purpose of forging a link with the sinister activities of the real gunman. Inspectors Paine and Warren would have felt gratified that, for all its logical problems, Martin Bryant’s scenario contained four episodes that feature in the official account of the Port Arthur massacre: (i) arriving at Seascope; (ii) in a stolen BMW; (iii) with a male hostage in the boot; and, (iv) setting the BMW alight.

Nonetheless, Bryant’s scenario can be rejected as false because at least three known facts about the case directly contradict it. First, the BMW was actually set on fire by constable Andrew M. Fogarty of the Special Operations Group (SOG), who was the first police officer to arrive at Seascope. According to a police insider – apparently the superintendent Bob Fielding, who arrived at the police operations centre at Taranna about half an hour after the incident occurred – Fogarty fired a phosphorus grenade at the vehicle in order to prevent it from being used as an escape vehicle. (The drums of petrol which Bryant had **allegedly** brought with him from Hobart that morning, but which no eyewitness actually reported seeing, may therefore be **completely fictitious**.⁴⁸)

Second, while Bryant believes that the BMW driver was still in the boot when the explosion occurred, the body of the hostage – Glenn Pears – was [allegedly] discovered inside Seascope, not inside the BMW, suggesting that the gunman had freed him from the boot of the BMW and escorted him into the house.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Third, the burns to Bryant's body were in reality sustained the next day during the Seascope fire. (He emerged from Seascope on the morning of 29 April 1996 with his back in flames.)⁴⁹

In short, although Bryant's story constitutes an admission of criminal acts, **it does not add up to an admission of responsibility for any events that actually took place that day.** Damian Bugg was therefore misleading the Court when, on 19 November 1996, he declared that *Jamie* – who he assumed to have been Bryant – had admitted stealing the Nixons' BMW and taking Glenn Pears hostage. In fact, *Jamie*, as we've seen, had only related a parallel event involving *Rick* from Florida. Bryant did no more than *confess* to the same episode.

When his police interrogation began, the only significant information Bryant knew about the events of 28-29 April is that Seascope had burned down and a number of people had died in the fire. He said he obtained the information not from inspectors Paine and Warren (who seem to have been surprised to learn that he knew this), but from "a doctor, and security guards." What few Australians know is that Bryant was saddened to hear about Seascope's destruction and expressed sorrow for the Martins' loss: "Worked hard all their lives, renovating; took them years to build it, renovate it and to start it all up, and it's just so sad to see; apparently it's burnt down, it's so sad to see it burnt down," he lamented.⁵⁰

Before we recount the process by which Bryant was first made aware of his alleged responsibility for the Port Arthur massacre, it is necessary to remind the reader once again that **neither forensic nor eyewitness evidence exists to link him to it.** The case against him depends entirely upon two circumstantial factors: **1.** The distinctiveness of his personal appearance: and, **2.** The distinctiveness of his 1979-model yellow Volvo.

The **police framing of Bryant** for the massacre therefore included obtaining concessions from him as to the distinctiveness of his appearance and that of his Volvo.

The matter of his appearance was raised spontaneously by Bryant himself, but was instantly capitalised upon by inspector Warren, who deviously connected it to "Port Arthur," even though Bryant hadn't mentioned that location himself:

Warren: Martin, getting back to that point about the hostage, you taking the hostage because you didn't want him telling the police. What didn't you want him telling the police?

Bryant: That I took his, umm, car.

Warren: But I mean, if you'd have left him on the side of the road, he wouldn't have known where you could've driven.

Bryant: Yeah, but he could've let them know that there was a chap with blonde [sic] hair, took me car, stole me car. So I sort of put him in the boot to be safe.

⁴⁹ "In his book *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident*; 2001: pp. 119-27, the author Noel McDonald discusses several other problems associated with this." (Wernerhoff)

⁵⁰ When Martin Bryant was first told about the incident at the Port Arthur Historic Site, he asked if anyone had been hurt. The following is an excerpt from the transcript made of the audio-tape conversation between Martin Bryant (one of the *Jamies*) and Terry McCarthy the police negotiator:

Jamie: Yeah what what went on at Port Arthur? [sic]

McCarthy: Well I was hoping that you might be able to tell me a little bit about what happened at Port Arthur you being down there.

Jamie: **Was there anyone hurt?**

McCarthy: Well, I understand there's been er er a number of people hurt at Port Arthur.

Jamie: **Oh they weren't killed?**

McCarthy: Well, I don't know what....

Bryant was not attempting to fool the negotiator. Bryant did not have the intellect to do that as McCarthy was experienced. Bryant expressed genuine concern for people, as he did for the loss of Seascope cottage for which there is **not one shred of evidence** he destroyed by fire. This is what Bryant said about Seascope cottage and David & Sally Martin when the subject was raised by the cop interviewer Warren: "Worked hard all their lives, renovating, took them years to build it, renovate it and to start it all up and it's just so sad to see, apparently it's burnt down, it's so sad to see it burnt down."

*A review
of what is left of
the hacked and
redacted transcript
reveals the two
police detectives
were not
questioning Bryant
to get at the truth,
but were trying to
implicate Bryant
in the incident at
Port Arthur.*

Warren: So you thought your looks that day were distinctive, and if someone said they saw a chap with blonde hair...
Bryant: Mmm.
Warren: ...at Port Arthur on that particular day?

Second, the distinctiveness of the Volvo:

Warren: We have lots of people who are telling us that they saw you at Port Arthur and your car.
Bryant: Well, it must've been another, there's other Volkswagens...
Warren: With surfboards on the top? With someone with long blonde hair driving them or getting out of them?
Bryant: There's not many with surfboards on top.

As we shall see below, these concessions left Bryant little wiggle room when police confronted him with a photograph of what seemed to be his yellow Volvo parked at Port Arthur. Once they had succeeded in having Bryant admit the distinctiveness of his appearance and that of his Volvo, inspectors Paine and Warren had to do one more thing before they could confront him with the accusation that he had perpetrated the massacre inside the Broad Arrow Café: they had to convince him that he had entered the PAHS that day.

To do so, Warren confronted Bryant with generalised references to eyewitness sightings of himself which he was ill-placed to contest, having already conceded the distinctiveness of his appearance and of his Volvo:

Warren: Well, what would you say if I told you that you were seen going into Port Arthur and in fact you were at the toll gate?
Bryant: I couldn't've been.
Warren: And more than that, that you did complain about the price of admission.
Bryant: Umm, **I don't remember going in, into Port Arthur or going through the toll gate at all.**
Warren: Well, as you said a minute ago, you, your description of the long blonde hair does make you, umm, stand out from the crowd.
Bryant: Mmm, exactly.
Warren: What about your yellow Volvo?
Bryant: That would, wouldn't it? That would stand out.

Later in the interview, Warren showed him a photograph of a vehicle that Bryant conceded looked like his own Volvo:

Warren: Martin, I want you to have a look at this photo. It's photo number zero one one two. In it is a car I believe to be yours and it's depicted adjacent to the toll booth.
Bryant: Couldn't be mine. Where'd you get that? I don't remember being stationary [inaudible]...
Warren: Do you agree that that could be a surfboard on the top?
Bryant: Yes, I think it probably is.
Warren: And it's certainly similar to your, ahh, your car?

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Bryant: Mmm.
Warren: The registration number of this vehicle I think is CG two eight three five.
Bryant: I don't remember the registration.
Warren: Well that's your car. So that certainly suggests it be- 'cause that's the exit road at the toll booth, that your car had been.
Bryant: How could the car be there when I didn't go, go there in the first place [inaudible]...?
Warren: As I said, sorry, as I've said, we have, there are lots of people saying that they saw you in the Port Arthur site and your car in the Port Arthur site.⁵¹
Bryant: Mmm, I can't recall that.

That inspector Warren twice told Bryant that "lots of people" had seen him at Port Arthur is a clear-cut case of **police mendacity**. Police witness statements show that the eyewitnesses had seen a man with long blond hair – who, on account of numerous discrepancies, could not have been Bryant. Furthermore, as we saw in the previous article, only one person who actually knew Bryant observed the Port Arthur shooter in action. That person, Jim Laycock, got a good enough look at the gunman to estimate his age but told police that he "**did not recognise the male as Martin Bryant.**"⁵²

Another witness, Michael Copping, who knew Bryant "by casual contact," saw the gunman driving the Volvo but did not indicate in his police statement that the man had been Bryant.

In addition, it should be noted that Warren claimed Bryant had complained about the price of admission to the PAHS. Although he made this statement twice during the interview, both PAHS employees who said that they accepted money from the Volvo driver, Aileen Kingston and Steven Howard, stated the exact opposite in their respective witness statements. Kingston related: "I was expecting an argument about the entrance fee from the Volvo driver as he looked to me that he didn't have a lot of money. This didn't eventuate, and the driver produced \$50.00 and I gave him the change with the tickets as well as a briefing, and he then drove off towards the site." **Inspector Warren seems to have been so determined to stick to a prefabricated script that he felt free to disregard information supplied by actual eyewitnesses.**

And what about the Port Arthur massacre itself? Towards the end of the interrogation, inspectors Warren and Paine finally broached the subject for which they had spent several hours laying the groundwork. After again denying that he had even been at Port Arthur on 28 April, Bryant reacted as any reasonable person would when charged with crimes as heinous as the Broad Arrow Café shootings:

Warren: We believe you went into Port Arthur. Had a slight argument with the toll gate person about the price on entry. We believe you then went to park your car and an attendant or someone...
Bryant: Park the car?

⁵¹ Note all the devious statements made by Warren during this part of the dialogue. They are good examples of how corrupt cops set up innocent people. Martin told the cops that he did not go to PAHS. But they had a photograph of a Volvo, which they said was photographed inside PAHS. And the cops also claimed Martin had driven the Volvo inside PAHS. But we (and the cops) know that some other person could have driven that Volvo, and any other similar Volvos into PAHS on the day of the incident. So to fix the official accusation that Martin was the gunman, Warren told Martin that: "there are lots of people saying that they saw you in the Port Arthur site." Warren was using that *everyone-knows-you-did-it* line to **set up** incompetent Martin, who must have then convinced himself that he was there but he just could not remember being there. (He probably blamed himself even though he had absolutely nothing to do with PAHS.) As for Warren, he could not then, or now, produce one credible witness who knew Martin Bryant and who had seen him at PAHS on 28 April 1996. The minds/memories of everyone were contaminated, because within 24 hours of Martin being burnt and apprehended at Seascope, the media was flooding Australia with banner headlines and (stolen) images of Martin Bryant – *GUNMAN! KILLER! SHOOTER!* they screamed.

⁵² These are the words spoken by a person who knew Martin Bryant. Similar negative words were spoken by Graham Collyer who, before he was shot at the Broad Arrow Café, looked the gunman right in the face – **it was NOT Martin Bryant**. Yet the State wants you to believe people who gave statements weeks after the incident and thus after their memory had been influenced by the media's demonization of Bryant.

Warren: ...said you couldn't park in a certain spot, so you didn't and sometime later you did move your car to that spot. We believe you went to the Broad Arrow Café with that bag over there, containing some guns and your video camera.⁵³ You purchased a meal, you went outside, sat down, and then went back into the café. Took one.

Bryant: But you might've. That's like me saying to you, that you were down there.

Warren: But the difference is, Martin, my car wasn't down there and I haven't been identified as being down there and I wasn't down there. And then you took one of the guns out of your bag and opened fire in the café.

Bryant: Why would I do that? I mean...

Warren: I don't know, you tell me.

Bryant: Why, why would anyone do a thing like that, what?

Warren: Well, you tell us.

Bryant: [inaudible]

Warren: That's what we want to know Martin, why.

Bryant: What, what, would, I wouldn't hurt a person in my life.

Inspector Warren then reminded Bryant that he had already admitted having done someone some harm that day:

Warren: Well, you've already said you'd put the man in your boot of the car.

Bryant: Only, yes, yes.

Warren: Then you've set fire to the car and you thought that he was in the boot.

Bryant: [inaudible]

Warren: So how do you explain that?

Bryant: It was a bad thing...

[something missing here? or a pause? – ed.]

Bryant: Well, I shouldn't've gone and kidnapped him and the BMW. It's the wrong thing. That and, that, and in the, being caught with not having a driver's licence. So they're the two things I've done wrong. I don't know why I stole the BMW in the first place. I wish I'd

[inaudible].⁵⁴

Bryant found himself checkmated. By having him admit that he had done one bad deed that day, inspector Warren effectively deprived him of a case for asserting that he would not be the kind of person who would murder 35 people! Although the taking of a hostage is clearly not a crime of the same magnitude as mass murder, most readers will think that Bryant has been caught up in his own lies and that the truth will unravel, inch by inch.

The problem with the case inspectors Paine and Warren presented to Bryant, however, is that it **relied upon assertions**, not evidence. Apart from the aforementioned image of some yellow Volvo – not necessarily his – parked at the Port Arthur toll gate, they showed

⁵³ The video camera taken into the Broad Arrow Café by the gunman but which officials never accounted for. It just **vanished**. Obviously, officials do not want you to know anything about that camera. What are they covering up?

⁵⁴ Again, when you see “inaudible,” or other words confirming something is missing from the transcript, think about evidence tampering, because that is what officials do with transcripts and audio/visual tapes. Unless a transcript is prepared by an objective 3rd party (not the cops or any other employee of the State) from the original tape, never believe what is on it is the truth. And this is proved by the resistance cops put up when people make freedom-of-information applications for **original** tapes – not copies which a corrupt official makes, but the **originals**.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Bryant **no** visual evidence – **no** photographs, not even the video allegedly made by American tourist James Balasko which purports to show the gunman at the scene – that would decide the matter. What’s more, they showed the accused man nothing of a forensic nature – fingerprints or DNA – which could substantiate their extraordinary allegations.

In other words, when it came to convincing Bryant that he had been responsible for the most appalling crime in recent Australian history, as late as 4 July 1996, inspectors Paine and Warren still had nothing to fall back on except the distinctiveness of his appearance and that of his car. However, it is not hard to see that both are things that could easily have been imitated by someone involved in a plot to **set up Bryant**. Indeed, the conspicuous absence of any other kind of evidence against him renders such a scenario a virtual certainty.

Unfortunately, Bryant’s intellectual limitations are such that he was incapable of graduating to the relatively complex idea that someone had emulated his appearance in order to set him up. His low IQ, in a nutshell, is the real reason why he seems destined to spend the rest of his life in prison.⁵⁵

III. THE SET-UP

In the first section of this article, it was shown that Martin Bryant could not have been the perpetrator of the horrendous massacre at Port Arthur on 28 April 1996 because his fingerprints and/or DNA were never found at the crime scene. Eyewitnesses also described a man who was not only much younger than but who also differed from Bryant in several significant respects.

The popular idea that eyewitnesses identified Bryant as the gunman is therefore a complete misrepresentation of the facts, as is the theory that he was a mind-controlled patsy. Quite simply, he wasn’t even there. Given that Bryant eventually [under documented duress] pleaded guilty to all charges arising from the massacre, the question inevitably arises as to how this came about. Three factors made it possible for the Tasmanian government to **manipulate Bryant into pleading guilty**.

First, Bryant is an individual of extremely low intelligence, with a mental age estimated to be that of an 11-year-old. He was therefore **much less capable of realising that he was being set up** than a person of average intelligence. This circumstance alone helps explain why Bryant, rather than someone else, was selected as the patsy.

Second, after being deprived of his liberty, Bryant was maintained in a condition of virtual solitary confinement for months on end. During this period, he was at the absolute mercy of his captors and their agents: police; lawyers; psychiatrists; doctors; nurses; and, security personnel. They could do with him **whatever they wanted** because very few members of the public, if any, cared what happened to him: the media had successfully persuaded them to believe that he was a monster,⁵⁶ not worth an ounce of their pity.

55 Think about these words stated by Wernerhoff. Poor Martin must have been struggling to comprehend what was taking place – more specifically, what was being done to him. We know something about what Paine and Warren did to Martin, but we have no knowledge of who else was working Martin’s mind over while he languished on his bed in pain at the Royal Hobart Hospital and later when he was transferred to Risdon Prison. Decent people rightfully think badly of those who mistreat the mentally-handicapped. And decent people stop such mistreatment from happening. Yet, when it comes to Martin Bryant there seems to be an endless line of people who have, or who would like to, put the verbal boot into him. And let’s not kid ourselves. There are people out there who would **kill** him if they had just half a chance. Martin was on his own. He had **no** guardian, **no** lawyer (John Avery was pathetic), **no** family, and **no** good mind to defend himself from a stream of corrupt assertions from police and **no** doubt from other State officials – assertions presented without a shred of hard evidence which he could not rebut. Though he tried and tried the best he could. If you are Australian, doesn’t this make you feel ashamed to come from a land where justice is a game? A land where the mentally-handicapped can be imprisoned for life. Just look at the note below in which the titles of two references are given. The authors saw nothing wrong with identifying Martin as a: “mass murderer”; and, “a monster.” The three mongrels involved (Davies, Totaro, and Wainwright) made money with their callous words. Almost every fact within this book you are reading was available to the general public prior to 2009. But these three authors ignored all the available evidence revealing the official narrative is a pack of lies. They ignored all of it because there was **money to be made selling the official narrative**. *And every tragic day, poor Martin advances toward his death.*

56 Examples are: the subtitle of the 2009 book by Robert Wainwright & Paola Totaro is: *Martin Bryant: the making of a mass murderer*; the title of a 4 April 2006 article in The Bulletin by Julie-Anne Davies is *Making of a monster*; etc.

57 Numerous websites display an image of the person believed to be **Benjamin Overbeeke**. In that image, he is dressed in camouflage clothing and is seated on the front passenger seat of what seems to be a Tasmania ambulance vehicle. And if officials of the State deny this person is Overbeeke and/or deny he was the shooter, then who is he? And what was he doing in that vehicle? Unless the State provides an exposé detailing everything about this person, which can then be studied, it is reasonable to conclude the State is perpetrating a serious cover-up. (It has also been suggested that the brother **Warren Overbeeke** might also have participated in the killing.)

58 The official narrative says Martin Bryant drove that gold-coloured BMW from the PAHS tollbooth to the Port Arthur service station / general store, and from there to Seascope cottage. But there is **no hard evidence** to prove this. Witnesses saw a young man with long blonde hair **below** his shoulders at the PAHS tollbooth and they were told it was Martin Bryant. But his presence was not proved at a trial. And Martin Bryant himself said he was **never at PAHS on 28 April**. It seems he did say he carjacked the BMW at Fortescue Bay where there had been a woman with a baby in it. (*sic*) But that place is north of where Seascope was located, not south as the tollbooth is. And none of the witnesses at the tollbooth said either of the two women who they observed (Mary Rose Nixon, Helene Salzmann) had a baby. It is all so suggestive of a **set-up**. Now, another revealing fact has come to the fore. Martin Bryant had no licence to drive any vehicle. But he owned a vehicle and he did drive it. Related to this, his mother states this in her book *My Story*: "Martin would regularly drive a little Honda Civic **automatic** that had belonged to Helen's mother" (p. 121); & "Martin could drive an **automatic car**" (p. 134). The Volvo he owned also had an **automatic gearbox** as **Martin could not drive a vehicle with a manual gearbox**. So who did drive that BMW, which it seems had a *four-on-the-floor manual gearbox*, from the PAHS tollbooth to the service station / general store then on to Seascope cottage? Was it Benjamin or Warren Overbeeke? Or.....

ROLE OF THE JAMIES

THERE is **so much confirmatory and suggestive evidence**, the Port Arthur incident cannot be anything else but planned. That on one day some person secretly loaded a sedan vehicle with a huge armoury then drove to Seascope cottage, then drove on to Port Arthur Historic Site, then went back to Seascope causing murder and mayhem along the way, and then held off a **team of well-trained police killers** is ludicrous. No one who thinks could believe a person having a 66 IQ could have done all that. No one who thinks believes a man with a mind of an **11-year-old-boy** kept the Tasmania Police SOG at bay overnight. SOG is armed with the best killing (day & night) equipment tax-money can buy.

Facts say there were at least **two active people/shooters** with Martin Bryant inside the cottage on 28 & 29 April 1996. Bryant was manipulated by the planner of the incident who it is believed was one of those people/shooters inside Seascope. It seems that person was **Michael Dyson** of Tasmania Police who has admitted a passion for being involved with violent incidents. The other person with Dyson and Bryant was the gunman from PAHS, who the literature says is **Benjamin Overbeeke**.⁵⁷

Dyson had to have a closed (not open like a radio) line for communications with the outside to plan the exit of the real gunman who had arrived from the Broad Arrow Café with the hapless hostage in the BMW, which was soon fired to destroy all evidence therein – including poor Glenn Pears. There is **not a shred of hard evidence** Martin Bryant had anything to do with that BMW sedan⁵⁸, the hostage taking, or that incineration.

You are to believe Martin Bryant was alone inside Seascope and that he decided to use the phone and identify himself as *Jamie* the gunman who murdered 32 people and injured another 22 down the road. What for? Martin Bryant never tried to disguise himself in any other way during all the calls he is alleged to have made. If he was responsible for leaving the Volvo near the Port Arthur Historic Site, and if he was seen taking Glenn Pears and the BMW and driving off to Seascope cottage, there was no reason on earth why Bryant had to identify himself as *Jamie*. Unless he had agreed to, wittingly or unwittingly, help play out a hostage-taking exercise with the cops. And this is exactly what the police negotiator Terry McCarthy implied when he admitted that he thought Bryant was acting out a pre-planned script of a training exercise.

Not once did *Jamie* make any of the usual hostage-taker demands to the police negotiator. But he did tell McCarthy that he (*Jamie*) was preparing a snack for those with him inside the cottage. Think about it. Bryant had, allegedly, just killed 32 men, women, and children, but now he was busying himself with preparing his fellow cottagers snacks to eat. And during his amiable chats (numerous phone calls were made) with McCarthy, rifle fire from inside the cottage can be heard on the audio tape. But you are not supposed to know this, because on the transcript those shots are identified as **coughs**. And there are many (22) of them on the transcript.

(cont.)

Then we had a *Jamie* speaking with a news reporter from the ABC after Alison Smith unexpectedly telephoned Seascope on Saturday (28th) afternoon. There are two different stories about that call. The public does not know which story is correct. According to the reporter, *Jamie* told her that he had to have a shower – this was while the police siege of Seascope was underway. Imagine that. This *Jamie* was probably the gunman **Benjamin Overbeeke**.

Then we had one *Jamie* speaking with the female partner of the police constable Paul Hyland who was stationed at Nubeena. That *Jamie* made suggestive comments and accused this woman of masturbating herself. All of this confirms the phone calls attributed to *Jamie* were inconsistent and that the stated actions were not reasonably in accordance with the alleged situation – the situation being a high-powered police siege of a cottage in which there was only one gunman with an IQ of 66.

The truth is, we do not know everything about those phone calls and *Jamie* because the only evidence related to them was provided by the cops. And no one in their right mind ever trusts cops. Whether all the *Jamie* conversations were audio recorded by the cops is not known by the public. Whether all those recordings were transcribed accurately is also not known. And, it seems that officials did not have all the audio tapes examined by a forensic sound analyst/engineer. A recorded third voice would clearly expose the officially-planned scam.

So **before, during, and after** the conversations between Bryant and McCarthy, that phone could have been used by anyone who was inside the cottage to call anyone about anything. That person would have also identified himself as *Jamie*. Officials are not going to reveal the details. In fact, cops who were not part of the official plan would not have been told anything.

The *Jamie* conversations prove Martin Bryant was inside Seascope cottage, which, officials want you to believe proves Bryant is the lone gunman. But **it does not prove this**. When in continuous conversation with McCarthy, the sound of weapons being fired inside the cottage has been detected on those audio-taped *Jamie* conversations, which investigators now have. This **proves conclusively** that Bryant was not alone. The *Jamie* part of the plan actually confirms the whole incident at Port Arthur was a set-up in which **Bryant was framed**.

Once you stop unthinkingly believing Bryant was the planner of the whole Port Arthur incident, was the gunman, was *Jamie*, was the sole person involved, **the whole incident changes**. The test of interocular significance applies with the facts hitting you right between the eyes. The use of the name *Jamie* was a cover for closed communication to and from Seascope. When that communication was no longer needed, one *Jamie* disappeared leaving the other *Jamie* (the patsy) to burn to death inside the cottage. Finally, one top cop said the calls ended because the telephone battery was depleted. But that too was just another official lie – because the *Jamies* had a land-line telephone in the cottage. – **ed**.

The false identification of Martin Bryant being the gunman is what keeps the official narrative together – immediately that is acknowledged to be the lie it is, then the corrupt official narrative falls apart.

⁵⁹ An extremely serious point raised by Carl Wernerhoff. Bryant was charged with the murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott. He was charged on **Tuesday, 30 April 1996, at 11:00** only a day after he arrived at the Royal Hobart Hospital after being sent there by ambulance from Seascope cottage with severe burns on his back which required skin grafts. The major newspaper in northern Tasmania, *The Examiner*, wrote this on 1 May 1996 about that process: "No family members or friends of Mr. Bryant were present when he was charged." **Alone, confused, medicated, without anyone to speak for him and with his IQ of 66**, this *boy-man* was charged with a crime he knew nothing about. So while the country was stunned, families and relatives were devastated, and victims were receiving life-saving surgery, bureaucrats were preparing the official papers to charge Bryant with murder. So Reader, Martin Bryant was going nowhere. He was in too much pain to move. But the State had to tell the public that action had been taken quickly: **before** a thorough investigation; **before** any hard evidence was obtained; **before** all witnesses had been contacted and their statements taken; **before** any objective conclusions could be made; **before** the results of any forensic test could be completed and replicated; *etc.* It was not until 10 May 1996, which was 11 days after Bryant had been charged with the murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott, that the cops contacted James Laycock, and this is what he revealed in his *Witness Statement*: "On this Sunday the 28th April 1996, I did not recognise the male as Martin BRYANT." The only person in the whole incident who saw the gunman in action and who knew Martin Bryant said the **gunman was NOT Bryant**. And witness Graham Collyer said the same thing. But the State did not give a damn about witnesses, because 11 days earlier Martin Bryant had been charged with murder. He was set up and charged before any proper investigation was undertaken. And once the legal wheels had begun to turn, no exculpatory evidence was allowed to get in the way of a conviction.

Third, in order to prevent him from finding out the full extent of the crimes which were being attributed to him, Bryant was not allowed to watch TV, listen to the radio or read newspapers or magazines. His only potential sources of information about the massacre were his former girlfriend Petra Willmott, who visited him once, and his mother, who visited him once every few weeks; however, neither was permitted to discuss the case with him.

As late as 4 July 1995, Bryant was under the impression that the only charge against him was a single count of murder arising from the abduction of a male hostage: a lawyer from Fort Lauderdale, Florida, USA, whom he knew only as *Rick*. This is simply astonishing because, by 4 July, at least officially, Bryant had been informed on no fewer than three prior occasions (1 May, 22 May, & 14 June) that he had been charged with the [Broad Arrow Café] murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott. Yet the transcript of the 4 July police interrogation makes it abundantly clear that this was the first occasion on which he grasped the fact that the murder charge had arisen from the death of a female. This finding inevitably raises questions as to **whether Bryant was present (or, if he was present, whether he was conscious) during the three initial indictments.**⁵⁹

In the second section of this article, the hypothesis was advanced that in the weeks prior to his 4 July interrogation, a concerted effort was made to implant false memories in Bryant's mind that would represent a first step towards having him accept responsibility for the Port Arthur murders. According to my hypothesis, psychiatrists would have told Bryant that he needed their help to reconstruct memories of his actions that he had blotted out due to trauma. The anticipated outcome was that Bryant would finally grow convinced that he had committed the crimes, even if he would have no idea why he would have done so. Fortunately **for the Tasmanian director of public prosecutions (DPP), motive was irrelevant.** In order to forestall a court trial, Bryant only needed to accept that he had committed the crimes; he did not also need to furnish a motive for having committed them.

The [incomplete] transcript of Bryant's 4 July police interrogation shows that the initial effort was successful enough: on this occasion, Bryant produced a narrative of participation in the carjacking of a BMW at the Fortescue Bay turnoff that was uncannily similar to that related over the phone to police negotiator Terry McCarthy by the enigmatic *Jamie*, the spokesperson for the bizarre events at Seascope guest house that followed on the heels of the massacre.

Although the crime to which Bryant *confessed* was unconnected to the events at Port Arthur and almost certainly never took place in reality, Bryant's yarn was interpreted by the DPP as a confession to acts actually perpetrated at a different location by the real Port Arthur gunman, *i.e.*, the carjacking and abduction of a male hostage that took place outside the Port Arthur General Store. By **ignoring the details of Bryant's confession**, the DPP, Damian Bugg, deceived Tasmania's supreme court by telling it that Bryant had confessed to the acts perpetrated by the real gunman.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

However, at this early stage of the game, Bryant vehemently resisted the idea that he had perpetrated the murders at Port Arthur. He maintained that he had not even visited the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS) on the day in question, and he had difficulty understanding how the police had obtained a picture of a vehicle that seemed to be his own yellow Volvo parked at the PAHS toll gate when he only recalled driving past it. Clearly, a great deal of work remained to be done before Bryant could be made to confess to the shootings.

EVERY CAPERS

Bryant's second lawyer, David Gunson, failed to make any headway in this respect, and on 30 September 1996 Bryant pleaded "not guilty" to all of the **72 charges against him**. He did so "clearly and coolly."⁶⁰ Gunson resigned as Bryant's lawyer the very next day and refused to clarify his reasons to the media. The individual who rose to the task was John Avery, who had already been involved in the case as **part of the police effort to frame Hobart gun dealer Terry Hill** for allegedly supplying Bryant with the weapons and ammunition used at Port Arthur. That Avery was waiting in the wings, ready to take over from Gunson, can be inferred from his presence in the courtroom when Bryant pleaded "not guilty." Avery met with Bryant for the first time the following day – the day that Gunson retired from the case.

Avery did in one month what Gunson had failed to do in five. On 7 November 1996, Bryant reversed his "not guilty" pleas and finally, on 22 November 1996, pleaded "guilty" 72 times. The fact that on the latter occasion Bryant **tittered** between his "guilty" pleas is a baffling circumstance that begs comparison with his experience on 30 September. On that occasion, Bryant entered "not guilty" pleas without⁶¹ any inappropriate noises, so it is extremely strange that he apparently tittered while pleading "guilty." Since one would expect the opposite – that a mass murderer declaring himself "not guilty" might do so with some self-amusement – it is striking that Bryant apparently was more amused by the idea of pleading "guilty."

Alternatively, he may have been trying to send the public a message: the sounds he made to accompany his "guilty" pleas may have been intended to help convey the message that his pleas were **insincere** and not to be taken at face value. A further circumstance that invites concern is that, having pleaded "guilty" to all charges, Bryant was never escorted⁶² over the crime scene to verify that he had perpetrated the criminal acts to which he had allegedly *confessed*. Such *walk-thrus* are a staple of modern crime investigations and are invariably videotaped. Footage of this nature is often used in TV crime programs, such as *Forensic Investigators* and similar American programs (*Body of Evidence*). In short, Bryant has never corroborated his "guilty" pleas – a fact that makes them virtually worthless.

How did the turnaround come about in the space of about a month? Until recently, it has been impossible to do more than guess how Bryant was finally persuaded to plead "guilty" to all charges against him. All we have had to go by is a sequence of events that looks **extremely suspicious**: (i). Bryant stunned the Tasmanian legal

⁶⁰ "Noel McDonald. *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident*; 2001: p. 145." (Wernerhoff)

⁶¹ A reliable source has informed the editor that this is not correct. According to the source, Bryant did titter at the plea hearing – which is not a trial – on 30 September 1996. It was reported in at least one newspaper as he "laughed." We should ask ourselves why he would laugh during something that most of us would consider serious. Was Martin Bryant under the influence of some drug, possibly a medication which reduced his inhibitions? Did Martin think this plea submission process was just another part of a play in which he had a part? Recall the negotiator Terry McCarthy said it was his belief Martin was reading a script at Seascapes cottage during the (alleged) siege. It is not unreasonable to believe that Martin laughed or tittered or reacted in whatever way he did due to nervousness. And it is also not unreasonable to believe he did not exhibit mature adult behaviour simply because **Martin is not an adult**. He is a *boy-man*. If he had really understood the seriousness of the situation, he would not have tittered, or laughed, or whatever it was he did. But Martin did not understand and this is evidenced by his inappropriate behaviour. But because people were encouraged by officials and the media to **hate** him, the negative interpretation was callousness – *he did not care about the victims*. But there is every likelihood that Martin had no real understanding about what was happening to him. Nor did he understand the ramifications of Avery's guilty plea. What poor Martin Bryant openly and naively did was act exactly like the **11-year-old boy that he is**.

⁶² *Walk-thrus* (re-enactments) of **all** crime scenes of the Port Arthur incident were NOT conducted with Martin Bryant. This standard procedure can assist the police with their investigations. Of course *walk-thrus* with Martin Bryant did not take place because not having committed any of the crimes, he could tell the cops anything. (The things he did relate about Seascapes cottage, a place he was at, made no sense at all.)

63 “For the transcripts of Interview 1 (3 October 1996), follow the link: bulletin.ninemsn.com.au/bulletin/site/articleIDs401A8F3AB6442877C. According to writer Julie-Anne Davies (*Making of a monster*; The Bulletin; 4 April 2006), Avery conducted 20 conversations with Bryant and possesses hours of tapes. According to Davies, Bryant refused to allow his former lawyer to release them. If true, this makes it seem most unlikely that Bryant gave Avery permission for the release of the three transcripts published by The Bulletin. If Avery felt free to disregard Bryant’s wishes in the case of three transcripts, it is hard to see what prevents him from releasing them all. Admittedly, Avery denies having given the transcripts to The Bulletin; however, I admit to not believing him. Avery was disbarred in early 2006, some say as a consequence of having released the transcripts to The Bulletin. However, the official explanation appears to be that he was disbarred on account of a financial irregularity. The matter cannot be clarified by contacting the Law Society of Tasmania – the organisation that brought the action to disbar Avery – as I sought to do between June and August 2006. That Society stonewalled me by simply referring me to a website publishing all the decisions of the Tasmanian supreme court. However, the Avery decision was not available on the website to which I was referred (austlii.edu.au/au/cases/tas/supreme_ct/recent-cases.html) and is in fact still not available there today (as at the commencement of September 2006). When I wrote back to the Law Society to point out the omission, I was glibly informed that ‘Some judgments seem to take some time before being posted on the web.’ At this stage, I strongly doubt that it will ever appear.” (Wernerhoff)

64 Wernerhoff overlooked the former Tasmania Police member (ex-SOG) Michael Dyson. Facts suggest that during the Port Arthur incident, he was the person called **Rick/Mick** in Seascope cottage. Dyson’s admitted passion to be involved with incidents of violence seems to have involved him, directly and/or indirectly, in the **killing of 35** and **injuring of 23** at and near Port Arthur in 1996. The wanted-poster image (author?) is freely available on the Internet.

Establishment by refusing to plead “guilty”; (ii). Bryant’s lawyer [David Gunson; the second] abandoned his client; (iii). Bryant was given yet another [the third] lawyer, John Avery; and, (iv). Bryant pleaded “guilty” a month later. Three transcripts of conversations between Bryant and Avery, published by The Bulletin on 4 April 2006, shed a great deal of light on the sudden transformation.⁶³


THREAT OF A TRIAL

However, before we discuss what can be learned from The Bulletin-published transcripts, it is important to emphasise that the first transcript supports the conclusion that the DPP was extraordinarily anxious **to prevent a trial from being held:**

Bryant: ...Mr. B., do you know Mr. B.?
Avery: I know Mr. B, yes, and Mr. D.
Bryant: Well, **they are trying to brainwash me** to not having a trial. [added emphasis]

It is intriguing that The Bulletin has suppressed the names of the two individuals who, unacknowledged in any public source concerning the Port Arthur case, were clearly part of some **irregular or extra-legal form of pressure being exerted on Bryant**. (I know of no one involved with Bryant’s case whose surname begins with “D.”⁶⁴ However, “Mr. B” might well be Damian Bugg.)

MICHAEL DYSON



Although Dyson’s eyes in this image on an Internet poster seem demonic, the image has not in any way been manipulated. – ed.

If Bryant were really guilty, there would seem no reason why a trial should not have been held. On the other hand, it would be consistent with the case of Bryant being set up that a trial be averted at all costs. Bryant clearly raised the stakes by pleading “not guilty” to all charges on 30 September 1996. At this stage, the DPP at least went through [ostensibly] the motions of preparing for the possibility there would be a trial. A first-session provisional date was set for 18 November 1996. Throughout October 1996, the DPP’s focus was on strategies for controlling such a trial. One strategy was clearly to sift through the body of witness testimony and eliminate witnesses who posed a problem for the prosecution – for example, Mrs. Scurr.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

One witness scrubbed at this point was Wendy Scurr. Despite her status as one of the more high-profile witnesses, Scurr was sent a letter by the office of the DPP, dated 15 October 1996, informing her that her witness testimony “will not be necessary in the trial of Martin Bryant.” By far the most interesting part of this letter – which does not even consider the possibility that Avery might call her as a witness for the defence – is a passage in which Scurr was warned against speaking to the media prior to the trial: “Because you are not called as a witness it does not mean that you can freely discuss issues in a public way. We would be most concerned if there was any inappropriate pre-trial publicity about this matter. We would ask that you exercise caution if you are approached by any representative of the Media as it would be unfortunate indeed if the trial process was in any way delayed or complicated through inappropriate pre-trial discussions.”⁶⁵ The **intimidating tone** of this letter defies belief.

By 15 October 1996, **Bryant was already the victim of the most prejudicial pre-trial publicity in Australian history.** Given that there is virtually nothing Scurr could have said to foster a more anti-Bryant climate than that which already existed, it would be difficult to interpret this letter as a warning to her not to contribute in any way to the further demonisation of the accused. Virtually the only way Scurr could have “delayed” or “complicated” the trial was if she had thrown a spanner into the works by publicly declaring that the man she saw at the PAHS that day **had not been Bryant** – which we now know is her position – or if she had reported the existence of hitherto unsuspected accomplices.

This letter could therefore be regarded as a deliberate attempt by the prosecution to **pervert the course of justice** by ordering a witness to shut up. It is the authors of this letter – Damian Bugg, and DPP clerk Nick Perks – who should therefore be under scrutiny.⁶⁶ A further insight into the deviousness of the DPP’s strategies derives from Bryant himself. On 3 October 1996, Bryant told Avery that he was not allowed to cut his hair, which by that stage was so long and unruly as to resemble dreadlocks:

Bryant: ...I can’t have a haircut until after the Court case.
Avery: Who said that?
Bryant: I mentioned that to one of the officers.
Avery: Oh, did you?
Bryant: He said to me the other day, “You can’t till after the court case.” I’ll have to try and brush my hair a bit and keep it tidy.⁶⁷

Given that the only thing Bryant had in common with the Port Arthur gunman – other than being male and under 30 – was his long blond hair, it is hardly surprising that he was denied a haircut. The DPP would have wanted Bryant to preserve the image of a *blond Rambo* in case his distinctive appearance became a factor during a trial. In any event, Avery’s successful interventions in the case soon spared the DPP the immense trauma of orchestrating a trial, and when Bryant appeared in court in November he had in fact had a haircut.

⁶⁵ “in Noel McDonald. *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident*; 2001: p. 264.” (Wernerhoff)

⁶⁶ “In fact, Bugg has done well out of Port Arthur. On 19 October 1996, The Mercury newspaper revealed that during the year Bugg’s income had risen from a regular annual salary of A\$107,638 to c.A\$221,836, including the value of a private-plated car. Soon afterwards, Bugg was promoted to Federal Director of Public Prosecutions.” (Wernerhoff)

⁶⁷ These words of Martin Bryant are significant in two ways: **i.** It is obvious Martin believed there would be a “court case” (a trial) during which he knew he should look presentable. He had been raised by good parents who had taught him to be clean and tidy and neat in his appearance. (It is strange that he usually had his hair short, but a few months before the Port Arthur incident he had let it grow. Why? Was he encouraged to do this? By whom? Tiger?) So to Martin, his hair should have been cut and he mentioned this to Avery in association with the phrase “court case.” **Avery was told Martin was expecting to appear at court in a trial related to the Port Arthur incident,** which he was concerned about. For that trial, Martin wanted his hair cut, but he had concluded he would have to “brush my hair a bit and keep it tidy”; and, **ii.** During one of the phone calls made by one of the *Jamies* inside Seascope, the following was stated to Merran Craig who was living at the police station residence in Nubeena: “Playing with yourself, are we?” (appears in Part 4, see *NAME INDEX*) Now, do you believe Martin Bryant, who had an IQ of 66, would phone that police station looking for the copper there (Why? Where would Bryant have got that phone number from?), then ask the woman who answered the phone if she was masturbating herself? It was completely out of character for Bryant. He thought more about things like keeping his hair “tidy.” It seems the *Jamie* who made that phone call – **Benjamin Overbeke?** who it has been said is the Port Arthur gunman – must have had the phone number of the Nubeena police station. Bryant had no reason to look for the cop Hyland, but it seems that Overbeke did. It is very suggestive.

*After
Bryant's image
was released
in the media,
all identifications
by eyewitnesses
were contaminated
– thus they are
unreliable.*

AVERY TRANSCRIPTS

Throughout October 1996, John Avery engaged in untold hours of *discussions* with Martin Bryant at Risdon Prison Hospital. Of the 20 meetings the pair had during that period, only the transcripts for parts of three have been made public. (Whether these transcripts are accurate verbatim records of the conversations must remain in doubt. Their accuracy clearly cannot be firmed without having access to the original recordings.) The first transcript, which preserves part of a conversation that took place on 3 October 1996, is from most points of view the most important. The second and third present a Bryant echoing the police tune like a trained parrot.

How Avery got Bryant to the point that only five days later he would casually discuss the massacre as if he had really perpetrated it is a subject that is ignored in the published transcripts; only unedited transcripts of all the conversations would provide the necessary clues.

Avery's major concern was apparently to persuade Bryant away from persisting with his "not guilty" pleas, as doing so would force a trial. As he told *The Bulletin*: "That was the hardest thing, because if Bryant wanted to be the ringmaster, it was going to be difficult to stop him." When Avery met Bryant on 3 October 1996, Bryant clearly still regarded himself as the *ringmaster* and was anticipating a trial in the not-too-distant future. Only five days later, according to the second transcript (8 October 1996), Bryant was apparently prepared to accept responsibility for literally any acts Avery wanted him to, no matter how heinous, meaning a trial would no longer be necessary.

Two factors seem to have contributed to the transformation. The first was Avery's success in convincing Bryant that, without an alibi for his whereabouts at the time of the massacre, he had no viable defence strategy. "I can't magically find a defence that you were in Hong Kong or somewhere else," he told Bryant.

The second factor was Avery's use of *evidence* allegedly putting Bryant at Port Arthur on 28 April 1996. In addition to the old chestnut that lots of people saw him at Port Arthur – "Heaps and heaps of people [say] you're it, you were there" – Bryant was given an undisclosed number of witness statements to study. Since his low IQ would have rendered him unable to consider the possibility that the statements he was given **had been faked or were being presented to him in a misleading way** – matters concerning the integrity of the evidence are, of course, normally the responsibility of the defence; but Avery was **not** seeking to defend Bryant, only persuade him to plead guilty. Bryant was left in the position of being forced to conclude that the man they referred to could only have been him.

THE BALASKO VIDEO

Avery told Bryant that the evidence against him, in addition to the witness statements, included a video image: "...they've even got a photograph of you off the video walking round with a gun at Port Arthur shooting everyone. So you're pretty distinctive." The video to which Avery was referring can only have been that allegedly made by American tourist James Balasko. **It is a fake.** It was reportedly

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

filmed from behind a campervan as the gunman returned to his vehicle. However, the actual circumstances in which the video came to light are highly suspicious and militate strongly against its authenticity.

The official story is that Tasmania Police only became aware of the video's existence after a follow-up interview with Balasko on 1 August 1996, two weeks before the police investigation concluded. To be sure, **Balasko did not mention having filmed the gunman** in the police witness statement he gave on the day following the massacre. The best explanation for Balasko's failure to mention the video on that occasion is, quite simply, that he hadn't made one. It is, after all, extremely improbable that he would have tried filming the gunman. Like most of the latter's other potential victims, the American's priority at that stage would have been to remain as inconspicuous as possible. Yet seven months later, Damian Bugg, told the supreme court that Balasko had "placed himself in a position of danger" in order to make the film, and furthermore that the risk had become a reality because the gunman noticed Balasko filming and fired a shot at him. Can we really believe that Balasko would have risked his life to make a video?

The two contradictory statements Balasko made regarding the circumstances in which he allegedly made the video are proof of the hoax. In his 29 April statement, he said that he ducked behind the campervan precisely because he saw the gunman take aim at him. He made no mention of either possessing a video camera or filming the gunman. In his statement of 1 August, however, Balasko said: "As I was filming the shooter, he noticed me sticking out behind the van with my camera..." Not only are the two statements irreconcilable, but if Balasko really had made a video of the gunman it beggars belief that he would not have mentioned it to the police at the first opportunity. At this stage, the footage would have been of immense value to both the police and the Australian media. What's more, failing to declare the existence of footage pertaining to the commission of a crime would probably have constituted a felony.

There can be little doubt, therefore, that Balasko and Tasmania Police **are lying** and the video was actually concocted after the event. Balasko, who is rumoured to be an American CIA operative, would readily have agreed to help the police out by vouching for the spurious footage. He also agreed to overdub some corny commentary for the video's first public presentation on Channel Nine.⁶⁸

The spuriousness of the video becomes readily apparent upon close examination. Particularly suspicious is the fact that the images of the shooter captured in the video entirely lack facial detail. The facial area looks unnaturally washed out, which can only have been the result of digital tampering. The only discernible facial feature, in fact, is the outline of the actor's nose, which looks pert and feminine – in clear contrast to Bryant's extremely full nose.

In this regard, Ian McNiven, a critic of the official Port Arthur story, made an interesting observation that towards the end of the footage:

⁶⁸ A Current Affair; 24 November 1996.

PAHS MEMORIAL GARDEN BROCHURE
- Lie After Lie After Lie -

FOR a nicely presented pitch of lies, go to portarthur.org.au where you will find a small (six-panel; gate-fold) brochure entitled: *A brief outline of events*, which refers to the day of official killing at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, Sunday 28 April 1996.

You are to believe this subject is so sensitive, you are not even to ask any employee at the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS) about it. Can you imagine what would happen to any employee if he/she told the truth to some visitors? Though this is most unlikely to happen. No doubt all the employees there now are more concerned about their jobs than they are about the truth, or about poor innocent Martin Bryant. This is what readers of the brochure are told. (Italicized comments of the editor follow each extract from the brochure.):

"Please understand that for many people, including staff members at Port Arthur, answering questions about the events of 28 April 1996 can be very disturbing. [Yes, the truth is disturbing.] We prefer not even to use the name of the person responsible. [Benjamin Overbeeke?] We want to explain to visitors what happened, but we also want to protect our people from distress. [So they have been told lies, and now you will be lied to.] This account is intended to outline the facts with clarity and simplicity." (original emphasis)

Of course it is disturbing to people (includes staff) if they know or suspect the official narrative is a big lie, which clearly it is. This is what a former PAHS supervisor says: "I am very disillusioned with the present system which is denying survivors of this tragedy the opportunity of presenting their testimony in the cause of truth and justice." (Robyn Cooper) This is what a former information officer of PAHS has stated: "A hell of a cover-up." (Wendy Scurr) this is what a female commentator on the official killing at PAHS has said: "The relatives of the [35] people gunned down on that day are entitled to know who really did kill their loved ones!" (Helen Laxton) And this is what a male commentator on the official killings has stated to us: "What appalls me is that no-one seems to answer the important questions they raise about the Port Arthur killings - questions that cry out for real answers." (Michael Moore)

*Normal decent people do not accept the sham pretense that people must be sensitive. People who think are sick of the deception, are sick of the cover-up. They have said that not only do the relatives of the 35 shot to death at and near Port Arthur 17 years ago deserve to know the whole truth about officials who killed their loved ones; **EVERYONE IN AUSTRALIA** deserves to know.*

*"On the morning of Sunday 28 April 1996, a young Hobart man armed himself with three high-powered automatic firearms and a large quantity of ammunition, then drove to Port Arthur." Martin Bryant never owned any automatic firearms. Not one. At the time of the shooting, one semi-automatic rifle he did own had been left for repairs at a licensed gunshop in Hobart. That leaves two semi-automatic weapons. **There is no evidence** Martin Bryant took either of those weapons to Port Arthur that Sunday. Police say he did, but have not produced anything to prove it. **There is no evidence** that those two weapons were fired at or near Port Arthur. **There is no evidence** proving the "shitloads" of ammunition alleged to be in Martin Bryant's possession belonged to him or to anyone else. All that imaginary ammo only existed to demonize him.*

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

"Just north of the township he entered the home of a local couple he knew. Inside, he shot and killed them both. He drove to the Historic Site and ate a meal on the deck of the Broad Arrow Café. He re-entered the café, which was crowded with lunchtime customers, took a rifle from his bag and began shooting. In the first 90 seconds, 20 people died and 12 were injured." *There is no evidence Martin Bryant ever went voluntarily inside Seascapc cottage. There is no evidence he shot and killed anyone, certainly not David and Sally Martin the co-owners. In their **Witness Statements**, neighbours reported shots possibly emanating from that cottage long before Martin Bryant was anywhere near it. And of course there is not one mention of the naked black-haired woman running and screaming in the yard that afternoon, a fact reported by several cops. No. Everything has to fit with the corrupt official narrative. Which is why there are unproved lies about 20 people dying and 12 being injured in 90 seconds. Several witnesses have written that this did not happen. Of course there is no mention of the seven people who died because they could not exit the café because of the **inoperable emergency door** which PAHS officials knew about. And there is no mention of a second sportsbag being left behind in the café to incriminate Martin Bryant. But it's there in the police training video.*

"After shooting indiscriminately at people in the grounds of the Historic Site, he got into his car and drove up the former main entrance road to the original toll booth. In this area, seven more people were killed in two separate incidents, during which he stole a victim's car and abandoned his own." *No mention of the fact that in the police training video the body of one of the children is moved to reveal a spent cartridge **beneath that body** – an impossibility arising from someone placing that spent cartridge there. No mention at all of the fact that at the tollbooth four people in a BMW waited for the gunman to arrive. Two of those people sat in the gunman's Volvo and talked with him. And no mention of the fact Martin Bryant did not carjacked that BMW because he could not drive it. No. You won't find such details in this memorial garden brochure.*

"At the house, the man set fire to the stolen car, then took his hostage inside. Through the afternoon and night, shots were fired at police officers on the scene. At some point during this time, the gunman killed the hostage and was captured by police as he fled from the burning building." *The lies get richer and richer. There is no evidence the gunman who took the BMW set fire to it. Everything suggests it was burnt by a member of Tasmania Police. There is no evidence the gunman took his hostage inside Seascapc. Officials want people to believe this, so they will not raise the belief that Glenn Pears was cremated alive while locked in the BMW boot. Officials never did present any handcuffs which they allege were on Pears inside Seascapc. Again, there is no evidence Martin Bryant fired a shot at Seascapc. He staggered out unarmed with his back on fire and in a **mentally-abnormal state**. Everything suggests he had been drugged and left to burn to death in Seascapc cottage which evidence suggests the cops set on fire. Readers of the brochure will not find details in it about Benjamin Overbeeke or Michael Charles Dyson. Nor are they told that none of the firearms allegedly found at the cottage belonged to Martin Bryant.*

At PAHS, you are expected to go weepy and never ask intelligent questions. Be a good visitor and do as you're told by the sensitive officials. Go and look at the memorial garden plaque – but don't ask why the name of the victim Raymond Sharp (brother of Kevin Sharp) is missing, or why. Sssssh.... And never ask any PAHS employee about how could Martin Bryant (the 36th victim killed) have been imprisoned **WITH NO TRIAL**. Never ask about this. – **ed**.

"...just as the gunman turns to face Balasko's camera showing the gunman's face, the head of the gunman disappears having been clearly fuzzed out when the remainder [of] him is quite clear.... The dazzling gold hair also has disappeared.... This fact is clear evidence someone didn't want the gunman's face seen and the reason is because it wasn't that of Martin Bryant. What they wanted the public to see was the blond-haired man...."⁶⁹

ABDUCTED THEN DRUGGED?

Now that it's been established that Bryant appears to have been persuaded to plead "guilty" to the massacre because he had no alibi, the question that arises is this: if Bryant was not guilty of the crimes at the PAHS, where was he when they took place? Why is it that no one can provide him with an alibi for his whereabouts between 12:50 p.m. and 1:50 p.m. on 28 April 1996? There are, as we should expect, very few clues as to what happened. All that can be said with confidence is that something happened to Bryant shortly after he stopped for coffee and a toasted sandwich at Nubeena, since that is when his pseudo-memories began.

The baffling gap that appears in Bryant's recollections after Nubeena can probably best be explained by a scenario in which Bryant was intercepted, abducted and drugged into unconsciousness after he left Nubeena. If Bryant had any genuine memories of that period, he would probably have been far less suggestible than he turned out to be. Around lunchtime on 28 April, therefore, Bryant must have been administered a drug that literally knocked him out until he woke up, with his back on fire, in Seascope the following morning. (The lingering effects of the drug may explain why Bryant retained **no memory** of the bedside hearing on 30 April at which time he was formally charged with the murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott.) Thus, with no memory of where he was at the time of the massacre because by then he was already unconscious; accordingly, no one can provide him with an alibi for his whereabouts in the crucial time period because by that stage he was already in police custody. The interception and abduction of Bryant can be deduced from a number of intriguing facts.

First of all, in his 4 July police interrogation, Bryant lamented that one of the only two things he had done wrong was "being caught with not having a driver's licence." However, there is nothing on the public record about Bryant's apprehension for driving without a licence. This otherwise overlooked incident probably suggests that, after he left Nubeena, Bryant was intercepted by the police, the pretext for taking him into custody being his lack of a driver's licence. His Volvo would have been taken into custody at the same time. One of the policemen could have drugged Bryant – probably at Nubeena Police Station – then delivered him unconscious to Seascope in the boot of his police vehicle, while the other would have dropped Bryant's car off at the PAHS before the massacre began.

This scenario presupposes that there were police in the area tailing him. Strikingly, three policemen were present in the area that day, any or all of whom could have been involved in the abduction effort.

⁶⁹ Lloyd T. Vance. *The truth about Port Arthur massacre – part 1*; The OzBoy file; books.google.at/books?id=iLt4OYwyt68C; 2012: p. 76.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

According to the official story, sometime around midday the only two policemen on the Tasman Peninsula, Paul Hyland of Nubeena police station and Garry Whittle of Dunalley police station, were summoned away to a remote location at Saltwater River – the farthest point on the peninsula – by an anonymous caller reporting a large stash of heroin. About an hour later, the policemen allegedly rang in to report that it was a hoax call and that nothing had been found at Saltwater River other than a sample of ordinary soap powder. It is generally assumed that the perpetrators of the massacre decoyed the two policemen to this remote location in order to retard the police response to the massacre. This story could well be bogus and have been invented to provide an alibi for police doings in the crucial hours beforehand. At the time the policemen were allegedly decoyed on a wild goose chase, they could well have been actually engaged in abducting Martin Bryant and commandeering his Volvo.

A third policeman, constable Chris Iles from Sorell Police Station, was also present in the area at the time of the massacre. According to eyewitness Kyle Spruce, Iles appeared in front of Port Arthur General Store within a minute or two of the gunman's departure. He then sped off towards Seascap. **No explanation** has ever been given for Iles being out of his own district that afternoon, just as there has been **no explanation** for what he did after he reached Seascap, which he would have done within five or 10 minutes.⁷⁰ The scenario described above would account for several interesting circumstances:

1. Bryant told his interrogators that while surfing at Roaring Beach he noticed two people bodysurfing in short wetsuits at the other end of the beach. It is interesting that Bryant should recall such a trivial detail. That he chose to mention it may indicate that he assigned the men some significance – significance which has been expunged from the interrogation transcript. Could the men have been Hyland and Whittle? If so, how did they know they could commence tailing Bryant from there? Did Bryant's girlfriend Petra Willmott, after she left his house that morning, alert them to the fact that Bryant planned to go surfing at Roaring Beach?

2. According to Michael Beekman and Rebecca McKenna – two persons who had been sitting near the gunman on the front deck area of the Broad Arrow Café – the Port Arthur gunman was watching the carpark anxiously in the period between about 1:10 and 1:15 p.m. According to PAHS employee Aileen Kingston, a yellow Volvo arrived at the Port Arthur toll gate at around the same time. The vehicle could therefore have entered the Port Arthur carpark a minute or two later. After a few minutes of inane chatter, the gunman suddenly rose from his table on the front deck and entered the café proper. Chronologically, the two events are so closely tied that they must represent cause and effect.

The Volvo's arrival in the carpark appears to have been a signal to the gunman that the massacre was to go ahead as planned. (The use of such a signalling device seems obvious enough when you consider that the decision as to whether the massacre was to go

⁷⁰ This is a classic example of the **State withholding evidence from the defence and the public**. If this cop Iles did not involve himself with negative or criminal behaviour, the Tasmania Police would have related what Iles did. But officials do not want anyone knowing. So to this day, neither the cops nor the DPP has explained the behaviour of Iles. The so-called defence lawyer, John Avery, never gave a damn because he did not raise it. The refusal of the State to explain the behaviour of all its employees at and near Port Arthur confirms that the State is corrupt.

ahead would have depended on whether Bryant, **the designated patsy**, had successfully been apprehended. It wouldn't have been acceptable to have allowed Bryant to be seen elsewhere at the time of the massacre, and his car also needed to be on hand for the gunman to use as an escape vehicle.)

3. At around 1:50 p.m., in circumstances that remain extremely obscure, two things seem to have happened at Seascope. A hostage was taken out of the boot of a vehicle and taken inside Seascope cottage. At more or less the same time, an explosion occurred which destroyed the BMW that had been hijacked by the gunman. It is entirely possible that the hostage who was taken by the gunman – Glenn Pears – **was still inside the boot** of the vehicle when it ignited, and that the hostage who was taken inside the cottage was none other than Martin Bryant. In short, the gunman might have taken Glenn Pears hostage for no other reason than to provide a cover story for witness sightings of a hostage being bundled into Seascope. Although the official story is that Pears' body was found inside Seascope, only the officers who first opened the BMW's boot after the siege was over the following morning – and the media were not allowed to visit the location until 11:00 a.m., giving the police a period of approximately two hours in which to tamper with the crime scene – would be in a position to know the truth.

72 Those asking this type of question have not thought about reality. Or they have, then chose not to assist. Their underlying assumption is that as soon as a witness speaks out, the whole official narrative will unravel and whatever wrong that exists will be quickly righted. But unfortunately, life does not function that way. Around the world there are innocent people in prison. Getting them out is not just a simple matter of someone presenting exculpatory evidence then the prison gates are opened wide. Good lawyers – there are some moral ones – have to fight long debilitating and expensive battles to overcome resistance put up by the State. (see Clive Stafford Smith. *Injustice*; 2012) Next thing, because it seems no one has spoken out does not mean many witnesses have not already gone to officials and raised exculpatory evidence. But if this fact does not get into the media, the public will never know. Media channels are regulated by the State and controlled by their owners. Information does not get into the media if it will create turmoil for the State and embarrassment and/or litigation against the media owners. It's called censorship and it comes in two types: State censorship; & self-censorship. And with reference to any case in which there is some injustice, it would be rare not to find words of people speaking out on the Internet. People do speak out (look at the Martin Bryant case), but States which control all levers of official power just deny, denigrate, and/or dismiss all evidence which conflicts with their official narratives. The people who ask this *why has no one come forward* question are either clueless or deceitful. **Decent people do speak out** about injustices in the world, but their good efforts do not always bring about immediate positive outcomes.

WHERE ARE THE WITNESSES?

All researchers of the Port Arthur Massacre (PAM) face essentially the same obstacle when they seek to show that the official narrative cannot be true. If that story is not true, people ask, then why haven't eyewitnesses come forward to denounce it as a hoax and tell us what they saw?⁷² In my opinion, it is impossible to answer this question satisfactorily without presenting an overarching theory of the case.

In this three-part article I have concerned myself with only a part of the whole: the issue of Bryant's framing. A great many aspects of the case have not been dealt with for reasons of space, and these aspects include evidence that would convince anyone that the massacre involved elements of the Australian federal government.

In the wake of John Howard's emergence as opposition leader in January 1995 and police forensic expert sergeant Gerard Dutton's move from Sydney to Hobart soon afterwards, the year preceding the events of 28 April 1996 also saw a staggering number of personnel changes within the Tasmanian government, including premier Ray Groom's baffling exchange of the state's top job for a swag of ministerial portfolios six weeks before the massacre. Also, in June 1995, Jim Laycock sold the Broad Arrow Café to the Tasmanian government. This, in an age of privatisation, seems to have been an extremely unusual case of acquisition by government of the kind of business normally considered the preserve of private enterprise. The government, which took over the building on 1 July 1995, then proceeded to refurbish it – presumably to create the perfect environment for the kind of massacre being planned. The work included the insertion of a new door to the rear of the building – the very door which infamously failed to operate on the day of the massacre.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A particularly damning piece of evidence is the fact that in 1995 the Tasmanian government ordered a mortuary vehicle that was capable of carrying 16 bodies at once.⁷³ It is impossible to account for the government's decision to buy such a vehicle when Tasmania – which had been the most peaceful in Australia for over 100 years – had an average murder rate of **one every two months**. No other state, not even New South Wales and Victoria – the states in which all previous gun rampages had taken place – possessed a vehicle with such substantial capacity. So why did the Tasmanian government decide it needed such a vehicle in 1995? And why did it subsequently decide that the vehicle, having proved its worth at Port Arthur in 1996, would not be needed in future and, in September 1999, offer it for sale? Someone with remarkable abilities of prediction seems to have been steering the course of Tasmanian government policy in the 1990s.

The mortuary ambulance remains just one small piece of the puzzle. It takes looking at only a few such pieces before it becomes impossible to avoid the conclusion that the massacre had to have been organised by elements within the Tasmanian government (albeit presumably at the instigation of the federal government). It is only as a government conspiracy that the carnage makes any sense.

The most important clue perhaps is that, when the shooting began at 1:27 p.m. that day, the café was crowded with in excess of 60 people. It was “chockers” (crammed full), to quote witness Michael Beekman. This is because, in addition to the regular numbers of tourists, there was a sizeable contingent of members of the Australian security (police/military) and intelligence establishments – including many individuals who appear to have been agents of covert government organisations such as ASIO and the even more secretive ASIS.

Among the dead, there is considerable certainty regarding the intelligence affiliations of Tony Kistan, Andrew Mills, and Anthony Nightingale.⁷⁴ Of the survivors, those who have been tentatively identified as spooks include Rob Atkins, Karen Atkins, Lyn Beavis, Justin Noble, and Hans Overbeeke....

Intelligence agents from abroad may also have been involved. In addition to two suspicious Americans – James Balasko, whose role in the production of a **fake video** was mentioned above, and **gun-control advocate** Dennis Olson – there is the intriguing case of a Taiwanese man injured in the shooting who would not tell anyone his name, and whose identity in fact **has been suppressed by the DPP**, even to the point that Bugg referred to an “Asian gentleman” rather than a “Taiwanese gentleman.”⁷⁵ It seems that planning for the massacre drew upon the expertise of intelligence agents from around the world.

The most plausible explanation for the presence of so many agents in the café at the same time is that their work had brought them there: their job was to pose as members of the public and help manage the aftermath of the slaughter. Some may have been tasked with scooping up evidence afterwards; others may have been coached to talk

⁷³ This vehicle was built for the incident. It was later advertised for sale and the notice appeared on the Internet in September 1999. (interested parties were asked to contact: cwright@trump.net.au) In that notice, the vehicle is described as a **22-body vehicle**: “Yellow Chevrolet 350 V8 truck with refrigerated body, holds 22, this vehicle was primarily used as the disaster vehicle in the Port Arthur Massacre. This vehicle is currently for sale....” (see Part 6)

⁷⁴ “Anthony Nightingale, who was ostensibly a Commonwealth Bank employee at Noble Park, Victoria, is particularly interesting. According to one researcher, Nightingale’s beneficiary received a six-figure payout from his employer in compensation for his death – a fact that implies that, far from being on holiday, **he was on active duty at the time.**” (Wernerhoff; added emphasis; see Christine Caulfield. *Big compo for Port Arthur massacre nurse*; The Mercury; 10 August 2004: compo is Australian slang for the word compensation) For a more detailed insight into the presence of these intelligence agents, see newsletter number 227 (November 2004) of the Adelaide Institute: adelaideinstitute.org/newsletters/n227.htm.

⁷⁵ “Noel McDonald. *A Presentation of the Port Arthur Incident*; 2001: pp. 185, 225.” (Wernerhoff) On the list of injured (23) which this editor has seen, there is no person with an Asian, Chinese, or Taiwanese name. It seems that this injured person was able to keep his name off the list of people injured at or near PAHS. This is highly suspicious.

to the press, perhaps to offer detailed descriptions of a gunman who would, at least in their accounts, bear an uncanny resemblance to Bryant and to provide other sundry pieces of disinformation. Other operatives may have been present only because they wanted to see for themselves how everything went down, perhaps out of curiosity or out of *career development* motives.

Obviously, they cannot have expected the massacre to take place inside the café. The expectation seems to have been that it would be carried out some distance away, on the Isle of the Dead. At least four witnesses – Rob Atkins, Michael Beekman, Gaye Lynd, Rebecca McKenna – claimed to have heard the gunman make remarks about going to the Isle of the Dead to kill wasps.⁷⁶ After the shootings, the idea that the gunman's original destination was the Isle of the Dead was expressed by several people including PAHS employee Ian Kingston and assistant police commissioner Lupo Prins.

Prins told The Mercury newspaper of Hobart: "At one stage we thought he was trying to get on a boat which a lot of people were on, to go to the Isle of the Dead. Had he got on the vessel he could have shot everybody on board, so the potential was there for it to be a lot worse than it was."⁷⁷ I have always been highly sceptical about the idea that the police were able to read the gunman's mind – to claim to know what he intended to do – when there are no indications, other than a few vague references to the island, that he planned to do anything other than what he finally did do. What we are supposed to believe, apparently, is that the gunman only entered the Broad Arrow Café after he had learned that the *Bundeena* ferry service was taking tourists out to the Isle of the Dead at 2:00 p.m. that day, not at 1:30 p.m. as he had supposed. (The ferry timetable had been changed two weeks earlier.)

This theory has the advantage of explaining why a café brimming with intelligence agents became the target. Unfortunately, the theory also asks us to accept two highly unlikely things: (i) that the gunman (or anyone working with him) never bothered to check the ferry timetable carefully before he came up with his plan; and, (ii) that at more or less the last minute the gunman, on his own initiative,⁷⁸ made a radical change of plan and fixed on the café as the location, even though it was "chockers" with agents involved in the exact same plot.

Yet according to Rebecca McKenna's *Witness Statement* of 28 April 1996, the gunman went from chatting idly about European wasps to entering the café in the space of a few minutes. As far as I can tell, nothing significant happened in the interval – although the gunman was watching the carpark anxiously and must have had a reason for being fixated on that area. It is possible, therefore, although I think not highly likely, that someone signalled to him from the carpark that the café, rather than the Isle of the Dead, was to become the massacre scene. (My view [Wernerhoff] is that what he observed was, rather, the delivery of the Volvo to the carpark, and that the presence of the real Bryant vehicle was the signal for the massacre to begin.)

⁷⁶ "Overseas readers should know that European wasps, which were introduced to Tasmania in 1959, are attracted to picnic areas, barbecues and schoolyards by sweet foods and meats. They are a particular nuisance at the PAHS during the warmer months of the year." (Wernerhoff) In the case literature, the word also appears in capitals, WASPS. This is an acronym, originally North American, meaning White, Anglo-Saxon, Protestants. It has been suggested the gunman uttered this word as he was looking for such people to kill. This has led to the belief that the gunman was either an agent of or was trained by Mossad, the Israeli intelligence and killing service.

⁷⁷ "The Mercury; 31 Dec. 1996." (Wernerhoff)

⁷⁸ It is possible the gunman was in radio (small and concealed possibly under a wig) contact with a handler. Changing the place for the shooting, and dealing with contingencies which could arise, would, it is reasonable to believe, not be left to the discretion of the gunman. Far too much effort had gone into planning the incident to let unexpected problems derail the plan due to the gunman being out of contact with his handler.

EYES THAT SHAME AUSTRALIAN JOURNALISM

IF you're an Australian journalist who earns a living from writing, reporting and commentating, imagine these eyes from time to time, staring at you hopelessly. They're the eyes of a fellow human being. **They cry out for justice.**

Have you been looking the other way? [This image] was before his indefinite incarceration in a prison from which he's been denied any hope of eventual release. Reports suggest he's become a despondent overweight zombie. He doesn't even watch television. Letters are left unopened. His condition is described as an example of a living death sentence. His name is Martin

BRYANT



Bryant. Doubts persist. It's partly the improbability of the official narrative of the atrocity, partly the unseemly lack of due process. At the behest of newly-elected prime minister John Howard, **no** coronial inquiry was ever held into the 1996 Port Arthur Massacre. There was **no** inquest. **Nor was the evidence against Bryant ever tested in court.**

Initially Martin Bryant signalled his intention to plead not guilty. Then another lawyer, John Avery, was retained on his behalf.

AVERY



Mr. Avery advised Bryant to plead guilty and avoid a painful trial. By that time, Martin Bryant had been locked up for several months. He was isolated and probably very confused. Bryant's IQ is apparently quite low. Eventually, the prisoner acquiesced and pled guilty on all charges. After the trial, he refused to see Avery again. In the late 1990s, John Avery was a successful and respected Tasmanian barrister. When later he waxed lyrical on numerous occasions in the media about Bryant's guilt – and excoriated *conspiracy theories* that suggested otherwise – Avery's voice was authoritative and persuasive. That was until 2006. Now Avery is also in jail.⁷¹ His crime: theft of more than half a million dollars over an extended period. **Avery is a convicted fraudster.**

The lack of judicial due process in the case of the Port Arthur massacre is a **scandal of national proportions**. The complicity of Australia's mass media is equally malodorous – as is the silence of leading politicians within all the major parties.

A foul smell hangs over the Port Arthur massacre. Was an innocent man sacrificed as a patsy? Is this an unsolved mass murder? It follows that if the *lone-nut* theory of Bryant's sole guilt is incorrect, the massacre and subsequent cover-up were carried out by people with extremely good connections. Does no-one in the Australian mass media **have the guts** to raise concerns openly about Port Arthur? Will no-one **call for the long-overdue inquest and/or public inquiry into the atrocity?**

Syd Walker (SydWalker.info)
14 April 2009
(amended; added emphasis)

⁷¹ Avery was paroled from prison in 2012. An absolute disgrace to his profession and a blot on humanity, this thief stole from his clients and his colleagues. Martin Bryant never had a chance with this foul bit of excrement.

I part ways with most other PAM researchers, therefore, when I reject the theory of the Homer-Simpson-like gunman so daft as to forget to check the ferry timetable ahead of time (doh!) and argue that the eventual outcome was far from being an accident: the gunman was a skilled professional who did exactly what he had been trained to do. The view that the massacre went off according to plan is buttressed by the footage that was released to the media of faked images of the gunman's blue sports bag sitting on top of a table inside the entirely pristine café.

Referring to a frame taken from the footage that appears on his website, McNiven writes that since it is "inconceivable" that the police "would have cleaned up the crime scene to take this picture," it must have been taken before the massacre – perhaps, I would suggest, before the café opened for business that day. This seems strong evidence that the massacre unfolded in the café exactly as planned.

79 Nightingale was fatally shot immediately after he leapt up and yelled at the gunman inside the Broad Arrow Café. In *9/11 Synthetic Terror Made in USA*; 2008: p. 93, American author Webster Griffin Tarpley states this about intelligence agents/spooks: "They come from out of town, and disappear as soon as their work is done. Their main occupational hazard is not that of arrest by the police, but the risk of being liquidated by their own employers as a basic security measure." So if Anthony Nightingale (was from out of town; Melbourne, Victoria) was a spook, and it seems that he was, his boss stopped him from revealing anything about the planning and execution of the incident at and near Port Arthur on 28 & 29 April 1996.

80 In *9/11 Synthetic Terror Made in USA*; 2008: p. 92, Webster Griffin Tarpley says this about professionals who execute incidents of planned killing like that which took place at and near Port Arthur: "They are the well-trained, well-equipped operatives who really do have the technical, physical, and mental ability to bring about the terrorist acts which the public sees. They are the members of the team which was indeed able, using the best state-of-the-art ...rifles and related equipment, to fire the requisite number of shots...and to fire them with sufficient accuracy within the objective time limits imposed by the situation.... The expert professionals are the persons who can accomplish amazing feats which **the media attribute to the pathetic patsies**" – like Martin Bryant.

The key to understanding the massacre is thus that it contained at its heart a *double-cross* mechanism enabling it to eliminate a substantial part of the personnel who had actually been involved in planning it. It is certainly hard not to believe that Anthony Nightingale was involved in the plot: as soon as the shooting started, he leapt up from his seat to cry out: "No, no, not here!" Clearly, Nightingale knew, or thought he knew, where the massacre was supposed to take place. Yet the gunman fired on regardless.⁷⁹

The best answer, therefore, to the question of why no survivors have come forward is that many, if not most, were intelligence operatives. Those who knew about the massacre were expecting to be able to observe it from a safe distance. Those at the highest levels of the plot had in mind a quite different development: the massacre would lead to the elimination of most of the people who knew anything about it. This was easily done – only a handful needed to know that the carnage would really take place inside the café – and would ensure that afterwards there were very few left who actually knew what had happened and so there could be few leaks. The survivors, having been duped in this way, would have been left in an extremely awkward position. They could hardly have gone public with what they knew, for to do so would oblige them to admit that they had been involved in a plot to murder tourists on the Isle of the Dead.

If my theory is correct, there is a silver lining to the horrendously dark cloud that was the Port Arthur massacre. At least some of the dead had themselves been party to a conspiracy to murder dozens of innocent people. Maybe there is some justice in their becoming victims of their own planning.⁸⁰

Author's Note:

Some transcript extracts used in this article have been slightly modified in the interests of readability. – Wernerhoff ■

(amended; added emphasis)

WAS MARTIN BRYANT FRAMED?

Daniel Baxter

aractus.com

11 October 2010

The reason why it's important to understand this is because a lot of muck has penetrated the facts muddling up what's fact and what's fiction.⁸¹

BRYANT has no memory of the crimes he confessed to. He was **never tried** even though he was under a court order that legally prohibited him from pleading guilty. The only eye-witness to see the shooter and who knew Bryant before the shootings did not identify the shooter as Bryant. The FN-FAL murder weapon **cannot be linked to Bryant** at all. Despite applications by family members, not one of the 35 victims has had a coronial inquest held into their death. Everyone who knew Bryant described him as **gentle, kind and courteous**. He lived independently from an inheritance he received in addition to his disability pension and everyone who knew him described him as happy, and always nice to everyone he encountered.

So why would someone who's described as being nice to everyone, who essentially has no enemies⁸² and who is happy, commit mass-murder? Mental impairment is not an excuse. Bryant's girlfriend – Petra Willmott said that he wouldn't hurt a fly.

ABC's Kerry O'Brien reported that Wendy Scurr and Stephen Howard (both tour guides at the time for the Port Arthur Historic Site) were calling for a coronial inquest. Howard was a survivor of the massacre but lost his wife in the shootings. He made this written statement:

"My wife Elizabeth and I were both employees at the Port Arthur historic site management authority and were both working there the day of the massacre. My wife Elizabeth was murdered inside the gift-shop section of the Broad Arrow Cafe. One of 20 victims murdered thereabouts. I know that **Martin Bryant was not the gunman** at the Port Arthur. How do I know? The coroner Ian Matterson wrote a letter to a number of the survivors of the massacre informing us that Martin Bryant was not the gunman at Port Arthur. In the letter dated the 31 January 1997 (Stephen then quotes the letter that I've copied in its entirety below – Baxter), well I thought long and hard about this statement and discussed the point with friends, you must understand that there were many other facts of the shootings inside the Broad Arrow Cafe that **begged a proper open investigation** including workplace safety issues and especially the issue of the emergency exit that were totally outside the issues of the gunman. It was the simple fact that a coroner Mr. Ian Matterson believed that

⁸¹ Statement from beginning of this article by the blogger Daniel Baxter: aractus.com

⁸² There was a person Martin was afraid of. He is referred to as "Tiger" by his then girlfriend Petra Willmott. See her *Witness Statement* of 28 April 1996 in Part 7. It has been suggested this (Tasmanian) Tiger might be **Michael Charles Dyson**.

*The
official cover-up
of the crimes
requires you
to ignore
a great amount
of exculpatory
evidence.*

he could not make any finding that was inconsistent with the findings of the Hobart Supreme Court that really stirred me. The Supreme Court can only make the finding of Guilty or Not Guilty in the matter brought before it. It follows that for Mr. Ian Matterson's inquest into the massacre of Port Arthur to make a finding inconsistent with the Hobart Supreme Court, then the finding could have only been that **Martin Bryant was Not Guilty of the charges brought before him**. For the coroner Mr. Ian Matterson to arrive at this decision not to resume the inquest, into the death of the 35 people who were murdered at the Port Arthur massacre, due to this reason which he himself provided, then the coroner must have been aware that **Martin Bryant was Not Guilty** of the serious offences which produced 72 charges police brought against him that day."

LETTER OF MATTERSON – BRYANT NOT GUILTY

31 January 1997

PORT ARTHUR

As a result of the outcome of the charges preferred against Martin Bryant in the Supreme Court of Tasmania, I write to advise I do not intend to resume the inquest that I opened on the 29th April 1996. I believe it is not in the interests of family, friends or witnesses to again traverse the factual situation to a public hearing, particularly when any finding I make must not be inconsistent with the decision of the Supreme Court.

I have today written to the Attorney General advising of my decision.

May I take this opportunity on behalf of the staff of my office to extend our condolences for your sad loss.

Yours sincerely,

Ian R. Matterson
*Chief Coroner's Delegate
Southern Tasmania*

Please note this is a survivor and eyewitness who says categorically: **"I know that Martin Bryant was not the gunman at Port Arthur."**

Howard was interviewed on **A Current Affair** and said that he believed important issues surrounding what happened on that day, and what could have been prevented needed to be addressed. The statement he made above was written after the fact that Bryant had pleaded Guilty – clearly showing **he had a very firm belief that justice had not been served** if he was still to contend that Bryant couldn't have been guilty after a plea of Guilty made by Bryant.

And Wendy Scurr is as genuine as they come. She is an eyewitness who is not only vocally against the "official story" but who has been actively demanding a coronial inquest for a long time. She was a nurse and tour guide at the time and [she entered] the café [soon] after the massacre. She was the first person to phone the police, and

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

she is a very well trained emergency personnel (first aid instructor, etc). She saw the crime scene hours before police did, she went in and searched for survivors with her colleagues and she helped save many lives that day. On top of all of that, she has spoken in front of public audiences about her experiences, and if you have any doubts whatsoever about her, watch the videos.⁸³

This was a conference which was held in 2001 and there for the first time Wendy spoke publicly about the massacre. Wendy insists that **if the fire door was not inoperable, seven lives would have been saved**. This is just one of many facts that demonstrate that a coronial inquest would have been very valuable even if it had not made any findings exonerating Bryant or contradicting his role as the gunman. Stephen Howard referred to it as "workplace safety issues," and faced with the allegation made by Wendy that the inoperability of the fire door cost seven lives I cannot reason why a coronial inquest would not take place. After all it is breaking standard practice in Australia not to hold one.

Wendy Scurr was [among] the first on the scene to start treating the wounded, and she was also the first person to lodge a 000 call⁸⁴ about the incident. What is totally amazing is that one would think Wendy's statement and version of events would be treated as very important by police, but she believes it **was not** and she is vocally against the official version of events. Wendy's eyewitness report says that the shootings inside the Broad Arrow Café lasted between 4-5 minutes – more than double the official 90-second timeline.

She is not the only [person] to report this. [The investigator] Andrew MacGregor contends that the timeline is a fabrication intended to cover up the mishap about the broken fire door.⁸⁵ Wendy's story is detailed and complete, it is not erratic or missing details. She states that the official version is a **massive cover-up**. She has been so traumatized by the event and has felt so unheard by the government and authorities that it drove her to depression and she attempted suicide.

MacGregor is a retired Victorian policeman who has investigated this case with the assistance of Wendy Scurr and others. MacGregor has some very highly developed theories (most of which he presents as fact) which I'm not including here because it is not independently verifiable; however his corroboration for some very important facts are duly noted....

We know as an incontrovertible fact that the fire door was broken. [If it had not been], **it would have saved lives**. Withholding a coronial inquest prevented anyone from ever being held accountable for it. An investigation [should have been held] into how such a thing could happen, so appropriate changes can be made to ensure that there is never again a risk of lives being lost to other broken fire doors. Not to mention it would have formally confirmed the number of lives that were lost due to the door being inoperable. The best estimate for the number of lives potentially saved if the door was in operation is Wendy Scurr's estimate of **seven lives**.

⁸³ See the many videos related to the Port Arthur incident posted on youtube.com.

⁸⁴ Triple zero is the public phone number for emergencies.

⁸⁵ See article *THAT BLOODY DOOR* in Part 8.

There is strong, recorded evidence that Bryant was not alone at Seascope. Shots are heard on a number of separate occasions while he is calmly speaking to the negotiator Terry McCarthy, some of those shots were believed to be an SKK (remember this point). The **negotiator himself has reservations**. He even said that Bryant sounded like he was “reading from a script” and for those and other comments that were not in line with the official story (or so it is contended) McCarthy lost his job. Furthermore Bryant references several times to an accomplice (puppet-master?) Rick.

86 In Tasmania prior the horrific incident at Port Arthur, a gun license was required to possess any such weapon. In the literature, the editor has not been able to find any credible facts related to whether Martin Bryant had or did not have the appropriate licence for the weapons he owned. (He did own and drive a vehicle, but he did not have a driving licence. He said the following about himself to the cop interrogator Ross Paine: “Ahh, I didn’t think I’d ever pass or get through the courses ’cos I’m not that bright.”) On the day he took one of his firearms to a Hobart gunshop owner Terry Hill (he kept it for repairs), an Internet article says Bryant showed a license to Hill when Hill asked to see it: “Martin Bryant presented a licence that day in the name of **‘Martin’ Ryan** correctly endorsed for prohibited and fully automatic weapons. Where Martin Bryant obtained this highly unusual licence has never been properly investigated.” (added emphasis; despatch.cth.com.au/Misc/martinbryant/PortArthur_detail2.htm) This raises very serious questions: Who issued Bryant with this licence showing the false name Ryan? (He could never have prepared it himself.) When was it given to Bryant? Was Bryant told to show it to a gunshop proprietor? Did Bryant know this licence was false? Why was this false licence, which was “endorsed for prohibited and fully automatic weapons” not fully investigated and the findings made public. If the facts on the Internet are true, it does not take much thinking to understand that Martin might have unwittingly participated in the setting up of himself – if he had been instructed to present the false gun licence at a gunshop. For the State, it was essential to demonstrate a link between Martin Bryant and weapons fired during the incident at Port Arthur. **This link has never been established.** (see Part 6)

Media Watch slammed the [media] coverage, attesting that showing Bryant’s face would prejudice potential jurors, and that the photos of Bryant were obtained illegally. They publicised the Police statement that the policeman guarding the house was distracted while another person entered.

...[The lawyer John Avery] represented Terry Hill, a gun dealer alleged to have sold Bryant his guns. Avery attempted to convince Hills to testify against Bryant and ultimately represented Bryant and had him plead guilty to the charges. Hills was put out of business it is contended as a direct result of refusing to testify against Bryant. It should be noted that according to Hills, Bryant showed Hills a license⁸⁶ that Bryant “got from his lawyer,” if it really was a fake license then it doesn’t sound like Bryant knew it was.

Isn’t it interesting – or should we say unprofessional – that Bryant’s lawyer John Avery himself stated that he felt he had a responsibility to Australians to get his client to plead guilty? Isn’t it interesting that John Avery, Martin Bryant’s defence lawyer himself publicly stated that Bryant didn’t want to plead guilty and it wasn’t easy to get him to and he even declares how many visits it took him to convince Bryant to do so (about 13).

Isn’t it interesting that Bryant was denied his sovereign right to be tried by a jury? Prior to that, Bryant had pleaded Not Guilty and had maintained that he was innocent for months. **Was he made to plead guilty because of the lack of evidence against him?** Isn’t it interesting that from interview transcripts released by Avery himself it is now known that Avery firmly believed his client to have no memory of the events and yet he still **made him plead guilty?** (remember this)

The way that Andrew MacGregor puts it is this: Bryant was under a court mandated guardianship – meaning that in the eyes of the law he was a child, and needed a guardian present at all times whenever legal affairs were brought before him. So not only was his request to his lawyer ignored, he was interviewed without a guardian present to begin with.

Let me state this in plain English: **his civil rights were violated**. He had the right to have a lawyer present, and legally he had to have a guardian present – yet neither was present in the interview with police that took his so-called confession. Here’s another question – why risk the integrity of an investigation by violating his rights when

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

interviewing him? Why risk losing the case against him? I could quote the entire interview (which as far as I can tell doesn't contain a confession to killing a single person anywhere in it), but this is my favourite part:

- Q. How many guns do you own?
A. I own umm, a shotgun and a semi-automatic and another semiautomatic. Three altogether.
Q. Where'd you get those guns?
A. Oh, umm, I can't really say, I haven't got my lawyer here so.
Q. Well we have spoken to your lawyer and he knows that we're talking to you.
A. He knows, he knows.
Q. And aah, has no problem with that so aah.
A. Yeah I got umm, one ooh, off a gun dealer and also I got two of 'em umm, got two off ... (inaudible)⁸⁷

...When Bryant says he can't answer that question without his lawyer, they inform him that they already asked his lawyer and everything's ok??? You have to be kidding me!

A clear violation of his rights (on top of the fact that he didn't have his guardian present). Remember that Bryant actually had no memory of any of the crimes. This is revealed in the recorded interviews between Bryant and his lawyer, and this was reported in the mainstream media by Kerry O'Brien in his 7:30 Report segment and is therefore an incontrovertible fact.⁸⁸ What's also interesting is that since Bryant's incarceration he's not said a word about any of his crimes, the best psychiatrists Australia has to offer have seen him and gotten nothing.

Following the Port Arthur massacre, unconstitutional uniform gun laws were passed. The theory of uniform gun laws in Australia is rather simple. Unless a referendum was held the only way for the federal government to gain the power to enforce uniform firearm laws was if every state and territory in Australia would agree to surrender their powers, but that had never happened. Following the massacre at the Broad Arrow Café it did happen. Think about that for a moment, dwell on it. **Unconstitutional firearm restrictions were legislated.**

However, I'm not going to talk about the conspiracy theories but rather the facts of this case that stand out. There are enough Vialls fanboys out there as it is, and besides conspiracies are very confusing without fully understanding the facts first (for instance what if I told you that the theory holds that the Broad Arrow Café was not the intended target for the massacre, but rather improvised?) The facts themselves tell a very serious story that was never fully investigated, **this is on public record.**

If the confession were to be true, somehow Bryant has managed to tell the story of how he saw the deceased people when they were alive without alluding to any details as to how they died, let alone the fact that they had died at all:

⁸⁷ A transcript of the police interview with Martin Bryant: "Read the following transcript and then decide for yourself if you think this slow moving and slow thinking individual was the same one who acted like a combat assassin to execute an operation as efficient as the Port Arthur massacre." (see: loveforlife.com.au/content/07/10/30/transcript-police-interview-martin-bryant) Note again that when the word "inaudible" (or "cough" or any similar wording that is not dialogue) appears, there is a great likelihood that the police do not want you to know what the interviewer or interviewee said. Manipulating and mishandling evidence is what State officials do.

⁸⁸ Kerry O'Brien. *Martin Bryant Port Arthur killer*; 7:30 Report – ABC, 28 April 2009.

DEMONIZING WORDS ABOUT MARTIN BRYANT

Saturday 1 June 1996
jpalmer@tassie.net.au

White Bubble, P.O. Box 1000
Dodges Ferry, Tasmania 7173

Hi there,

Yours is the only Port Arthur site I could find on the net. Here is an article **I wrote one week after it happened**. I submitted it to various newspapers, but it wasn't published. Maybe they found it too controversial or opinionated or they found the whole thing disagreeable or unsuitable. Maybe you will too, but you may find it interesting enough to put on your site.

Julian

The day after the shooting of 35 people at Port Arthur, his picture was on the front page of every major Australian newspaper. He was a young man, with long blonde hair and blue eyes. On the newsstand every photo of him looked different; each in different sizes and color separations. On one front page his eyes looked like that of one of those cutout 19th men in Monty Python cartoons. He was looking indifferently at the camera and his head was tilted curiously to one side with empty eyes. **This showed a clear sign that he was a schizoid personality type.**

A person who with a schizoid personality disorder **does not feel**. [*sic*] They are usually pale and quiet people who seem a little strange to others. Their head is usually tilted to one side, so it looks like that person is continually being **hung by a noose**. Their life is usually traumatic and strange; a series of fantasies and failures. They usually display inappropriate emotional reactions to events. They have difficulty in forming relationships with others. They are usually reasonably intelligent. But the overwhelming factor in their life is that **they do not feel**; they have little capacity for pleasure. They do not experience emotion; **they have no heart**. A person such as this is usually acutely sensitive and vulnerable to their environment, so they are shaped very easily. They often feel a pain so great they block it off along with the rest of their life. **Martin Bryant is a classic schizoid personality type**; he is not *paranoid* or *schizophrenic* in the way that most other people are diagnosed as. His case is very unusual and complex. After the event, nobody knew what to make of Martin Bryant. People who knew him described him as a lovely, gentle and kind person. One said that she couldn't imagine how the Martin Bryant she knew could have killed all those people. Others [Who? No names mentioned.] said he was strange, with steely cold blue eyes.

Martin Bryant was set adrift in this culture with nothing to do and nowhere to go. He had plenty of money and big house, but he was very lonely. He once joked to someone that all he needed was a girlfriend and then his life would be complete. At the time of the shooting he had been involved with a girl for two months. There was nothing in this culture for him. There was nothing he wanted. He didn't have an occupation; who knows how he spent his days? He jumped up and down in joy at the first day of a TAFE course. He thought perhaps that would give him an opportunity to express himself in some productive occupation. He lied to people about being a carpenter. He once went to Disneyland, but came back after three days because it was raining. He travelled to London and spent a week there shopping and taking high tea. **Perhaps the only thing that excited him or interested at all him were guns.** Martin Bryant wasn't angry at anyone in particular. Who could he blame for his empty life? Who was responsible for shaping him the way he was? His father who beat him had recently died in mysterious circumstances and his mentor and virtual mother Miss Harvey had also died recently in car accident. He had nobody to blame for who he had become. He only expressed strange throwaway lines of "I'll kill you" [no reference] to various people. He was angry at life more than anything else. He was angry at all people for how he was; **a useless and nonliving creature.**

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

And so he struck back; choosing Port Arthur as the site of his revenge. [sic] It was here that he was brought up and it was here that he believed that he became what he was. People have said that he was sometimes like a silly child and at other times like a rational adult. Seemingly split between two characters. On the one hand he was a child who had never really grown up, who froze his emotional development at a certain level of maturity. And on the other hand he was a normal, adult, rational member of society who could appear as sane as anybody. People said he was angry become a different person; capable of anything. [sic] But he never allowed himself to fully express the anger deep inside him; even when shooting those people. **He shot each person in a calculated and deliberate way.** His anger was frozen within him and was expressed mutely. The gun expressed it for him because he didn't know how to do it for himself. For him, **shooting those people was the thrill of his life.** It was pleasurable to destroy life in itself; it was fun to have the power and the expression he felt denied to him before. **To him it was a huge creative expression.**

By all accounts Martin Bryant was a very passive and subservient young man; following Miss Harvey around, and doing all the chores for her. He appeared to most people as a very pleasant young man, perhaps a little odd. **It seems his only real interest was guns.** As static objects they are cold, steely and characterless. Like Martin Bryant, they have no soul. Yet guns can be very aggressive and powerful. A gun makes a person very powerful. And power was something that he didn't have; no power over his own life or over the lives of others. He had no power in himself, **no power to do or be anything in his life.**

Martin Bryant is not evil. He is not a bad person. He is not a representation of societies' evil. He represents something more common and therefore perhaps more sinister. Because it is nothing so easy to define as evil. [sic] **Martin Bryant has no heart; he has no soul.** He is a representation of soullessness, insensitivity, repression and powerlessness. Through those characteristics **Martin Bryant created pain and suffering.** He created pain and suffering from powerlessness; from **his own worthless life.** It wasn't the availability of guns that allowed Martin Bryant to kill those people. A person who is obsessed with guns would find an appropriate gun, if it was legal or not. It is not the violence on television or videos that motivated Martin Bryant to kill those people. Martin Bryant was fascinated by the horror movie *Child's Play 2* because it empowered him. He is just like *Chucky*; a seemingly friendly, harmless, childish, inert and powerless character. He enjoyed the fact that a thing with these characteristics can get its own back and take revenge and express itself. In the end, what killed those people was a human being who had no power or ability to express himself appropriately either emotionally, physically and mentally. His act had arisen from that and nothing else.

The young Australian male has one of the highest suicide rates in the world. The Australian male is stereotypically not meant to express emotion, he is not meant to have needs and he is always supposed to present a tough exterior. When Martin Bryant killed each of those people he displayed these characteristics; **but he killed people,** with a complete lack of sensitivity or moral intelligence as if he were performing a routine chore. It was as if he was acting out the sensibilities of those whom he killed and all the people he lived among.

Julian Palmer

1240 words, 1996

(includes all original errors; added emphasis)

original title of article:

The motivation of Martin Bryant
geniac.net/portarthur/jpalmer.htm

*Palmer did not know and had never met Martin Bryant. His unqualified opinions are examples of the **demonization of Martin which was encouraged by State officials and the media.** For those who have these false understandings, it seems they are incapable of thinking. – ed.*

- Q.** I mean do you think that people should accept the consequences of what they do?
- A.** Yeah I do. I s'pose I should for a little while for what I've done. Just a little while and let me out, let me live my own life. I'm missing my Mum. I really miss her actually, what she cooks up for me, her rabbit stews and everything. She's not even allowed to bring a little bit of food for me, that, that's a bit upsetting. Mmm.
- Q.** Martin, unless there's anything else that you want to tell us, we're going to ahh, stop the interview now. As Mr. Warren explained to you, this is the last opportunity you'll have to speak to. You'll be at your next court appearance, charged with twenty murders, I'm sorry, thirty-five murders and ...
- A.** Just that.
- Q.** ... And approximately twenty attempted murders and several wounding charges as well.
- A.** Attempted murders?⁸⁹
- Q.** And also.
- A.** You mean attempted, they weren't hurt?⁸⁹

Joe Vialls⁹⁰ never concerned himself much with Seascope, which is typical for any conspiracist mixing a **cocktail of truth and fiction**, but it's important to understand Seascope nonetheless. Firstly it was the location at which earlier in the day the Martins had been murdered (according to the official police timeline), and it was the Martins' property. Someone inside Seascope was firing at police (Bryant, or so it is claimed), but from a point inside where he could not be seen – and he moved room-to-room. It is uncharacteristic for someone of low intelligence to be moving in such stealth.

The police also claimed that Bryant had put a gun in every room of the cottage. Police did not fully reveal how many weapons were actually loaded. This theory that Bryant went room-to-room and gun-to-gun returning fire is **absurd**. There was a Norinco semi-automatic rifle (SKK) found without its magazine inside the cottage that Bryant could have fired. Shots of an SKK are heard being fired while Bryant talks to the police negotiator Terry McCarthy (as mentioned earlier). Where did the magazine go? Did Bryant make it evaporate? Did it grow legs and walk out of the building? What other possible way was there for it to leave?

There isn't any evidence that most of the other guns were fired at Seascope, most appeared to be inoperable, most were found without ammo and three of the 14 guns found at seascope belonged to the owners (two of which were inoperable antiques), not to mention that one of the working guns was a non-deadly air-rifle and so we can safely assume that there isn't sufficient evidence for official police version of events that Bryant was going gun-to-gun and room-to-room. Besides, Bryant only owned three guns – **so where did all the other ones come from?**

Now we have the interesting part of Seascope – Bryant used, so it is said in the official story, two main weapons during his killing spree: a Colt AR-15 and an FN-FAL. Most of the "guns" found in Seascope

⁸⁹ Here, Martin Bryant clearly replied in a manner indicating he had no idea that people died at Broad Arrow Café. He asked about whether they were hurt. Now, does that sound like the pathological gunman who went to that café and there at close range shot 20 people killing them outright and wounded another 10? From his words, it is obvious that Martin **did not fully understand** what he was being charged with or what had happened over those two days (28 & 29 April 1996).

⁹⁰ Evidence strongly suggests that this Joe Vialls was/is an evil professional deceiver. Be warned.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

were burnt, some were inoperable before the fire, and most were not found with their ammunition. Yet the FN-FAL “murder weapon” was found on the grass outside Seascope, as a gift to police. Despite surviving the fire, it had been damaged so that it no longer worked (preventing forensic testing) and it was incomplete – and those parts (with the exception of the scope) have never been recovered. Did they also grow legs and walk away from the crime scene?

Witnesses testified that the gunman fired the FN-FAL [alleged] murder weapon in the Broad Arrow Café with its telescopic site attached. When found on the grass outside Seascope cottage the weapon had no sight attached to it. A telescopic site (unattached from any gun) is listed on the list of weapon-related items recovered at Seascope, but the problem remains: why did Bryant remove that site? Furthermore, the telescopic site was not damaged (before the fire), which means that it could not have been attached to the FN-FAL when the damage to it occurred. Very strange indeed.

Was evidence planted? Here is a summary of how empty ammunition cartridges were *found* as described by Andrew MacGregor: “Constable Browning states: ‘A search was conducted by Sergeant FOGARTY, Sergeant HARWOOD and myself from the bridge over the creek on the western side, around the cottage to the waterfront on the eastern side, including a boat shed. No weapons, ammunition or other relevant items were located by us.’⁹¹ And yet, in this very area we get: ‘Sixteen 7.62 x 39mm calibre cartridges. (In good condition, from paving immediately to the west side of the burnt building in an area approximately 6m x 5m.)’⁹² In other words, either Tasmania’s finest were blind, or this ammunition was placed in that position after the SOGs searched the area.”⁹³

The AR-15 [alleged] murder weapon was also recovered in far better condition than any of the other burnt weapons inside the house, despite being found in burnt condition. It suffered only minimal damage in the fire. It was still recognizable and had it been in working condition before the fire it would have remained in working condition after the fire. This presents another coincidence; both of the main [alleged] murder weapons were found in damaged condition; the damage preventing them from being forensically tested however this damage **did not occur** in the fire. Was the AR-15 planted? If it wasn’t, why was it in “singled” condition instead of “burnt to a crisp” condition? **The weapons recovered at Seascope were never forensically linked to any of the shootings.** Coincidence?

[Allegedly] inside Seascope during the siege before the fire, there were four known people: Martin Bryant, Mr. & Mrs. Martin, and Glenn Pears.⁹⁴ Police believed Bryant was holding these hostages, yet all three people besides Bryant were already dead. How could low-intelligence Bryant have kept up a 12-hour standoff with police keeping them convinced he had hostages if he had not been aided?

There was no motive. To commit such a crime would have required planning, there isn’t any evidence for this. To commit such a crime someone would be expected to be very very angry, and otherwise very

⁹¹ Hedley George Browning (Tasmania Police). *Witness Statement*; not dated.

⁹² Gerard Dutton (Tasmania Police). *Statutory Declaration re Martin BRYANT*; 9 September 1996.

⁹³ Andrew MacGregor. *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; 2001-4.

⁹⁴ There is a strong possibility that Glenn Pears did not go into nor was he ever taken into Seascope cottage – which means he died in the BMW. That he died in the cottage is the official story, but as it is with so many of the official claims, no evidence to prove this has ever been presented. Even the handcuffs (2 pairs) which cops suggested belonged to Martin Bryant were never presented as evidence, nor do they appear on the list of evidence. No where in the coroner’s notes is there a description of the body of Glenn Pears being attached by handcuffs to an object in Seascope as is claimed in the official narrative. It seems that Mr. Pears was killed by SOG member Andrew Mark **Fogarty**, possibly inadvertently. Recall it was the SOG member Michael **Fogarty** who killed Joe Gilewicz. (see Part 3)

⁹⁵ This point made here by Baxter is rarely acknowledged. It is highly significant. People who know little or nothing about firearms, and people who think they know about shooting because they have squeezed a trigger a few times, deceive themselves and others. Military people who are trained to kill, and those military people who have killed, are troubled when it comes to that act. For most people, killing is not a pleasurable act. To think that a gun owner like Bryant, who had only shot at a couple of static targets a couple of times, could just go into any old place and there slowly, methodically, and repetitively shoot living people with a high powered weapon and not be psychologically impacted is faulty thinking. The inside of the Broad Arrow Café on 28 April 1996 has been described with the word carnage. (enough said) The gunman responsible seems to be a psychopath with no conscience and/or he was probably drugged to enable him to do what he did. But there is **not one bit of evidence** indicating or suggesting Martin Bryant had all the **physical, mental, and emotional** strength required to kill and wound 59 victims at and near Port Arthur. Officials want us to believe Bryant was out on a sunny Sunday knifing and shooting people by the dozens, **by the score**. He just had a whale of a time and it never bothered him one bit. Murdered and wounded over 30 people – men, women, children – then went off to Seascapes and made snacks for everyone who was there. Spent a few hours conversing with the police negotiator Terry McCarthy who said Bryant's verbal demeanour did not suggest anything benign. But officially it has to be Martin Bryant. Because if it isn't him, it means the gunman, and what he did, were all approved by officials. And when this is widely recognised by the public – inevitably it will be – some of those criminal officials who are responsible for all that carnage, destruction, and terror at and near Port Arthur might seek firearms so they can put some bullets into their own brains.

⁹⁶ Allegedly: Mary Rose (Rosemary) Nixon; Russell James Pollard; Helene Salzman; and, Robert Salzman.

emotionally unstable; Bryant's girlfriend, Petra Willmott, **did not describe any of the characteristics**. Not to mention that the police negotiator who spoke to Bryant [*Jamie*] at Seascapes, Terry McCarthy, also **did not find these characteristics** and he made a point to note it. I question how could Bryant commit not just one murder that day (say, the Martins) – but then continuously move on killing in several locations? Surely not for someone who has never killed someone before!⁹⁵

Even more questionable is why weren't the people in the crowded café able to overpower the low-intelligence gunman Bryant? This is a point that needs to be addressed. In the official version of events the vast majority of Bryant's bullets either killed or wounded (as opposed to just *shooting up the place*). However the crime scene was highly contaminated, and eyewitness testimony disagrees with the official timeline. What we're left with – according to Kerry O'Brien – is the worst killing spree ever committed by a single gunman anywhere in the world. And even more amazing is that one of the guns used in the massacre – the FN-FAL rifle – was a weapon that Bryant has no proven experience with!

What was the motive to steal the BMW? Take a moment to dwell on this. Bryant was a wealthy man, he did not have a driver's license (remember) but that wasn't a big deal for him in a secluded town with only one police officer. Is the scenario presented by MacGregor more plausible: the occupants of the BMW were a part of the operation, they all willingly got in the car with the gunman intending to leave with him? But the gunman had determined that it had to look like a carjacking and killed them instead? Well maybe, but let me ask this: The official version is that Bryant pulled up to the BMW that was stopped there...[and at the tollgate, the gunman killed the four people⁹⁶ who had travelled in that BMW, which the gunman then carjacked and drove to the Port Arthur General Store. There he shot Zoe Hall, then took Glenn Pears hostage him in the boot of the BMW then drove off to Seascapes cottage] What's the motive? It doesn't make any sense!... Why did he [Martin Bryant] tell police this: "No. I mean I let the lady go into the Volvo, I didn't hurt her or anything. No I don't register, it doesn't register"?

*The last two sentences quoted by Baxter above are extremely important in the case. On 4 July 1996, Martin was interrogated by Tasmania Police. Martin made bizarre statements which it seem he thought were true. He said he carjacked the BMW at Fortescue Bay – but it was exchanged at the tollgate for the Volvo. He said he "let the lady go into the Volvo. I didn't hurt her or anything" – Zoe Hall was already in the Toyota at the Port Arthur General Store where she was shot by the gunman who an eyewitness said was **not** Bryant. Bryant's sentences have characteristics of confabulation and of suggestion. Martin was trying to tell the story as he thought it had happened. Or, he was relating what he had been told had happened. Martin was not relating the official narrative. There are blanks in his story – "No I don't register, it doesn't register." Martin spoke in a way which reflected he did not know what had actually taken place. And if he was not there, he would not have known that. – ed.*

LETTER TO KEN MORONEY
Commissioner
New South Wales Police Service
14-24 College Street, Darlinghurst, NSW 2010
7 September 2004

Re: PORT ARTHUR VIDEO TAPE
(aka TASMANIA POLICE TRAINING VIDEO TAPE)

Dear Mr. Commissioner,

In late March 2004, I received anonymously through the post, two (2) individual, unlabeled video tapes in total, delivered consecutively, which upon my viewing, I found contained several sections, all of which indicated to me the tape had been produced by the Tasmania Police. The second of these two tapes was of such poor quality it would not run properly, and hence at the time, I disabled the cassette and disposed of it in the regular garbage pick-up.

The subject matter contained on my video tape I currently possess, has been the subject of much media attention in recent days. The Daily Advertiser newspaper of Thursday last, 2 September, 2004, and at pp.1-2, there is published an article – *Massacre On Tape* by Paul Enever. In that article I was the person referred to as having received two such tapes. When your crime manager for this jurisdiction, acting Inspector Rod Smith, was approached by The Daily Advertiser, he was quoted as suggesting that if I have evidence that hasn't been disclosed to the Tasmania coroner, I should "present it to the relevant authorities."

After considering that advice, I now am complying. However, I have studied very carefully the content, especially of the last track, which demonstrates clearly what I seriously consider to be disturbing evidence of probable serious crimes having been committed which directly affect certain people of the state of New South Wales (NSW), who died there in the area known as Port Arthur on or about the 28th April, 1996.

I have therefore today, Wednesday the eighth day of September 2004, handed to a Police Officer of the NSW Police, at my home, the sole video tape copy in my possession. As I have already stated publicly, I have not made copies of this video tape. Also I now formally request your agent, the aforementioned Police Officer, on your behalf to receive this video, and forward it with all due care and haste to you, so that you can hold this tape as evidence in safe keeping, in a manner that shall protect the quality of the sound and vision of the tape, until such time as a formerly constituted open coronial inquest can be held in NSW to inquire into all relevant matters surrounding the deaths of the **six persons** then residing in the state of NSW, listed as follows: –

Zoe Anne Hall, 28 yrs, then of Kangaroo Point; **Glenn Roy Pears**, 35 yrs, then of Sydney; **Russell James "Jim" Pollard**, 72 yrs, then of Brunswick Heads; **Tony Kistan**, 51 yrs, then of Summerhill; **Robert Salzmänn**, 58 yrs, then of Ocean Shores; **Helene Salzmänn**, 50 yrs, then of Ocean Shores. There has not been a coronial inquest conducted in the state of Tasmania into the deaths of any of the 35 people who died in the area of Port Arthur in the massacre that occurred there on the 28-29th April 1996. Hence I am formally asking that this unacceptable situation now be addressed for those 6 deceased persons I mention above.

Also, for the past six years, I have been engaged in investigating, researching, speaking publicly of my findings, and writing about the Port Arthur massacre and associated events. As a result of these activities, I now formally raise the following questions that I require answers to: – Since there has never been a coronial inquiry, into the deaths of the six (6) persons all then resident in the state of NSW, is there any reason why an open, coronial inquest into their deaths cannot be held in NSW?

(cont.)

Documented evidence shows the NSW Forensic Police were given the duty of covering the Broad Arrow Café. The Forensic Sketch Plan that was presented to the Hobart supreme court was lacking in certain detail one of which was the presence of at least one .308W spent cartridge case as is shown on the Tasmania Police Training Video. Were the NSW Police remiss in detailing such vital evidence, or was the Forensic Sketch of the NSW forensic team?

This altering of evidence is a felony, and the question now is, **which Police Force was responsible for misleading the Supreme Court of Tasmania**, and was there a conspiracy between the two State Police Forces to mislead the Supreme Court? In his report regarding the fire exit door to the Broad Arrow Café, the then DPP, Mr Damian Bugg QC, states that the Port Arthur Historic Site employee who was nailing all the doors and windows shut, with the assistance of a forensic policeman, tested the door lock, and found it to be inoperative.

The questions are: Why did the NSW Police permit the interference with a murder scene of the acts of nailing the particular door which was involved with the death of about six persons? Why did the NSW Police not make any report into the matter of the fire exit door that couldn't be opened? And was this particular door nailed shut prior to the arrival of the NSW forensic team? There is a large amount of carpet damage evident within the area of the Broad Arrow Café, near the Fire Exit Door, that appears to have been caused by bullets having been fired from a high powered rifle. None of this damage was listed within the NSW Police Forensic Sketch. Again, **which Police Force was responsible for this information being withheld from the Tasmania Supreme Court?**

In the Court transcript the Tasmanian DPP, Mr Damian Bugg QC, refers to live cartridge cases that were found within the Broad Arrow Café. The size of these live rounds has been stated by witnesses to have been of .308W calibre. Why was this important evidence not listed or shown in the NSW Forensic Police Sketch Plan? In the Tasmania Police Training Video there is shown a large blue sports bag, which appears rather empty, save for a white jumper, but according to several witnesses who saw the gunman carrying this bag, the bag appeared to be very heavy. What happened to the very heavy contents of this bag, bearing in mind that an AR-15 is not that heavy. Beside the same blue sports bag and resting on the table, there was a tray with a soft drink can on it and other food items. This tray and its contents match those witnesses state they saw the gunman carry, and drink from. What happened to this empirical evidence that was under the control of the NSW Police forensic team? **Who permitted this evidence to be lost?**

Also the Tasmania Police Training Video shows clearly beside the bag and the food tray on the same table, there is resting a large, all black video camera, with an integral, external microphone visible. In the Court Document and at p.160 for instance, the DPP's assistant Mr Perks talks about a "grey video camera bag." At p.71 the DPP Mr Damien Bugg QC, mentions the gunman carrying a video camera. However in a report by Chip Le Grand, in The Australian newspaper of 4 May 1996, it reports that Mr David Gunson had just been briefed to defend Martin Bryant. In that report, the first concern raised by Mr Gunson was the eyewitness reports of the gunman carrying a large video camera, which he is reported to have stated had **not been recovered**. Was this important empirical evidence lost, and if so was it loss due to any remiss on the part of NSW police, or Tasmania police?

In relation yet again to the sports bag left inside the Broad Arrow Café: We have evidence that a bag was left inside the café but we also have five witness statements saying that the gunman left the Broad Arrow Café carrying a bag, and then placing the bag into the boot of the Volvo. The James Balasko video shows the gunman picking up the bag he departed the café with, and placing the carry strap on his shoulder. Can the NSW Police forensic team give us **a proper explanation of why two bags were used by the gunman at the Port Arthur Massacre?**

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

In relation to the crime scene on Jetty Road: The Tasmania Police Training Video shows someone lifting the arm of the eldest Mikac child, to display a .223Rem fired cartridge case. When considering the manner in which this child was murdered, and the firearm alleged to have been employed, **there is no way that a fired cartridge case could end up under the body of this victim.** The question is who picked up the fired cartridge case, thus interfering with the evidence at a major crime scene and then placed it under the body of the child? How did the person picking up the arm of the murdered child know that the fired cartridge case was there at that instance?

In the boot of the yellow Volvo sedan allegedly abandoned by the gunman at the tollbooth of the Port Arthur Historic Site, we are shown a fired cartridge case of .223Rem calibre, and the Daewoo shotgun, and what was later described as hand drawn cardboard targets. However the Daewoo is shown sitting on top of a striped blouse or material, in a very neat arrangement, and the targets are placed neatly at the back of the boot. Now considering that the Volvo has completed various driving manoeuvres, just how were the targets able to remain in a neat position at the rear of the boot? Who placed the blouse under the shotgun to better illustrate that firearm?

Again with the Volvo sedan as shown in the Tasmania Police Training Video, you can see where a person's hand suddenly comes from within the back seat area of the Volvo and clasps the rear right window of the Volvo demonstrating that there was a person in that compartment of the Volvo. We are told by the Coroner that when he viewed the Volvo there were several petrol containers therein. The Coroner apparently didn't see the box of ammunition in the Volvo at Port Arthur, the policeman inside the rear passenger compartment wasn't impeded in any manner by a box of bullets, or at least one container of petrol, and the photographer certainly didn't take any photographs of that major piece of evidence until the Volvo was placed under police guard at Police Headquarters in Hobart. Would the NSW Police consider the act of embellishing evidence an ethical practice? Would the NSW Police consider such acts of interfering with evidence as **perverting the course of justice**?

Lastly we have the Tasmania Police Supt. Bob Fielding state that he made the right decision in forcing the gunman to come to us. Considering that the only way in which the gunman vacated Seascape Cottage, was that that building was set on fire, then we can only conclude that **Seascape Cottage was set on fire by the Tasmania Police** under the command of Supt. Fielding. In other words, Fielding has confessed to crimes including arson and the destruction of evidence. Of course there are also the numerous charges of perverting the course of justice that must be levelled against numerous members of the Tasmania Police, and one must also consider the involvement of the NSW police within these matters.

Sir, the matters I have raised with you here, are I believe of the gravest nature possible. I do not take such steps lightly. In raising these grave questions, I also realize that once raised, I could well be the target of retribution by those persons who may subsequently be found responsible for these unlawful acts. I therefore request that the NSW Police Service afford my family and I due care and consideration for our continued well-being.

I do expect that you will give all of the matters I raise your immediate consideration and attention. I also ask you to note, that as this correspondence is an open letter, I will today, simultaneously with it being served on your Police Officer, be furnishing all major news media, and Daryl Maguire MP, Member for Wagga, with a copy of my letter.

I await your reply at your earliest convenience, and until then,

I Remain, Yours Faithfully,

Stewart K. Beattie

Of course this commissioner of NSW police did not reply in a substantive way, which makes him complicit. – ed.

(amended; added emphasis)

97 Gary King gave a *Witness Statement* to the cops on 17 May 1996. There are several significant things to note about his statement: **i.** It was given c.three weeks after the Port Arthur incident. King's recall could have been influenced by the large volume of negative media coverage about Martin Bryant; **ii.** The distance from the Shell store at Forcett, where the coffee was purchased, to Port Arthur is c.58 kilometres. Based on the time given by King, it is reasonable to conclude Bryant drove away from that store at 8-10 minutes past 11:30 a.m. (midway "Between 11 am and 12 midday"); **iii.** Bryant said he was going to Roaring Beach, which is near Nubeena (see Map) and is c.76 or c.97 kilometres from Forcett depending on the route taken; **iv.** King said Bryant drove off in the direction of Port Arthur. But Bryant had told King he was going to Roaring Beach not Port Arthur. It seems the cop who took the statement might have encouraged King to state the place name Port Arthur. On 28 April 1996 and south of Port Arthur, a Roger Lerner spoke with Bryant after c.1:05 p.m. In Lerner's statement (28 April 1996), he does not give the duration of that conversation, but it is reasonable to conclude it lasted 10-15 minutes. So at c.1:15-20 that afternoon, Bryant was south of Port Arthur. There is no possible way he could have driven north passed Port Arthur to Seascope and there killed David & Sally Martin, then unloaded an armory of weapons and ammo, then driven south back to Port Arthur, then entered the historic site after driving in a queue to pay the entrance fee, then driven to the parking area to park his vehicle, then walked to the Broad Arrow Café, then ordered a meal, then spoke with people, then started shooting all by 1:27 p.m. which is when the shooting commenced. **No person on earth could have done all this in the declared timeframe.**

98 In her *Witness Statement* of 28 April 1996, Petra Willmott said this about Martin Bryant: "He doesn't remember a lot of things that I say to him and **he forgets** what he's doing sometimes." (added emphasis) So does that sound like the mastermind who, entirely on his own, planned and executed the Port Arthur incident?

What does make sense is that if the shooter had accomplices then they would enter the vehicle with him at a rendezvous point. Is this unexplainable behaviour also coincidence? Why did Bryant leave his shotgun behind? MacGregor contends that witness statements say the version of events that actually unfolded were that first the occupants of the BMW entered willingly into the Volvo with the shooter [gunman], and that they then got into an argument and the shooter got out of the car, went to the boot, got the gun, shot and killed the [four people from the BMW. Then the gunman carjacked the BMW and drove to the Port Arthur General Store where he shot Zoe Hall – she did not have a child with her – in a Toyota then took Glen Pears hostage. He then put Pears] into the boot of the BMW and drove off.

Bryant could not have acted alone in this massacre, this isn't just an opinion it is a certainty. Why is it certain? Because at the time that he allegedly killed David Martin he was 58 kilometres away having a coffee at a petrol station and Gary King attests to this in the statement he made to police.⁹⁷ That means Bryant has a reliable alibi for when the Martins were (believed to be) murdered.

Isn't it funny that the idea that Bryant was not the shooter at the Broad Arrow Café is scorned; while the mainstream media has often referred to the suicide of Bryant's father as *supposed* inferring Bryant may have had a hand in killing his father; and then present the fact that his father's head was weighted down while ignoring the facts that: **i.** His father left a suicide note; and, **ii.** His father had taken care of some business for his wife which involved transferring accounts into only her name. Isn't it interesting that people think they can question something without any evidence at all, while frowning on following something with a stack of evidence behind it?

Why was Bryant's guilty plea accepted when it's on record that he didn't understand the charges brought against him, nor have any memory of them?

Why did Bryant's lawyer convince his client to plead guilty when Bryant had maintained his innocence and never said a word to anyone confessing to a single murder; **what right did John Avery have to determine that his client Martin Bryant was guilty?** Shouldn't he have listened to his client, rather than decide himself the issue of guilt or innocence?

According to recorded interviews between John Avery and Martin Bryant, Bryant had no memory of the massacre or any of the killings that day. These interviews have been released by John Avery. Again, **how did John Avery determine that his client was guilty,** given the fact that Bryant not only professed his innocence, but that his lawyer firmly believed he had no memory of the events? Since the Port Arthur Massacre was pre-planned, even without remembering the events that took place if Bryant was guilty he should have memory of planning it, but he does not.⁹⁸

Bryant [was coerced then] pleaded guilty to the crimes without any memory of the crimes.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

It is standard procedure for police to get a full statement from a defendant following a guilty plea to assist in any further investigation, the location of other potential victims, and to have a valid confession to the crimes on record that shows the defendant understands the crimes he is confessing to. **Why is there no such statement in existence?**

If Bryant is guilty, why is it that he pleaded guilty and yet the best shrinks in the world can't get a word out of him? Why plead guilty and then refuse to give a single tangible detail about a single one of the 35 murders that day? Why was the killer shooting from the right hand when Bryant was a left-handed shooter?

The guns used in the massacre in the café included a Colt AR-15 and an FN-FAL. Martin Bryant's guns that he owned before the massacre were: a Colt AR-10 (in the possession of Terry Hill at the time of the massacre), Colt AR-15 and a Daewoo Shotgun (which Bryant said he was afraid to fire). The Daewoo Shotgun was found in the boot of his Volvo. Why did he leave only that gun behind, why didn't he take it with him inside Seascapes cottage? The FN-FAL rifle was responsible, according to police, for the deaths of 8 victims. Where did this gun come from? Who owned the gun? How could Bryant have been in possession of it?⁹⁹

Why was there no coronial inquest, when there is usually always a coronial inquest for every death that is not accompanied by a certificate of death from a doctor? Not to mention that a coronial inquest would have been important in finding out whether Bryant had acted alone (as it is contended), since Bryant never answered that question. It's easy to dismiss a conspiracy theory, but it's important to remember that no private investigation done on a shoe-string budget relying on the good-will of others can ever hope to be as thorough as a proper police investigation.

But a proper police investigation is not evidence of guilt; that has to be proven in court and that is the separation of powers. However, **Bryant was never tried** because his lawyer convinced him to plead guilty. A plea that is contested should not have been allowed due to his mental state. If he had not pleaded guilty **there would have been very little evidence on which to convict him**, and that's a fact.

Why were some parts of the guns found at Seascapes, guns that are claimed to be the murder weapons, never found? How could Bryant have made parts of the guns used in the massacre vanish? Was it a coincidence that Bryant returned to the scene of the Martins' murder for the siege? Had he chosen a different location he would only have had one potential hostage. As far as I've been able to research only two eyewitnesses identify Bryant as the killer. Why did the only eyewitness to know Bryant before the massacre fail to identify him as the murderer? Why do all other witness statements (excluding the two identifying Bryant) estimate the age of the killer between 18-25 when Bryant was almost 29 and could not be confused as being any younger than 26-27?

⁹⁹ There is nothing linking this firearm to Martin Bryant: **no** witnesses; **no** receipt of purchase; **no** images; **no** fingerprints; **no** forensic evidence; **no** ballistic test; **no** admission; *etc.* All there is, is a police accusation that the firearm belonged to Martin Bryant – a baseless accusation for which no hard **evidence** has been presented as proof. What cops say is not the law and too often is not the truth. Cops lie glibly, destructively, and often. Read from the increasing volume of literature on the criminal lack of police integrity.

When Bryant was “captured” at Seascope he was unarmed, and fled the building with his back on fire. Before Bryant was captured, while on the phone to the negotiator, Terry McCarthy, another person was shooting at police; shots were heard that were **not fired by Bryant**. Terry McCarthy believed that Martin Bryant had an accomplice. McCarthy also states that Bryant’s state of mind in his conversation was not what he expected from someone who just committed mass-murder. [But] according to Kerry O’Brien earlier this year, the Port Arthur massacre remains the worst killing spree ever committed by a single gunman anywhere in the world.¹⁰⁰

Why were Bryant’s rights violated? His court-mandated guardianship meant that **he was not competent to handle his own legal proceedings**; and it is on full public record that Bryant would use his lawyer to handle these things for him. The court had to accept that Martin Bryant was incompetent to plea. **Why then was a plea of guilty accepted by the court?**¹⁰¹

Martin Bryant’s lawyer John Avery previously represented Terry Hill. Terry Hill maintained that he never sold any guns to Martin Bryant; even when faced with the threat of police prosecution and the offer of indemnity if he agreed to testify against Bryant. Hill’s business was later shut down as the threats levelled by police were carried out (although he was never charged with illegally selling firearms to Bryant). This is evidence of attempted police cohesion [collusion?] against Hill. It would also appear to me that this would have been the link between Bryant and the FN-FAL murder weapon that the police were looking for; as **there is no evidence whatsoever that Bryant ever owned the FN-FAL**.

¹⁰⁰ Kerry O’Brien. *Martin Bryant Port Arthur killer*; 7-30 Report – ABC, 28 April 2009.

¹⁰¹ For months Martin Bryant kept saying he was **innocent**. So he had to be worked on. And he was. Tough incarcerating and badgering by the criminal lawyer John Avery screwed what little intellect Martin had and he went along with a guilty plea. It seems he was under the impression there was going to be a trial regardless of what the plea was. During one of Avery’s conversion meetings (pressure-sessions) with Martin at the Risdon prison, Martin mentioned to Avery that he wanted to have his hair cut for the “court case.” Avery must have made the necessary arrangements because at the sentencing hearing, Martin’s hair had been cut. The only thing that was missing was the trial – the “court case” Martin was expecting. Avery added to the big con by arranging a haircut for Martin, then watching happily as he was sent down for life with a tidy trim – NEVER TO BE RELEASED.

Stephen Howard who lost...his wife...states that he knows Bryant to be innocent. Wendy Scurr attests that someone should have been held accountable for the inoperability of the fire door exit. **Gun dealer Terry Hill was threatened by police in what appears to be an attempt to extort a false statement out of him to connect the FN-FAL murder weapon to Bryant**. Despite there usually being a coronial inquest held for every death in Australia not accompanied by a doctor’s certificate, and despite requests by some family members for coronial inquests to be held for their relatives, not a single coronial inquest was held for any of the victims.

Bryant was never subjected to a public trial despite pleading not guilty for months. Although he changed his plea, he did not remember committing any of the crimes he confessed to, and to this day he remains silent. And because we can be 100 percent certain that he has no memory of the events, we can also be 100 percent certain that his **police “confession” is nothing of the sort....** ■

(amended; added emphasis)

WE FORCED THE GUNMAN TO COME TO US

Andrew S. MacGregor

Speech; Launceston, Tasmania; 29 September 2004

At the end of the day, I'm satisfied that we made the right decision in fact waiting and forcing him to come to us as opposed to vice versa.¹⁰²

NOW what exactly has superintendent Bob Fielding told us above? He has just told us that the Special Operations Group (SOG) of the Tasmania Police forced the gunman to come to them. But how did the police do that as the only thing that forced Martin Bryant out of Seascope cottage was the fact that the building was on fire? This being the case, then the only conclusion that can be made is this: **Bob Fielding has admitted that Seascope cottage was set on fire by the SOG.**

Think about this for a moment. Setting fire to a building to drive a terrorist out into the open with no consideration for the hostages whatsoever, last occurred in Australia on **29 June 1880** in Victoria. It was on the orders of the police chief commissioner, Captain [Frederick Charles] Standish, who ordered the inn at Glenrowan to be torched in an attempt to apprehend members of the Kelly gang. Also killed in that deliberately-lit fire was a 16-year-old youth. In the subsequent Royal Commission, Standish got the sack.¹⁰³

Superintendent Fielding's statement corroborates what we had already been told by witnesses that the police had openly stated that Seascope cottage was set on fire by the SOG to force the gunman out. It also explains the time difficulties in that white¹⁰⁴ smoke was first reported coming out of that cottage at 07:47 hours and yet it was 37 minutes later, at 08:24 hours, that Martin Bryant was reported to have left Seascope.¹⁰⁵ Now that is a very long time for an old pine-board building to burn, especially one that had most of the upper windows smashed, which allowed the fire to feed on fresh air.

But we have one major consideration – the hostages. Fielding goes to great length to inform us of the problems involved in rescuing the hostages and about the discourse on whether the hostages were alive or dead. In such cases there is no choice but to consider the hostages alive, until such time as it can be confirmed that they are dead.

So consider this. Once Martin Bryant was seen to emerge from the burning Seascope cottage, with his clothes alight, the SOG went immediately into action with one of their much rehearsed drills, and arrested Martin Bryant at 08:35 hours¹⁰⁵ – 11 minutes after he was seen to emerge from the burning building. By this time, Seascope

¹⁰² Stated by the superintendent Bob Fielding on a Tasmania Police training video. This audio-visual tape came to public attention in 2004. In newsletter number 227 published November 2004 by the Adelaide Institute, it states this: "On a particular day she [Olga Scully] bought at the Hobart rubbish tip a cart-load (literally hundreds) of used video tapes. Once home, she cleaned them of dust, and she also briefly glanced at the titles. Mrs Scully noticed that she had a Tasmania Police Training tape in her hands. It was from the Tasmanian Police training unit that, using original scenes shot on the day of the Port Arthur massacre, 28 April 1996, a video was produced that offered the official version of events." The video viewed by this editor is undated, but it clearly reveals places as well as people and their comments made in relation to the incident at Port Arthur, as well as dead bodies in and outside the café. Note there are other videos on the Internet which can be mistaken for the original. All might have been posted intentionally to deceive viewers. Be warned.

¹⁰³ Australian colloquialism meaning to be terminated from a position or place of employment.

¹⁰⁴ White smoke is also produced when incendiary devices containing phosphorus are ignited.

¹⁰⁵ Richard McCreddie. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response* (part 1). Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 6.

cottage had been reportedly burning for 48 minutes, and there was no longer any chance to rescue the hostages. In fact in the film taken of this event, you can see the roof of the cottage collapsing.¹⁰⁶ Eleven minutes into a major life-threatening event, but even then the local fire brigade which had been called out at 06:00 hours, and was on standby at the nearby Fox and Hounds Hotel was still not permitted on the scene, until Martin Bryant had been physically restrained and the area secured. In this event, the hostages were superfluous. At Glenrowan, at least the police were allowed to drag the body of young Joe Byrne from the burning building.

In any police action where hostages are involved, the safety and welfare of the hostages are paramount. One of the primary tasks of the police in a hostage situation is to rescue the hostages and remove them from danger. If there was not a viable situation for the hostages to be removed with safety, then it would be the police task to create such an opportunity. Fielding tells us that the police did have plans, most of which he signed off by about 07:00 hours,¹⁰⁷ but still there was no move to rescue the hostages. This tells me that the **Port Arthur Massacre was an exercise.**

¹⁰⁶ Channel 9. A Current Affair; 29 April 1996. During this programme, Ray Martin the presenter suggests that the arrest of Bryant could be witnessed. But all that can be seen in the footage referred to are two figures dressed in black who are Tasmania Police SOGs. The view in the footage presented was of the north side of the burning Seascope Cottage, but Bryant actually emerged from and was arrested on the south-west side of the cottage. (MacGregor)

¹⁰⁷ Jenny Fleming. *Forward command at Port Arthur*; Police Journal (Police Association South Australia); March 1997: p. 6. At the end of this article it states this: "Story courtesy Tasmania's 'Association News'." But being unable to find the story on that Association's website, this editor has not been able to confirm those official words.

¹⁰⁸ An Australian English word the meaning of which is equivalent to luggage compartment, trunk, etc.

¹⁰⁹ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 213.

¹¹⁰ Geoff Easton. *Port Arthur – media management*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 121.

¹¹¹ Heather Kennedy. *Last contact with Martins years ago*; Sunday Herald Sun; 5 May 1996.

In an article printed in the Australian Police Journal, Gerard Dutton then a sergeant with the police in Tasmania makes this statement: "It wasn't until the following day, after Bryant was captured, that police realised the elderly couple that owned Seascope and the man taken captive and placed in the boot¹⁰⁸ of the BMW were missing."¹⁰⁹ In other words, the hostages didn't rate. Again, **the only time that hostages don't count is in an exercise.**

Now consider this quote from Geoff Easton who at the time of the shooting was the media liaison officer with the Tasmania Police: "A young man called at the Public Enquiries counter and asked for me. He was to tell me that he was a relative of the Martins (David and Sally), the owners of SeaScape [*sic*] and that he had a cache of weapons stored there, and, in his words, 'Shitloads of ammo mate!' I immediately took him to be interviewed by detectives."¹¹⁰

Glen Martin's response was as per the Herald Sun article: "Mr Martin said there was no truth in reports that guns used in the massacre may have belonged to him or were stored in the Seascope owned by his parents."¹¹¹ This article continues with: "Mr. Martin said he was appalled by reports that **he had an arsenal of 43 guns** stored in his parent's pretty cottage on Fortescue Bay." In fact, Glenn Martin totally denies these reports of their being 43 guns at Seascope.

But note this is the only time we are given any indication of the number of firearms allegedly burnt at that cottage. Forty-three firearms, all supposedly purchased and/or collected by Martin Bryant over some unstated period of time, then stored somewhere, then at some unstated time put in his Volvo sedan, then driven to Seascope, then unloaded there, all without anyone noticing anything unusual. Nowhere in the official documentation are there any credible reports or statements by witnesses which detail the history of these 43 firearms. **All the allegations about them stem from the police.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Now on Monday morning on the Channel 9 **Today** programme, at approximately **7:45 am**, the female presenter stated: "We are told, this is yet to be confirmed, that the gunman has something like two and a half thousand rounds of ammunition."¹¹² But Bryant was not arrested until **8:35 am**. So where did the media get the figure of 2500 rounds of ammunition so early that morning? The only persons who would have known the quantity of ammo at Seascope cottage would be those who put it there.

It is interesting to note in the court transcript¹¹³ that when the police initially searched the yellow Volvo at the tollbooth of the historic site, they didn't photograph a box of ammunition that was supposedly left on the rear seat. But a box of ammunition (439 rounds of .308 calibre) was photographed at police headquarters in Hobart,¹¹⁴ and allegedly another 1737 rounds found in the passageway and in a spare room **during the second search** of Bryant's residence at 30 Clare Street. Suggestively, the police didn't even trip over them during their first search.¹¹⁵ Altogether, that's **over 4000 rounds** of ammunition supposedly belonging to Martin Bryant. Yet, Tasmania Police **never identified** any place where Bryant obtained all this alleged ammo.

The son of David and Sally Martin has denied emphatically the claims made by Easton. Glen Martin says there were only a .22 rifle and two antique shotguns with their firing pins filed off. The witness Donald Cameron Gunn says he saw a rifle in one of Seascope's outbuildings when taken on a tour by David Martin just prior the massacre.¹¹⁶ This means that the firearms at Seascope had to have been brought in by the gunman, but Martin Bryant was only interviewed in regard to three. All the rifles allegedly located at Seascope cottage and in Bryant's home were **totally ignored by police**.

Now here's another point of interest. We know that Martin Bryant hadn't seen the Martins for years. So, if Bryant had all this ammo found in his car and at his home, why did he leave it in his car and at his home? Did he trust in providence? Was he aware of all the ammo that was supposedly lying about in the Tasman Peninsula's premier bed-and-breakfast residence? How would Martin Bryant be aware of the "Shitloads of ammo" that Easton says Glen Martin told him were at Seascope but which **Glen Martin has emphatically denied as being not true**. Why is Geoff Easton trying to compete with the Brothers Grimm, those authors of delightful fairy tales?

Just where did these firearms and ammunition come from? The police make no mention of them!!!

On Monday morning (29 April 1996), the deputy commissioner of Tasmania Police, Richard McCreadie, held a media conference. Many attendees were already in Hobart to participate in the Pacific Area Newspaper Publishers Association conference which was to begin that day. McCreadie told the media this: "[A] person has been taken into police custody, conveyed to the Royal Hobart Hospital suffering from burns, no gunshot wounds. He will we expect appear before the court later today [29TH; see Insert *BRYANT CHARGED WITH MURDER*] or

¹¹² Transcript – **Today**, Channel 9; Liz Hayes interview with professor Simon Chapman; 29 April 1996. (To her credit, the host said that what was stated had not been checked.) So before Bryant was arrested – in fact, even before he first exited the burning cottage with his entire back ablaze – mongrel officials started the demonization process: Bryant was the gunman; Bryant had shot children; Bryant had highpowered guns and **2,500 rounds of ammunition**; etc. And mindless members of the media broadcast and published, early and late, news of a murderous massacre at Port Arthur in Tassie with updates and anything else to tell every stunned Australian that Martin Bryant was the **monster** who had done it.

¹¹³ Martin Bryant was NOT tried in a court anywhere in Tasmania, or in Australia. **There was no trial**. This transcript referred to is a disgraceful record of the sham hearing which took place at Hobart on 19 November 1996. During that outrageous process the so-called judge (William Cox) accepted every corrupt syllable from the prosecutor (Damian Bugg), and ignored the fact that the alleged defender (John Avery) relentlessly pressured Bryant to change his **original plea of INNOCENT** to guilty. It was/is all a complete sham.

¹¹⁴ *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*. 22 November 1996: pp. 160-161.

¹¹⁵ *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*. 22 November 1996 pp. 189-190: "On the twenty-ninth of April [1st search] and the third of May [2nd search], 1996, police conducted an extensive search of Bryant's house in Clare St. New Town." (p. 189) The massive quantity of weapons and ammunition allegedly found at Bryant's house suggestively appeared sometime after the 1st search and most conveniently before the 2nd search. Now who might have planted them in the house? It definitely was not Martin Bryant as he was in hospital between 29 April and 3 May.

¹¹⁶ David Martin told Gunn that he shot "feral cats" that came onto his property as they attacked the local birds. See the *Witness Statement* of 16 May 1996 made by Gunn who did not see 43 firearms and "shitloads of ammo" at Seascope cottage.

tomorrow [30th] so we obviously can't comment on motive or anything else like that, but I'm happy to make Mr. Fielding, who was the Forward Commander in Charge of the operation down here, available to answer your questions about how the situation unfolded, and then we'll talk about how we'll facilitate the opportunity as media to get a look at the house, which has been destroyed by fire, burnt to the ground, and then to progress on to some of the other sites that will obviously be of interest to you."¹¹⁷

Then after McCredie's presentation, superintendent Jack Johnston gives us some of the reasons why and how the media were to be given a tour of the crime scenes **before** they had even been properly examined by the police forensic squads: "It became necessary during the course of the morning to identify the fact that the media were expressing such considerable interest in attending the scenes that we should facilitate that, so it became imperative that as soon as the crime scenes were cleared from a scientific perspective and an evidentiary perspective that we allowed them access and we did that by making two coaches available to transport them through the scenes in a very ordered way. They were given access to each of the sites at which the various murders occurred, and under very strict guidelines were entitled to film the sites where the bodies had been located."¹¹⁸ Now were the media not fortunate?

Richard McCreadie, had left Hobart after doing an early interview with Steve Lieberman of the **Today** show. Then this commissioner travelled to Taranna where he had his media conference and informed the media of their reward – a guided tour of the Port Arthur massacre site. Then we had superintendant Jack Johnston informing us that it was a necessity to placate the media. If that was the case, the question was/is: When would it be proper for such an exercise in media control be expected to take place? The answer was/is at the end of the media conference, when the last of the bodies had been located and the fate of the hostages properly established.

The coroner Ian Matterson states this in his report to Emergency Management Australia (EMA). "**Prior to 08:00** I received a telephone call indicating there was a desire by a government Minister to allow a bus load of press personnel on site around 09:00. I indicated this was neither possible nor desirable because of the stage of investigations and that they ought not to be allowed on site until the bodies had been removed. I indicated that at this stage that could be several hours into the future. I advised that at the time of this telephone call potential exhibits were still being located, identified and marked for photographing and that I had no desire for the press to be present whilst bodies were still in situ and while investigators were attending to their duties with the further distinct possibility of exhibits being trampled upon, moved or even destroyed (albeit accidentally) by having extra personnel in the form of press on the site."¹¹⁹

And the coroner continued: "A little later in the morning I was in discussion with senior police officers whereby it was agreed that, provided we could complete our investigation of the bodies on the tollgate road, once they were removed the press could be brought on site in

¹¹⁷ Tasmania Police *training video*; see note 102.

¹¹⁸ Tasmania Police *training video*; see note 102.

¹¹⁹ Ian Matterson. *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 92.

MARTIN BRYANT IMAGES (4)
1972-1992



MARTIN BRYANT

Birthdate	1967 May 7	Queen Alexander Hospital, Battery Point, Tasmania (<i>My Story</i>)
Top Left	1972	5 years of age; family photograph (<i>My Story</i>)
Top Right	1977	10 years of age; family photograph (<i>My Story</i>)
Base Left	1979?	c.12 years of age; location – Royal Hobart Hospital?
Base Right	1987-1992	c.20-25 years of age; location?

Images of Martin Bryant on the Internet are usually without dates, locations, and/or sources. Thus, all images of him must be questioned. A number of these images have the sole purpose of demonizing him. On some, the eyes have been deliberately manipulated and accentuated: "Newspaper coverage immediately after the massacre raised serious questions about journalistic practices. Photographs of Martin Bryant had been digitally manipulated with the effect of making Bryant appear deranged." (wikipedia.org) Editors continue to use these manipulated images. – ed.

buses, corralled in the Port Arthur Motor Inn where they would be briefed before being allowed to walk along a set route across to the historic church and up the road to the tollgate. It was agreed this would not occur before 13:00 and no press member was to stray from the designated route nor would they be taken within 300 metres of the Broad Arrow Café. This was a perfectly acceptable compromise that enabled the forensic team sufficient time to properly complete their investigations of bodies in the open.”¹²⁰

So, according to the coroner Ian Matterson, the request came from a government minister **prior to 08:00 hours**, which was before Bryant emerged from Seascope, and well before his arrest. Matterson then tells us that he spoke a little later to senior police officers in regard to this matter, and plans to bus in the media were finalised.

What all this tells us is that at the time these plans relating to the media being bussed in and escorted through the Site, the coroner was still considered as being in charge of the investigations. And this scenario would have continued had Martin Bryant died in the fire at Seascope. However Matterson then informs us that at 08:40 hours, he was told that Bryant had been arrested and therefore he as the coroner had ceased to have control over the investigation. In other words, the plan to bus in the media had been completed prior to 08:40 hours – **before the arrest of Martin Bryant**.

The questions now must be put as to how could such activities be planned whilst uncertainties such as the final outcome of the siege at Seascope existed. Police resources must have been stretched to the very limits, and the safety of the hostages, the public and the media could not be guaranteed until the event at Seascope was finalised. Unless, of course, someone knew what was to happen and that could only be if the **Port Arthur Massacre was an exercise**.

In this handling of the media by the Tasmania Police and Tasmania government, remember the coroner has informed us that the plan was first mooted with him by a government minister. It was a unique situation and it is worthy to consider just where this plan may have been created. Perhaps the Tasmania Police media liaison officer, the former Canberra based communications officer, Geoff Easton, learnt this containment strategy when, as he put it: “Just the fortnight before I had spent five days in Western Australia on the anti-terrorist SAC-PAV Exercise, ‘Top Shelf’.”¹²¹

Let us consider another little piece of information given by Easton: “...at 08:30 I was able to fly by helicopter to the PFCP [Police Forward Command Post] with the Deputy Commissioner as news came through to us that a man had emerged from the flames of the Sea Scape Cottages [*sic*]. I conferred with Peter Hazelwood who had spent a chilly night at the PFCP assisting the forward commander to facilitate as much media inquiry to around 80 journalists as he could, with regular briefings throughout the night. We decided that journalists in Hobart would be placed on a chartered coach from there and brought to Port Arthur to join those at the PFCP, to use a chartered coach that had already arrived for other purposes.”¹²²

¹²⁰ Ian Matterson. *Coroner’s responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 92.

¹²¹ Geoff Easton. *Port Arthur – media management*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 120. **SAC-PAV** is the official abbreviation for: **S**tanding **A**dvisory **C**ommittee on commonwealth & state cooperation for **P**rotection **A**gainst **V**iolence.

¹²² Geoff Easton. *Port Arthur – media management*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 121.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Now the coroner has already told us that he received a telephone call on behalf of a government minister **prior to 08:00 hours** in regard to permitting a bus load of journalists to tour the Port Arthur Historic Site around 09:00 hours. Who was this minister? It could only be the minister responsible for Port Arthur, Mr Ray Groom MHR (Member of House of Representatives).

That a government minister would interfere with an ongoing situation is preposterous. Just how could a government minister interfere with a coronial or police investigation that may in some manner jeopardise the final outcome? Unless of course, the government minister was aware of what the final outcome was to be. **This smacks of a terrorism exercise.**

The police media liaison officer is now telling us that a coach was waiting at the police forward command post at Taranna when he arrived there at approximately 08:45 hours. This corroborates the coroner's statements of the 09:00 hours appointment for the busload of media at Port Arthur. So the questions are: What time was the bus, which had to travel from Hobart and it takes 90 minutes to make this journey, booked for it to be at Taranna prior to 09:00 hours?; and, For what purpose was the bus required at Taranna, especially when the bus was no longer used for that purpose?

Easton continues with these snippets: "The deputy commissioner gave a briefing to those assembled telling them of the arrangements to allow them onto the site"; "the crime scene examiner superintendent Jack Johnston gave permission, once the outside bodies had been removed, for the journalists to walk through each of the murder scenes"; "At about midday he [Johnston] took charge of this phase and a **small army of 120 media personnel** followed him through as he described as far as practicable what had been found and our understanding of the events"; and, "Seascope cottage was in ashes and the last rounds of ammunition had been discharged from the intense heat and the area was now considered safe."¹²³

Clearly, some members of the police and some politicians **knew in advance what would occur that Monday 29 April 1996.**

Here is a time line of these events to put things into perspective –

- 08:00 prior to this Matterson and government minister on buses
- 07:47 Seascope cottage reported on fire
- 07:52 McCreadie interviewed by Steve Lieberman
- c.08:10 McCreadie and Easton on route to airport
- 08:24 Bryant emerges from burning Seascope cottage
- 08:30 McCreadie and Easton board helicopter to Taranna
- c.08:30 Matterson talks with senior police – McCreadie or Johnston
- 08:35 Bryant arrested
- 08:40 Matterson informed of arrest of Bryant
- c.09:30 McCreadie informs media at Taranna of bus trip.
- 11:05 Walter Mikac views dead wife and daughters (2) at site
- 11:20 Walter Mikac comforted & escorted by Dr. Ireland from site
- 12:30 media buses arrive at Seascope cottage
- 13:00 media at Port Arthur

¹²³ Geoff Easton. *Port Arthur – media management*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 121.

The reason I've mentioned the Mikac episode is to demonstrate that these bodies were still in situ at 11:20 a.m., but it appears that they were moved just prior to the media's arrival at 13:00 hours.

Now the most telling parts here are the buses put on for the media prior to any facts that would indicate the siege at Seascapc would be resolved. The deputy police commissioner McCreadie was the police spokesman at police headquarters in Hobart up to his interview with Steve Lieberman early that Monday morning. By all precedents, McCreadie should have continued performing his duties at Hobart. But after **the fire was officially set off** at Seascapc cottage, McCreadie was travelling to Taranna with his media liaison officer.

It is McCreadie who informed the 80-odd media personnel at Taranna of the prepared bus journey to allow the media to have full access to all the various crime scenes at Port Arthur, including the burned ruins of Seascapc cottage. In the process, members of the media were able to photograph one of the presumed murder weapons, the FN-FAL rifle in the gutter of the garage at Seascapc.

Again we are told that a total of **120 media personnel** were led through Port Arthur by superintendent Jack Johnston, which means that there were approximately 40 media personnel from Hobart who took advantage of the Tasmania Police offer for the escorted tour of the Port Arthur Historic Site and other crime scenes.

From all of this we can conclude that the media had top priority in bringing forth the message of the Port Arthur massacre. Then we are informed that the majority of media personnel were gathered in Hobart prior to the event for a seven-day conference related to newspaper publishing. Even the Sydney-based John Raedler of CNN was there together with his camera man Hugh Williams then based in Berlin.

The significant point here is that **the media were used to deliver the required message to the populace.**

The thoughts of the Nubeena ambulance driver Gary Alexander were as follows: "Alexander's first thought was that he had arrived at an exercise, because the bodies looked like mannequins laid out. 'If it's a training set-up and they haven't told someone, gee I'll go crook'."¹²⁴ Now why would Gary Alexander think that? Joe Paul the executive officer of the Tasmania State Disaster Committee, tells us why in his report to the EMA:

"Several exercises have been conducted since 1995 that have been designed to assess the emergency services response capability to an event on the Tasman Peninsula, which includes Port Arthur"; "On 22 and 23 April 1996, five days prior to the tragedy, an aviation seminar was held at the Police Academy. The seminar considered Tasmania's resource capability to cope with a domestic aircraft accident and identified the support available from other states"; "Other exercises were held to test anti terrorist arrangements. These exercises practised emergency service personnel and other organis-

¹²⁴ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: p. 90. The Australian slang word crook means to become upset and/or to complain.

LETTER TO SUPREME COURT

Don Pike
c/o Post Office
St. Mary's TAS 7215
24.6.05

Judge S. Tennent

Tasmania Supreme Court
GPO Box 167
Hobart TAS 701

Dear Madame,

I was pleased to read recently of your new appointment to the judiciary as one who was particularly interested in reform of Risdon Prison. It is always a concern that prisoners everywhere, should be afforded fair and humane treatment during prison confinement and especially if that **confinement is one of isolation**. I feel you would agree that the forgoing should apply to all prisoners, irrespective of the nature of the conviction.

When Martin Bryant was imprisoned we were told that he refused to see his sister or mother. This morning the hospital section at Risdon informed me that he occasionally has consented to see his mother and did so. They further offered (or I requested) that they ask Martin; would he content to see me (a stranger). After a few moments I was informed that he had been asked the question, but had refused (he was said to have not answered his inquirer, but just walked away). I was further told that that behaviour was typical of his response when he was not interested in a visit.

The problem is, of course, when a **prisoner is held incommunicado**, it will always be easy for the authorities to say the prisoner doesn't want to talk to anyone, when in fact the truth may have been to the contrary. I am not suggesting that this is the situation in Bryant's case. However, and notwithstanding a person's right to refuse visits, it also follows that if justice is to be done (and not just *seen* to be done) a genuine determination must be made to show clearly and without any reservations that a prisoner did in fact refuse visitation and acted of his/her own *unaffected* free will.

To this end I believe that it is crucially important that a panel of *suitable* people be allowed to visit a prisoner, periodically, to make such determination and to establish, as far as possible, that there has been no coercion. Further, it would be equally important that affidavital documentation should be furnished from a medical officer (and others?) both inside and outside the prison system to establish that the prisoner has not been **subjected to mind bending or control drugs**. This would be particularly applicable to **prisoners who are subjects of doubt or controversy as to their conviction**.

I believe it should follow that the right of privacy, under no circumstances, should be regarded as priority over the above. A person's incarceration begets a regime of reasonable controls. Food and drink (special diet), recreation, exercise, medical attention, religion, *etc.* Perhaps as little as three visits per year to **determine the veracity** of their wishes, cannot be genuinely construed as an infringement of anyone's rights.

I would be pleased of your assistance in establishing what is suggested.

Yours sincerely,

Don Pike

(amended; original emphasis)

The rightly concerned Don Pike documented a clear request in a polite letter addressed to a new supreme court judge. Are you surprised to learn that he never received a reply? It seems that Martin Bryant is being "subjected to mind bending or control drugs." – ed.

ations in responding and managing an event with multiple deaths and casualties"; "Due to the small population and lack of Defence Force infrastructure, there are limited resources within the State to cope with a major emergency"; and, "On 28 April 1996, Tasmania was as well-prepared as possible to deal with expected emergency events."¹²⁵

¹²⁵ Joe Paul. *Setting the scene for the event*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: pp. 3, 4.

¹²⁶ See Insert *TWO BUS LOADS* in Part 4. It describes the unannounced arrival of those buses at the Port Arthur Historic Site together with what arrangements were made for all those visitors on 28 April 1996.

¹²⁷ *Witness Statement*; 30 May 1996.

¹²⁸ This word wasps is spelt several ways in the case-related documents: wasps; Wasps; and, WASPS. Given what the gunman stated to Lynd, and given later that same day he killed 32 people at and near the Port Arthur Historic Site, it can be concluded the gunman was using the word acronymically not biologically. The gunman told Lynd that he was going to get rid of some **White Anglo-Saxon Protestants**, not wasps of the stinging kind.

¹²⁹ Slang word first used in the US to define a spy. Has evolved to mean any person who, full-time or part-time, is engaged by a government or other significant entity to covertly gather information or assist with actions related to matters kept secret.

¹³⁰ ABC. *News*; 28 April 1996.

¹³¹ On goaustralia.about.com it says: "In the harbour adjacent to the Port Arthur historic site lies the Isle of the Dead which was selected as a burial place for those who died on Port Arthur. Some 1,000 burials took place on [that island] from 1833 to 1877, a majority of them of convicts and former convicts."

¹³² *The Mercury*; 31 December 1996.

¹³³ Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur – an overview of the police response*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: pp. 6.

¹³⁴ Tasmania Police *training video*; see note 102.

Then there was Code Brown. It was the new emergency plan of the Royal Hobart Hospital, which was implemented early in 1995 but [suggestively] finalised on the Friday (26 April 1996) just before the Port Arthur massacre, along with the 25 trauma specialist doctors from all over Australia who were in Hobart at that time.

So there were exercises aplenty going on in Tasmania to bring the local services up to scratch. There were seminars and conferences to bring in the media and the required specialist physicians, and there was even a seminar to remove the management staff of the Port Arthur Site out of harm's way. (see Insert *MY DAY* in Part 4) And of course none of this was orchestrated in any way – **or was it?**

Now in any emergency exercise there is the need for victims. So why not the two bus loads of American tourists?¹²⁶ But the Yanks weren't shot at. Again consider the words of the gunman who told Gaye Ester Lynd¹²⁷ that he was going to get rid of some wasps.¹²⁸ Or Rob Atkins, the Sydney based spook¹²⁹ told us that the gunman said: "He said there's a lot of wasps around today, there's not many Japs here are there, and then started muttering to himself, and then walked inside and that's when all the gunshots started going off."¹³⁰

But most of all, Lupo Prins, assistant commissioner of Tasmania Police, is quoted in the Hobart newspaper (*The Mercury*) as having said: "At one stage we thought he was trying to get on a boat which a lot of people were on, to go to the Isle of the Dead.¹³¹ Had he got on the vessel he could have shot everybody on board so the potential was there for it to be a lot worse than it was."¹³² Think about those words for a moment. Prins told us the plan of attack for the day.

The existence of this plan was corroborated by deputy commissioner of Tasmania Police, Richard McCreadie in his EMA address in which he stated: "Marine Division tasked (*Van Dieman & Vigilant*)."¹³³ And, we also have that same information on the police *training video*¹³⁴ which was found at a second-hand shop in Hobart.

Now if the Port Arthur ferry, the *Bundeena*, had been hijacked as Prins and McCreadie declared, the passengers slain and the ferry set alight, then the two Tasmania Police patrol boats (*Van Dieman & Vigilant*) would have been called to assist. But what happened to these two vessels as they never did reach Port Arthur?

Consider the thesis that the passengers on the ferry *Bundeena* were the original target and that something happened which stopped that attack. First, let us have a closer look at some of those who were shot on 28 April 1996 at the Broad Arrow Café.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

1. Anthony Nightingale

He was the person who jumped up when the gunman started shooting and yelled out, "No, no, not here!" Allegedly, he was a loans officer at a Commonwealth Bank branch at Noble Park, Melbourne. But I have received information that he was associated with ASIO (Australian Security Intelligence Organisation);

2. Andrew Bruce Mills

Another reputed member of ASIO, he was accompanied by Tony and Sarah Kistan of Sydney;

3. Tony Kistan

Alleged to be a high-ranking activist of the African National Congress in South African; and,

4. Dennis Olson

Olson¹³⁵ was quoted in an article (*Survivor recounts shooting spree*) on the internet news site, The Nando Times.¹³⁶ He said: "upon his return, he probably will get up on a *soapbox* and talk in even more passionate terms about his long-held belief in gun control."

Now let us consider an article published in a major Tasmanian newspaper.¹³⁷ A nurse, her name is suppressed, received a six-figure settlement from her employer, the Commonwealth Bank of Australia and the job agency Audiometrics of 814 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, Victoria. Now, the only Commonwealth Bank employee killed at Port Arthur was Anthony Nightingale, and since the Commonwealth Bank does not pay its employees and is not responsible for its employees outside of working hours, or whilst on a touring holiday of Tasmania and visiting the Port Arthur Historic Site, then we can only presume that **Anthony Nightingale was on active duty when he died.**

If you are wondering why the nurse's name was suppressed, kindly remember that it is still an offence to name a member of ASIO. Alright, in this article we are told that the nurse had to walk into a room full of dead people who had been shot with a high-powered weapon. That means the nurse walked into the Broad Arrow Café, and she could have only done that on the day of the massacre, and therefore this nurse was Lynne Beavis, who according to her statement was on a 10-day holiday with her sister, Jean Andrews. Again, the Commonwealth Bank does not pay for injuries to its employees (Nightingale, Beavis), a political activist and an American that occurred whilst on holidays. So what were three ASIO personnel, a communist activist, and an anti-gunner all doing at Port Arthur on that particular day?

But I have digressed from my topic, the Tasmania Police. The aims of the Tasmania Police are stated to be: maintain law and order; protect life and property; enhance community safety; and, reduce the incidence of fear of crime. Well for over six hours at Port Arthur, the whole community waited with dread whilst the Tasmania Police acted out their anti-terrorist protocols and ignored their stated aims.

Superintendent Fielding: "We put together our formulated plans for the resolution of the incident and I signed off on most of those by around about 7:00 a.m."¹³⁸ In other words, there appears to have been a schedule with a limited time factor. But what plans was

¹³⁵ 30 April 1996. Dennis Olsen has been described as an anti-gunner. He was also the first person Wendy Scurr met at the Broad Arrow Café immediately after the shooting there. On 10 September 2012, Scurr told this editor (Noble) that Olsen was "wounded by a shotgun at the café." For readers not aware of the associated facts, Andrew S. MacGregor posted this internet comment (14 January 2012) below the transcript of the ABC Radio National program *Guns Are Back* (8 January 2012): "Now before you say that no shotgun was used inside the Broad Arrow Café, please do not forget that Dr [Stephen] Wilkinson of the Royal Hobart Hospital stated quite categorically on Monday the 29th April 1996, that "where ever we looked **we found pellets!**" (added emphasis) It seems that an ambulance officer who saw Dennis Olsen at the Broad Arrow Café described Olsen's wounds as shotgun pellet wounds. (It also seems that ambulance officer was compelled by officials to retract his words because in the official narrative no shotgun was fired in the café. But the facts say otherwise.) And, having grown up in a rural area where shotguns were used, and with her 20 years of ambulance experience, Scurr knows about shotgun pellets. So too does Dr. Wilkinson the surgeon. For an analysis of the wounding of that US citizen see *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; 2001/4, by Andrew S. MacGregor.

¹³⁶ 30 April 1996.

¹³⁷ Christine Caulfield. *Big compo for Port Arthur massacre nurse*; The Mercury; 10 August 2004. A slang word, compo means compensation. The article is about money paid to an unnamed woman [**Lynne Beavis**] who allegedly: "...was hired to support Commonwealth Bank staff in Victoria and Hobart traumatized in critical incidents..." This sentence confirms Beavis was/is a spook.

¹³⁸ Jenny Fleming. *Forward command at Port Arthur*; Police Journal (Police Association South Australia); March 1997: p. 6. At the end of this article it says this: "Story courtesy Tasmania's 'Association News'." But being unable to find the story on that Association's website, this editor has not been able to confirm these official words.

Fielding talking about? The local fire brigade being put on stand-by? The only incident that occurred was that Seascope was set on fire, and **Fielding had already admitted that this was a police action.**

Superintendent Fielding: "I had further discussions with the SOG [Special Operations Group] liaison officer, the psychiatrist Dr. Sale and the head of the negotiation unit, inspector Tom Tully. I went through with them what they thought was the situation as far as the hostage being alive was concerned."¹³⁹ The hostages must be considered alive, until such time as **they are proven to be dead.** It doesn't matter what the exercise observers state.

Superintendent Fielding: "But they really thought that they were most likely deceased at that stage."¹³⁹ In other words, the hostages were immaterial to their plan of operations. Again this tells us that this was all an anti-terrorist exercise.

Superintendent Fielding: "We didn't know where Pearce [*sic*; should be Pears] was."¹³⁹ This being the case, we are now told that the person inside Seascope cottage with *Jamie* was not Glenn Pears. So who was *Jamie's* companion called Rick?

Superintendent Fielding: "The fire then started and there was a lot of discussion as to what we should or should not do."¹³⁹ And so they fiddled while Rome burned.

Superintendent Fielding: "There was some discussion about whether we would have to send somebody in because we might be letting people burn alive in there."¹³⁹ Again the hostages were immaterial. But consider just exactly what Fielding is telling us: "because we might be letting people burn alive." That is what the police were willing to do. Not protecting the community, but rather taking out a terrorist. **It was an anti-terrorist exercise.**

Superintendent Fielding: "At the end of the day I weighed it up on the basis that it was better to let that occur, than to needlessly risk another nine or ten people's lives to go in and that was what we did."¹³⁹ This means that Fielding was content to let whoever was alive inside the cottage to burn to death, as the police did not attempt to save any victim(s), the main duty of any police officer.

Also consider that the SOGs have been training since 1979 to battle terrorists and save hostages. Yet, Fielding considered that they would have a 30 percent casualty rate against Martin Bryant who is mentally-incompetent and an untrained shooter. Heaven help them should they come across the real thing. At Glenrowan in Victoria, the police went in and did drag the body of 16-year-old Joe Byrne out of the burning building during the gun battle with Ned Kelly.

Superintendent Fielding: "Certainly from his actions, Bryant wanted us to go in while the house was burning."¹³⁹ Well, if you consider acting sergeant Craig Harwood's words about Bryant, who after initially emerging from Seascope returned into the burning building,¹⁴⁰ then there is the real possibility that at least Martin Bryant

¹³⁹ Jenny Fleming. *Forward command at Port Arthur*; Police Journal (Police Association South Australia); March 1997: p. 6.

¹⁴⁰ In his *Witness Statement* dated 9 August 1996, Harwood says this: "The fire continued to engulf the cottage and spread to the bottom floor. I then heard via radio that S/Constable JAMES had seen the offender firing a handgun on the southern side of the stronghold. The offender was dressed in black. The offender then disappeared back into the burning building." Harwood says the fire spread downward to the bottom/ground floor. This implies the fire commenced on the upper/first floor. And it was on the upper/first floor where the windows were smashed out from the inside during the *siege*. That would have allowed an unobstructed entry of a SOG incendiary device shot into the house on the upper/first floor. From there the fire would logically have spread downward to the floor below, just as Harwood revealed happened. Note that this Craig Harwood was a member of Victoria Police. He would have had no knowledge of what the Tasmanian SOG planned to do during the *siege*. What he described in his *Witness Statement* suggests arson took place – **a member of SOG set fire to Seascope cottage.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

was concerned about the safety of others inside Seascope. Or constable Malcolm Scott's statement that Martin Bryant asked if his girlfriend¹⁴¹ had got out.¹⁴² It would be perfectly reasonable for Bryant wanting the police to enter the burning house and save the occupants. But as Fielding states, oh no, we can't do that.

Superintendent Fielding: "Right up to within ten minutes of being arrested, he was well ablaze and yelling out. He was trying to goad people to come in --- he was yelling out things like come on, come and get me!"¹⁴³ Of course it is natural for a young man to want to save his girlfriend, and when his own clothes and back are burning to yell out for someone to come to him and to help him.

Superintendent Fielding: "He came outside and his clothes were on fire or someone came outside with clothes on fire, they (the SOGs) could not see because of the smoke exactly who it was, I would not allow them to go forward because I could not be certain from what they were telling me that it was Bryant."¹⁴³

With every house fire that I have witnessed, the smoke rose into the sky. Only in Tasmania does the smoke drift downwards. But, again Fielding is telling us that the burning person may have been a hostage, and still the police would not attempt to save that possible victim. I guess it just was not part of any plan. Fielding tells of the various formulated plans that he had signed off on prior to 07:00 hours, and it is obvious that these plans had not been a spur-of-the-moment type, but rather some well rehearsed battle plans such as the use of ballistic shields to protect the SOGs from what Fielding termed "Bryant's mutton gun."¹⁴⁴

There is no doubt **the Port Arthur Massacre was a planned event from start to finish.**

The actions of the various players such as Richard McCreddie, Ray Groom, Geoffrey Easton, Sale and many others tells us that the Port Arthur massacre was a terrorist exercise from the start. Every major police member involved with the Port Arthur massacre had been trained by SAC-PAV, a federal government body from the federal attorney-general's department and controlled by the PSCC (Protective Security Coordination Centre).¹⁴⁵

Consider these snippets of information: "A revised edition of the National Anti-Terrorist Plan endorsed by SAC-PAV in November 1995"; "the effectiveness of the National Anti-Terrorist Plan and particularly the external support provisions was demonstrated during the Port Arthur incident in April 1996"; and, "the response arrangements of the National Anti-Terrorist Plan were largely followed by the Tasmanian Authorities in successfully managing the incident."¹⁴⁶

So, the plans that Fielding signed off on, were in fact part of the National Anti-Terrorist Plan endorsed by SAC-PAV in November 1995. The plans to accommodate the media, especially with the buses, and the organised tours then also had to be part of the National Anti-Terrorist Plan. So the next question is, who wrote these plans?

¹⁴¹ The name of Bryant's then girlfriend is Petra Willmott.

¹⁴² Malcolm Scott. *Witness Statement*; not dated. Note Scott was a member of Tasmania Police SOG during the *siege* of Seascope cottage.

¹⁴³ Jenny Fleming. *Forward command at Port Arthur*; Police Journal (Police Association South Australia); March 1997: p. 6.

¹⁴⁴ *mutton gun*: Australian slang for penis. At this stage, over 30 people had been shot to death and Fielding knew it. An unknown number were possibly burning to death in front of him, but Fielding thought it was so humorous he used a crude phrase to get a laugh from his brave boys. This supports MacGregor's argument. The siege at Seascope cottage near Port Arthur on 28 & 29 April 1996 was a **planned police exercise**.

¹⁴⁵ This centre was established during the primeministership (1972-75) of Gough Whitlam. In 1978, it was involved with the bombing in Sydney, NSW. (see *HILTON HOTEL BOMBING* at Part 3)

¹⁴⁶ Attorney-General's Department. *Annual Report 1995-96*: pp. 118, 119. (ag.gov.au/Documents/7AR1995_AnnualReportBody2.pdf)

147 This witness who saw the gunman is an independent citizen and is entitled to and should say exactly what he saw. Officials must never tell a witness what he/she can or can not say, verbally or in writing. This is the wording that appears in the *Witness Statement* (7 June 1996) of John Godfrey: "Other than hearing the firing and seeing him drive from the area I did not see any person shoot another. In my opinion the picture I saw in the newspapers was **not** the same person." (added emphasis)

148 This bias against Martin Bryant was something Jarvis had before he arrived at the home of Mr. & Mrs. Godfrey. Jarvis could have acquired his bias from his cop colleagues, all of whom would have experienced internal organisational (police) pressure to get Bryant, as well as from the mass media onslaught which defined him – **in words and images** – as the evil gunman. Imagine how many biased cops went out to get witness statements and during that process influenced the content of those statements – influenced them in a way that was negative for Martin Bryant. Once having the suspect, the hunt was on solely to obtain incriminating evidence. Any **evidence to the contrary was totally ignored**. In fact, there was a plethora of evidence that Bryant could not possibly have been the gunman, but that **evidence has always been ignored** by officials – but not by decent moral people.

149 Police station c.10 kilometres east of central Hobart.

150 Just before Pears was taken (the exact reason why Pears was taken is not public knowledge), the gunman killed four people who had been travelling in a gold-coloured BMW sedan. The gunman then drove that BMW to a small local store outside PAHS. It was there that Glenn Pears was forced into the boot/trunk of the BMW after which the gunman shot Pears' female companion who was seated in a stationary white Corolla sedan. The gunman then drove the BMW to Seascope cottage with Pears in the boot/trunk.

WHO TORCHED THE BMW & SEASCOPE – AND WHY

It was from the Vietnam veteran John Godfrey who we first gained the knowledge that **the two fires at Seascope cottage were actually ignited by the Tasmania Police**.

John Godfrey had been interviewed and his *police* statement taken by det.-const. T. D. JARVIS on Friday the 7th of June 1996. When shown a photograph of Martin Bryant, Godfrey was adamant that **the photograph was not of the Port Arthur gunman**. Det. Jarvis then spoke and implied the following: *You cannot say that as everybody knows that Martin Bryant was the gunman.*¹⁴⁷ *How about we say that in your opinion, the photographs in the newspapers was not the person you saw at Port Arthur.* Godfrey permitted the detective Jarvis to influence his *police* statement.¹⁴⁸

After taking that statement off John Godfrey, Mrs. Godfrey invited Jarvis to partake in a cup of tea, which Jarvis accepted and the three of them, John and Mrs. Godfrey and the detective sat around the kitchen table. Then that detective dropped his bombshell.

Jarvis told them that he had been told, whilst in the messroom of the Bellerive Police Station,¹⁴⁹ that the reason why the BMW had been set alight **was to negate it as a means of escape by the gunman inside Seascope cottage**. Jarvis said that he was also told [by police colleagues] that the reason why Seascope cottage was set on fire **was to force the gunman from the building**. I doubt it was coincidental that detective-sergeant Andrew Mark Fogarty was stationed at the Bellerive Police Station.

Of course, the first thought that emerges from this is that Martin Bryant was charged with setting the two fires at Seascope cottage, and yet police had admitted prior to June 1996 that the acts of arson were by the police – **not Martin Bryant**.

What is more, photographic evidence demonstrates that the BMW was bogged up to its axles and thus couldn't have been used as a get-away vehicle. So there had to be another reason for setting that hijacked vehicle alight.

Again, one must consider **the total destruction of evidence** that would have been found within these two objects – the BMW vehicle and Seascope cottage. However there is one far more sinister and horrendous fact that must be considered.

On the afternoon of 29th April 1996, after the fire at Seascope cottage had been extinguished by the local fire brigade, and police moved in to search the remnants of that building, the police located the bodies of the owners of the cottage, David and Sally Martin, and allegedly the remnants of many firearms.

But the police were **unable to find the body of Glenn Pears** who had been taken hostage.¹⁵⁰ It was not until the following day, when the coroner Ian Matterson was on duty elsewhere, that the body was found.

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Furthermore, with regard to the deaths of those three persons murdered at Seascope cottage, there were **no pathology reports** prepared and released. There was nothing to corroborate the statement made to the Hobart Supreme Court that Pears had been shot. Nor is there any evidence confirming that the body of Pears was found inside Seascope cottage.

Had Glenn Pears been murdered by being shot (twice) whilst in the boot of the BMW, that would have presented no major problems for the coroner.¹⁵¹ However, considering all the aspects of locating the body of Pears, and the total lack of pathology evidence, it can be assumed that he was not shot. It seems **Glenn Pears was burnt to death by the police whilst trapped in the boot/trunk of the hijacked BMW sedan.**¹⁵²

Given the hostage Glen Pears was murdered, the question is who actually did it. Was it SOG member Sgt. **Andrew Mark Fogarty** who had the flares and who admitted using them? Or was it Sgt. **Michael Charles Dyson**, who it seems played the part of *Rick* inside Seascope? Or was it both of them?

Andrew S. MacGregor
email to editor
19 October 2012
(amended; added emphasis)

*Everything that Andrew MacGregor has stated above is credible. It is the official narrative that is not credible. That take-it-and-believe-it tale is not what **Truth** and **Justice** are about. Before Martin Bryant exited that cottage and was arrested, definitive sounding statements about him were made by officials as well as gullible others in their sway. Before he was wrongly charged, he was declared guilty and his image was printed in newspapers along with demonizing remarks. Distortion and deception were full on, right in the public's face. Both fires were part of this. It is not difficult to comprehend they were essential to setting up Bryant. If that BMW was not burnt, it could have been determined that his fingerprints were not in the vehicle.¹⁵³ A cop could have shot an incendiary device into the interior of that BMW as the driver door was (intentionally?) left open.¹⁵⁴ And for the same reason and others, the cottage had to be torched. Fogarty claims one of the flares he fired failed to function, but he could have deliberately shot one through the upper level windows the glass of which had been purposefully smashed. It is inconceivable that Martin Bryant with his mentality of an 11-year old and IQ of 66: overpowered the owners of Seascope; tied then gagged Mr. Martin; made a meal as Jamie claims he did; chased a naked woman around the cottage yard; had many phone conversations with the cop negotiator; kept the heavily-armed and seige-trained SOG at bay for nearly 18 hours overnight; changed his clothes several times; used the toilet no one knows how many times; smashed upper windows of the cottage then hurled furniture below; stabbed, bludgeoned, and shot his dinner companions; protected the "main man"; set himself ablaze because he had nothing else to do; etc. Do you believe all that? And all that after allegedly taking a hostage, carjacking a BMW he couldn't drive, killing/wounding 58 people between the Broad Arrow Café and the cottage, in the manner of a psychopath trained in military-style murder. – ed.*

¹⁵¹ The coroner could have ignored where the body was found. Or, he could have declared that Pears was shot whilst inside the BMW.

¹⁵² On the American television network NBC, a news piece titled *Port Arthur Massacre* was broadcast on the **Today** programme at c.7:00 p.m. on 29 April 1996. It was then c.9:00 a.m. on 30 April 1996 at Port Arthur. A video of that story (7 mins 3 secs) can be viewed on youtube.com. Almost at the end (6 mins 50 secs) of that video, the following is stated: "...there were three hostages in the cottage when he set it aah on fire and they found two bodies." But no news reader in the United States knew with certainty there were three hostages in the cottage. That was a concocted story which was placed in the international news system by some news or police employee in Australia. No one saw Pears go into Seascope cottage – it is an unproved conclusion. That cops did find two bodies plus a large number of burnt bits and pieces of weapons and ammunition in the cottage is credible. (How all those weapons and ammunition got there is another suggestive story.) To find two bodies as well as all those bits of metal, quite a few being small, and not to find a third body tells us a lot. The cops did not find the third body inside the cottage because it was not there. It was located elsewhere as MacGregor says. Everything points to the body of Mr. Pears having been found inside the boot/trunk of the burnt BMW.

¹⁵³ In his *Witness Statement* (no date), the cop Paul Hyland says this: "I could see a brown vehicle similar to a BMW sedan. This vehicle was stopped on the grass lawn beside one of the buildings, facing east. This vehicle was on fire and there was heavy black smoke coming from the vehicle. The rear half of the vehicle had not caught fire at this stage."

¹⁵⁴ Prior to driving this BMW, the gunman drove a Volvo out of PAHS. The cops did not collect fingerprints from that vehicle as they would not have matched Bryant's. The cops left that Volvo, with one window missing, uncovered the night of 28 April 1996. This **ensured** the evening condensation ruined all the gunman's fingerprints on and in that vehicle.

Consider the career of the retired Tasmania Police sergeant, Michael Charles Dyson. He joined the Tasmania Police in 1974, and the SOG in 1985. In 1990 as a senior member and the only full-time member of Tasmania Police SOG, Michael Dyson, at the time with 16 years policing experience and five of those years with the SOG, was seconded to train New Zealand police officers at the New Zealand Police College near Dunedin for their inclusion in their Armed Offenders Squad. It was reported in New Zealand, that in regard to the Aramoana massacre on 13 November 1990: "an anti-terrorist unit was in the area helping to co-ordinate the scene."¹⁵⁵ Apparently Michael Dyson was part of this anti-terrorist team.

Dyson was the team commander at Pelverata, Tasmania, when the SOGs were involved in the killing of Joe Gilewicz (see Part 3) who was fatally shot by constable Michael Fogarty.¹⁵⁶

Interestingly, we learn from the inquiry transcript¹⁵⁷ that when Dyson left the SOG unit in 1995¹⁵⁸ – before the Port Arthur terrorist attack – he was posted to a Tasmania Police special section which was involved directly in, "counter terrorist exercises."¹⁵⁹ It was in this rather covert section, that Dyson spent his remaining time in Tasmania Police, being "involved in the development of the violent incident management plan."¹⁶⁰

About his involvement, Dyson has said: "I was being given an opportunity to go to the more strategic level and become involved in the overall command of violent incidents **which is my passion....**"¹⁶⁰

In other words, Michael Dyson told the commission of inquiry that he was posted to a unit directly involved in "counter terrorist exercises," and that he was involved in that unit's planning aspect for "violent incident management plan," the plans mentioned and used by superintendent Bob Fielding, Geoff Easton, and all the other players in Australia's worst massacre. Dyson describes his move as a "more strategic level," and then describes his involvement in regard to command of violent incidents as a **passion**. I would suspect that he means his passion would be in regard to the command and management of violent incidents rather than the victims thereof, so consider this aspect.

In regard to the Port Arthur massacre, the most violent incident ever to occur within Australia, let alone Tasmania, the first and only time that the plans for an **anti-terrorist** situation were implemented, sergeant Michael Dyson, the former SOG assault team leader, the only SOG member with any siege experience, **was not available to assist** the SOGs in their part of the exercise, and the required drills that had been planned by Dyson.

Dyson would have known the area around Seascope having previously been involved with the various SOG training exercises carried out in the area. He would have been aware of all the difficulties such as topography and radio communications that would beset the SOGs. But it appears that Dyson's passion would not be fulfilled on that particular day – **or was it?**

¹⁵⁵ See crime.co.nz: *The Aramoana Massacre*. Aramoana is a small coastal settlement c.27 kilometres north of Dunedin on the south island of New Zealand.

¹⁵⁶ See the book *Disquiet* (2007) by Paul Tapp & Part 3 for details.

¹⁵⁷ Commission of Inquiry relating to the Death of Joseph Gilewicz; *Transcript*; Hobart: Department of Justice; 7 September 2000.

¹⁵⁸ On p. 409 of the Inquiry transcript – see note 43 of transcript – Dyson states this when asked about his departure from SOG: "I think it would have been around about maybe 1995. It could have been 1994."

¹⁵⁹ On p. 409 of the Inquiry transcript – see note 55 of transcript.

¹⁶⁰ On p. 426 of the Inquiry transcript – see note 55 of transcript.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

We are aware that Martin Bryant had a mate with him at Seascapes cottage, someone called Rick. When we read of the various comments made by Martin in regard to Rick, then we become aware that they were old mates, and perhaps they had even shot together at one of the various target-shooting ranges in the area. We are also aware that whoever was with Martin, that person was well aware of the various tactics and drills performed by the Tasmania Police SOGs, and had similar equipment to the SOGs such as **night viewing equipment**, and **laser sights**. This equipment was not discovered in the charred ruins of Seascapes, and so presumably must have left with – been taken away by – Rick.

It is highly suggestive that Martin Bryant would have had to have changed his clothing at least **three times**. His clothes on the drive to Port Arthur were different from the clothes worn by the gunman at the historic site. At Seascapes, acting sergeant Craig Harwood said: "The offender was **dressed in black**."¹⁶¹ But when Bryant emerged on fire from the burning cottage, he was, according to Harwood: "dressed in blue jeans, a blue jumper and a red, white and blue striped shirt or similar."¹⁶¹ It is quite possible that Rick was also **dressed in black**. But, back to Martin Bryant inside Seascapes and talking with the police negotiator Terry McCarthy:

JAMIE: Yeah, while I'm on the phone um Rick's wondering how did the ABC actually get in touch with me.
MCCARTHY: Rick was Rick actually wondering that?¹⁶²

This little comment by *Jamie* does tend to demonstrate that he had an easy friendly relationship with Rick. But now consider this gem:

JAMIE: Uh well I'm well up 'til now and the past few twenty seconds. What I've actually found out man is that one of your boys is right outside North East I'd say. With an infra-red scope. **I've got one up here** that I've found from this person own um owns this property, he's shining right towards me. If he doesn't leave can you just ask him to move on, cause he's gonna shoot he's trying to shoot he's gonna shoot **your main man**.¹⁶²

Now the questions to be asked here are, just who was *Jamie* concerned about getting shot by the SOG marksman, as *Jamie* infers that the target inside the cottage is someone other than himself, and thus more than likely, Rick. But it is the description of the target to the Tasmania Police negotiator, in that the marksman was going to shoot the Tasmania Police's **main man**. That man has to be Rick, and *Jamie* has just told us that **Rick was a main member of the Tasmania Police**.

Thus, my question is this: What is the possibility that the person inside Seascapes cottage with Martin Bryant, aka *Jamie*, who *Jamie* called *Rick*, was actually a Tasmania Police Special Operations Group member known by the name of *Mick*?¹⁶³ ■

(amended; added emphasis)

¹⁶¹ Craig Harwood. *Witness Statement*; 9 August 1996.

¹⁶² Transcript (28 April 1996) of the audio-taped dialogue between police sergeant Terry McCarthy in Hobart and *Jamie* believed to be the pseudonym used for Bryant **and at least one other person** at Seascapes during the siege there, 28-29 April 1996, by the Tasmania Police SOG.

¹⁶³ Michael/Mick Dyson, then a member of the Tasmania Police who admitted to a commission of inquiry in 2000 that **his passion** was being "involved in the overall command of violent incidents"; see note 160.

PLUNDERING OF MARTIN BRYANT'S ASSETS

IN an unprecedented move Martin Bryant's million dollar estate that was left to him by an older woman friend who apparently thought a great deal of him and wanted him to live comfortably when she died, **was confiscated** by the court soon after he was charged. Never had this happened before, in fact they changed the law so that they could do this.

The intention was, so we were told, to provide compensation for the victims of the massacre. Provide compensation for the victims from the estate of a man who had not yet been tried and proven guilty? **To this day I have not had one survivor tell me that they saw any of this money.** All this preposterous action did was to deprive a man of funds for a decent defence. Never heard of before.

This decision was made before his trial and while he should still have been considered innocent. He was relatively **left penniless** and unable to afford a lawyer. Because of this [enforced] impoverishment he was appointed a lawyer who was very reluctant to take the case. The lawyer later resigned himself from the case after being threatened by the public for defending a madman. Another state lawyer was appointed who obviously had little experience since none of the very convincing evidence in these pages was collected or consequently presented during the hearing.

In fact **his counselling to Martin was that he was going to jail anyway and if he pleaded guilty he could have a comfortable cell with a colour TV but if he didn't do as he was told he'd get no TV.** Now to an intellectually handicapped man like Martin Bryant to live the rest of your life without television would be a very powerful motive for pleading guilty and I believe that that is the only way they got him to do it.

It is without a doubt that Bryant's estate was confiscated in order to deter some clever lawyer from earning his money and digging up the truth on the Port Arthur Massacre and declaring Bryant **the patsy** that he obviously was. The media had whipped up such frenzy around Martin that very few lawyers were willing to be the hated defender of a mass murderer but with a million dollar estate behind him I'm sure he would have found someone who would have been persuaded to earn a healthy fee.¹⁶⁴

Ned Wood

The Port Arthur massacre conspiracy
members.iinet.net.au

2 September 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

164 Ned Wood raises another of the appalling truthful facts of the case. One way or another, the State was going to get Martin Bryant to take the blame for the entire incident at and near Port Arthur. He was not going to be permitted to engage an effective lawyer. But in addition to this is the shocking fact that in all of Australia there was not one lawyer who went and stood with Martin to protect him. The entire legal community in Australia sat on its collective arse and watched as every applicable legal precept and law was ignored and/or circumvented, all so **a 66-IQ person could be set up** then imprisoned until he dies of despair, dementia, and drugs forced into him at Risdon Prison. This whole abomination proves yet again that **lawyers have no interest in Truth and Justice.** If they did, they could not be lawyers. There is a profession of money-grubbing mongrels having no higher calling. The following is attributed to Martin Luther King (1929-1968): "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly." It seems lawyers in Australia have got themselves caught in a network of greed, not one of standing up for Truth and Justice.


*Think about this – To stop Martin Bryant from engaging a lawyer who would defend him, Tasmanian officials just went to his accounts and cleaned him out. Took everything which **was legally his.** Everything. So then, those mongrels had poor Martin cornered and defenceless – with: no lawyer; no money; no legally-required guardian; no political connections; and, his bewildered brain. All the while, the media and the public were yelling **CRUCIFY THE BASTARD!** So they did. – ed.*

MY STORY – CHAPTER 16

Carleen Bryant

2010: pp. 128-144

*There were a large number of direct and indirect victims as a result of the Port Arthur Massacre. Many have spoken out, but one of them has remained silent: Bryant's mother Carleen.*¹⁶⁵



BEING Martin's mother, I had the experience and insight to tell when he was agitated. Over the years, if someone or something was putting pressure on him,¹⁶⁶ this is how he would react: his stress would be visible in his agitation and I could clearly see when this was happening to him. After Martin returned from the last trip abroad,¹⁶⁷ I noticed that he was very restless, agitated, and worrying about something, although he would not disclose what it was. I did not receive the usual pleasant welcome when I visited him. He asked how long I intended to stay, obviously not wanting company. He gave me the impression that I was imposing on his privacy. I wondered why he was behaving in this manner.¹⁶⁸

On Sunday 28 April 1996 a gunman opened fire at and around the Port Arthur Historic Site, about 100 kilometres south-east of Hobart and on the Tasman Peninsula. In total, 35 people were killed and many injured in a siege which lasted two days. The shooter moved across several crime locations. High powered semi-automatic weapons were used. I first hear of the massacre on television as I was walking through a local Glenorchy shopping centre. It was announced that the shooter was alleged to have been driving a yellow Volvo, as Martin did at this time. The media became the messenger of scattered information to the general public, although due to poor communications on the Tasman Peninsula and a delayed police reaction to the massacre, news reports covering the events could hardly be deemed to have been accurate at that early stage.

¹⁶⁵ From the back cover of the book *My Story*. Michael Ludeke of Ludeke Publishing* is commended for giving Carleen Bryant a way of expressing her feelings and beliefs related to a terribly tragic story in which her son Martin was ensnared then persecuted and imprisoned **without a trial**. Carleen Bryant's prayer for all those affected by the tragic incident at Port Arthur appears in Part 1 of the book. (* Hobart; ludek publishing.com.au)

¹⁶⁶ This should have been investigated as part of a trial or public inquiry. But corrupt officials do not want you to know anything about someone or something putting pressure on Martin Bryant – it would ruin their concocted *lone-nut* gunman story. Prior to the shooting, Martin had an intimate relationship with a young woman called Petra Willmott. She gave a *Witness Statement*, in fact she gave five such statements. This is what she said in her statement of 28 April 1996: **“Martin didn't have a lot of friends but the only enemy I know he has is a male called Tiger. This male calls Martin up. Martin doesn't like to answer the phone as he thinks it may be this Tiger. I don't know who Tiger is or why Martin doesn't like him.”** (added emphasis) So this person called Tiger had been phoning and intimidating Martin. But officials in Tasmania do not want you to know the real name of Tiger, or what he was saying to Martin that worried him so much that he disliked answering the phone. Might this person have been Hans Overbeeke, or Gerard Dutton, or Michael/Mick/Rick Dyson?

¹⁶⁷ On p. 125 of her book, Carleen Bryant says: “In late 1995 Martin's travel ceased.”

¹⁶⁸ Martin might have had to report to **Tiger** and his mother being there was stopping him from doing that.

169 Martin Bryant was taken to that hospital from Seascope cottage on Monday, 29 April 1996. There are various descriptions of him and his clothing being ablaze when he exited that cottage. Carleen Bryant does not give the date she first saw her son. But she does say it was in the prison hospital at Risdon. Mrs. Bryant makes it clear her son was in pain as **his back** had been badly burnt. Regardless, Martin Bryant had been **tied to a wheelchair with leather straps**. That would have increased pressure on his burns and it can only be described as official torture. Martin spent six days in the Royal Hobart Hospital. So if he was in great pain when his mother saw him at the prison hospital, then it is reasonable to conclude that his pain must have been even more extreme during those first six days he spent at Royal Hobart Hospital. When the badly burnt Bryant arrived there, some people say he was under the influence of a mind-altering drug. He had made statements which were nonsensical. And it is reasonable to conclude that at the Royal Hobart Hospital he was given sedatives and pain-killers for his severely burnt back. So for the first week, Martin must have been in shock over his predicament. This would have been compounded by the effect of all the drugs given to him. It is reasonable to believe Martin was **out of it** not knowing exactly what was going on around him and to him. And, it also seems that anyone who knew him – his mother, his girlfriend, *etc.* – was cruelly **not permitted** to visit him. Mentally-handicapped Martin was deliberately isolated. But that never stopped questionable Paul E. Mullen getting access to Martin. And just five days after being implicated in a police siege and house fire, and being severely burnt and hospitalized, and being drugged with pain-killers and sedatives, and being accused of killing and wounding over 50 people, that psychiatrist said* the dimwitted, drugged, and disoriented burn victim was guilty of all the killing and wounding at Port Arthur Historic Site and at Seascope Cottage. Mullen also used the phrase “lengthy incarceration.” Next day, Martin Bryant was sent to the prison at Risdon – **FOREVER**. (* *Psychiatric Report – Martin Bryant, Date of Birth 7/5/66*. Bryant was actually born in 1967.)

At 8:00 p.m. on the evening of 28 April two policemen arrived at my home and asked: “Do you have a son named Martin Bryant?” When I said that I did they took me directly to Tasmania Police headquarters in Liverpool Street, Hobart, for questioning. The officers bombarded me with questions about Martin’s big house in New Town and his overseas trips. They told me that they believed he may have been implicated in the shocking incidents that had occurred at Port Arthur.

My initial and immediate thoughts were that this scenario was not at all possible. It was like a relentless invasion by something foreign to what I knew. My world was being attacked by information that made no sense to me. Numbness and disbelief gripped me and I was in such a distraught state that, looking back, I have no recollection of how long the questioning by the police continued. I later learned that whilst I was being questioned by the police, **a man who had not spoken to Martin since he was 12 years** old had “assisted” the police by identifying my son’s voice during a telephone conversation between police negotiators and the Seascope cottage. This made no sense to me as the man could not possibly know what Martin’s mature voice sounded like.

After Martin was captured and arrested, I passed the following weeks in somewhat of a shocked trance. I was emotionally shattered and drained. I can never express adequately how this affected me. At the time, I just wanted to distance myself from the awful scenario. It was like watching an awful drama on television and, in despair, I just wanted it all to end. Thinking of all of those innocent people who had been affected was so painful.

How could the world possibly acknowledge the pain and suffering of all of the families who had lost loved ones, and the grief I had to live with knowing that my son had been arrested and charged with these horrific crimes. I felt the heartache and pain of all of those people who were suffering loss. The pain had become emotionally wrenching. Martin spent a couple of days at the Royal Hobart Hospital¹⁶⁹ being treated for burns before being taken to the Risdon Prison hospital. When I was finally allowed to see him I saw my son, badly burned in the Seascope fire and still in great pain, **bound to his wheelchair by leather straps**. Martin told me he had asked to have the painful restraints removed but his request was refused. When I asked Martin who refused, one of the prison officers leaned towards me and told me: “You cannot discuss the prison staff.”

At the time of the massacre, [my daughter] Lindy was living and working in Western Australia. Within days she had journalists knocking on her door and trying to gain information from her about our family and, especially, Martin. Lindy refused to answer the door and within a few days her friends helped her to pack her belongings and relocate to try to escape harassment from the media. Lindy requested time away from work to cope with the stress and heartache of what had occurred, but when she returned to work the media found her again and continued to hassle her. Lindy changed jobs and moved again to a new town, where she was again confronted by a journalist.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

In an effort to protect her, good friends and co-workers refused to acknowledge her existence to the pestering media. At one stage the persistent harassment made Lindy physically ill to the point that she was vomiting. On one occasion, she was even chased home by a journalist. Lindy was trying to get on with her life and her job while still struggling to come to terms with the massacre. She often suffered from dark days to the point where she did not know if she was able to continue on in life.

After the massacre, David Gunson QC was appointed as Martin's defence lawyer.¹⁷⁰ On 2 October 1996, Gunson stood aside, not wishing to continue in this capacity [or the conspiracy?]. John Avery was then appointed to represent Martin. **Martin was held in solitary confinement at Risdon Prison for approximately 120 days** and Avery visited him several times during this period.¹⁷¹ On one occasion Avery offered to take me to visit Martin. As we left home, the media were outside and he agreed to speak to them on my behalf. I hoped that they would then move on and not keep hounding me relentlessly. After arriving at the prison we were taken to Martin's cell. I soon discovered why I was there. On his previous visits, Avery had been unsuccessful in persuading Martin to plead guilty. He thought that if I could help to **encourage Martin to change his plea**, perhaps something could be done for him.¹⁷²

The general sentiment of the time was that since the perpetrator had been apprehended it would help ease the suffering of the survivors if they did not have to experience the pain of a public criminal trial. The media followed this sentiment with their reporting and **I was under great emotional pressure to convince Martin to plead guilty**. It was believed that a trial would cause undue suffering to those who had already suffered enough.¹⁷³ To this day, **I am ashamed to say that I told Martin he would never see Lindy or me again unless he pleaded guilty**.

I was wrestling with the emotions of everything that had happened. It had taken me some time to realise the enormity of the destruction that had taken place on that fateful day. I struggled, I guess as any parent would do, to cope with the thoughts of Martin being responsible for what took place at Port Arthur, the slaughter and injury of so many innocent people.

I know my son and it is difficult to imagine him being able to plan these events. Psychologists determined that Martin's IQ was that of an 11-year-old. **He could not even plan his overseas travel**. He would fly to one country and then decide on the spur of the moment where to visit next. He struggled with simple things such as how to remove a wheel from a bicycle, how to construct something from a Meccano set or build a simple airplane such as young boys enjoy making. Martin could drive an automatic car but he could never sit for a driver's licence. I wondered why it was that Martin was initially questioned **without** having a lawyer present. These were, after all, horrendous charges and at no time should he have been questioned without legal assistance, especially given his intellectual impairment which would have been quite obvious from the start.

¹⁷⁰ Martin Bryant seems to have had no input into this appointment. By law, a **guardianship order** applied to him but this was wilfully ignored by officials. Andrew S. MacGregor stated the following at Inverell, Victoria, at the *Conspiracies and Coverups* forum conducted on 24 March 2001: "In his report on Martin Bryant that was read to the Supreme Court on the 20th November 1996, Mullen refers to the fact that Martin Bryant was put on a **guardianship order** by the Hobart Court in October [November?] 1993. That the case was actually heard in camera (private) by the judge on the 22nd of April 1994, was not mentioned by Mullen, nor the fact that the application was brought under the *Mental Health Act*, or the fact that Bryant was represented by solicitors from the firm Griffiths & Jackson of Hobart, due to the simple fact that Martin Bryant was not present at that court on that day because he was in London. What the **guardianship order** states emphatically and this is something the learned professor should have been well aware of, was that the court considered Martin Bryant, due to his mental inability, **was not competent** to make any plea in relation to the charges he was facing in November 1996." (added emphasis)

¹⁷¹ Various numbers appear in the case literature. It seems Avery visited Martin Bryant over a dozen times before he browbeat his victim into having Avery change Martin's original innocent plea to Avery's guilty plea.

¹⁷² Martin Bryant was doomed once Avery submitted a guilty plea. Martin got nothing (certainly not the truth in a trial) and was sentenced to prison, with no parole, with no hope – **NEVER TO BE RELEASED ALIVE**. It seems that Martin Bryant, who was not fully informed, did not have a complete understanding of the outcome of a guilty plea. It seems that **he believed there would be a trial** regardless of what plea was entered.

¹⁷³ Martin Bryant, **mentally-handicapped and with an IQ of 66**, was put into prison for life because Avery **did not conduct himself ethically**. Avery was only interested in appeasing the public and pleasing his paymaster, not defending Martin.

174 Fatally shot inside the Broad Arrow Café at Port Arthur Historic Site on 28 April 1996.

175 Like so much in the case, these statements are deceptive – perhaps intentionally. To say Martin Bryant “did not make any statement,” suggests he could have if he wanted to, but he did not which implies Bryant knew he was guilty. And to say that he was “awake and aware” means nothing in a legal sense. Bliss had to say this to try and stop people thinking about the possibility that Bryant was asleep, possibly drugged at the time he was charged. That Bryant might have been awake and aware there were people standing near his bed, does not mean he knew what was going on, what he was charged with, why he was charged, what his rights were, what he could have said, etc. Bliss wants you to think that everything was done correctly by law – but it was **not** done correctly. The associated true facts prove Bryant: should **not** have been charged so quickly after being apprehended; should **not** have been charged as an investigation had **not** been completed; should **not** have been charged because his legally-required guardian was absent; etc. Also note that Bryant was forced to lie on his back – on his **3rd-degree burns**. He must have been pumped full of painkillers which would have diminished his already limited capacity to think.

176 This gutless lawyer allowed her corrupt legal colleagues to dictate her role, which Rigby was quick to ditch fearing public condemnation. She was replaced by David Gunson, who also ditched Bryant as a client because Martin insisted on pleading **his innocence**. Then there was the criminal lawyer John Avery. Saying Martin could converse and was coherent **does not** mean that this person with a 66 IQ understood anything which was going on around him or was being legally done to him. Rigby is guilty as all the other corrupt officials who took part in the **setting up of the innocent Martin Bryant**.

177 Freeman thought this was an amusing little note in her article related to the killing of 35 people and the charging of Bryant with murder.

BRYANT CHARGED WITH MURDER

MARTIN Bryant lay on his back yesterday just metres away from people he had shot and their numbed relatives. The victims and their attacker shared the small Intensive Care Unit on the first floor of the Royal Hobart Hospital. An ICU nurse said Bryant was in an isolation room, a walled-off section of the ICU which was one big ward. She said Bryant was in **considerable pain** from his burns but did not need to be in the ICU for medical reasons. He was placed there by the police for security reasons.

Police and security staff were on duty, but a hospital spokesman said a rumour that the police wanted to remove Bryant to a prison hospital for his own safety was untrue and he would remain at the Royal Hobart.

Yesterday at about 11 a.m., Bryant was charged with one count of murdering **Kate Elizabeth Scott**¹⁷⁴ and remanded in custody to appear in the Hobart Magistrate’s Court on May 22, at 9:15 a.m. The court was convened in Bryant’s small room which one nurse described as a “curtained isolation room usually reserved for infectious diseases.” The magistrate, Mr. Peter Dixon, was present along with the Crown prosecutor, the defence lawyer, a court clerk and security officers. Bail was not applied for.

Mr. David Bliss, the administrator at the Hobart Magistrate’s Court, said Bryant lay silently on his back throughout the proceedings. “He definitely **did not make any statement** during the hearing,” Mr. Bliss said. “He was definitely **awake and aware**.”¹⁷⁵ **Bryant’s Legal Aid representative**, Ms Deborah Rigby, said she was acting for Bryant only temporarily. “I did converse with him and he was coherent,” she said.¹⁷⁶

There was a security guard on the hospital’s front door but the public could wander freely around its old-fashioned and slightly battered corridors. In the cafeteria (**chicken pie and fried rice specials**¹⁷⁷), the two main topics of conversation were Martin Bryant and the media frenzy out the front.

One hospital staff member said the hospital was still “stunned.” “Yesterday it was hard to function,” she said. Hospital staff reacted angrily to the media scattered over the hospital forecourt. “**They breed like rabbits – they’re jackals**,” one nurse said. “Last night when the relatives were being flown over and brought into the hospital to identify the bodies, the media was storming them trying to get photographs.”

The mood in the busy hospital corridors was still slightly excited, despite one policeman’s assertion that the third day after a tragedy is usually a “low day.” Nurses and volunteers stood in excited knots discussing the hospital bomb threats. There was also anger. Someone had scrawled “**AN EYE FOR AN EYE!**” in giant black letters on the white [exterior] wall of the hospital.

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Hospital spokesman, Mr. Gary Knight, said the switchboard had received **many calls threatening Bryant**, using phrases like "I know how to treat him." However, the hospital's pledge to "the care and comfort of all" was tested when they had to tend to a **mass murderer**.¹⁷⁸

The ICU nurse said the unit was usually committed to healing "mind, body and spirit." "In this case I don't think anyone would be very worried about his spirit," she said. "**But if someone really doesn't want to treat him, they are not forced to.**" Ms Chris Tilyard, serving in the kiosk in the foyer, said: "**I don't understand why they just didn't shoot the man.**"¹⁷⁹ It's very hard for the doctor treating him." Bryant is expected to be moved to a burns unit in the hospital within a few days and may require skin grafts.

The hospital chaplain, Mr. Gerald O'Brien, said the chaplains were very busy but were willing to counsel Bryant. "**We will all do as much as we can for him.**"¹⁸⁰

Jane Freeman

hobartdoctor.com.au

17 December 2012

original: Sydney Morning Herald; 30 April 1996
(amended; original capitals; added emphasis)

*This article is one of the most revealing how criminally corrupt the Tasmanian legal system was/is. The article states the following: "Yesterday, at about 11 am, Bryant was charged with one count of murdering **Kate Elizabeth Scott.**" Now, according to facts presented at the Emergency Management Australia seminar, Martin Bryant was **apprehended at 8:35** on Monday, 29 April 1996. Given the severe burns on his back, he was taken to the Royal Hobart Hospital. So Martin's burns were given first-aid, then he was placed into the rear of an ambulance, then he was driven to Hobart. All that would have taken about c.90 minutes, possibly longer given the uncertain situation at Seascapes cottage where he was apprehended. So this means, Martin would have been admitted to the hospital sometime between 10:00 and 10:30. Then 30 minutes later "at about 11 am," **before any investigator had questioned Bryant, and before any serious investigation was completed**, he was charged with a serious crime. The siege only ended at 8:35 on Monday morning. Yet, some official was on the phone to have the legal paper work hurriedly prepared. (Or were those papers already prepared waiting to be used? Similar to the State having the gun-control legislation ready to go.) Some official sent a magistrate, the prosecutor, a defence lawyer, a clerk, the court administrator, and possibly other officials to the hospital so the bureaucratic process of charging poor innocent Martin with murder could be done, according to the corrupt Tasmanian legal system, "at about 11 am." **No** legally required guardian was with him. **No** member of his family, or relative or friend, was with him. Confused, drugged, in pain, in bed, under guard, and intellectually challenged, he was declared the killer. It was rushed so disgustingly fast it was all **another official Tasmanian crime** in itself. Think about it. – ed.*

¹⁷⁸ This article was first published by The Sydney Morning Herald on 30 April 1996 – thus "yesterday" was the day the siege at Seascapes ended. On that "yesterday" (29th), there was not a single shred of evidence that Bryant was the gunman, and there was none the following day (30th). And there still is none to this day. But there is a condemnatory phrase in the Sydney Morning Herald, which is a major newspaper in Australia: "**mass murderer.**" Even if there is a mistake with the date, it makes no significant difference – Bryant would still have been confused, drugged, in pain, in bed, under guard, and with an IQ of 66. His mind would have been clouded with a cocktail of pain-killers and other drugs, and still no thorough investigation would have been completed. The whole concocted corruption was a bang-up sham by the State to give the public the impression that the Port Arthur situation was under control, that the perpetrator was under arrest, and that he **HAD BEEN CHARGED** with murder. No thorough investigation could have been completed in that short time. And, there certainly were no words about Martin Bryant being innocent until proven guilty.

¹⁷⁹ Recall Part 3 of this book. Killing is what all States do and their citizens (military & police) participate in and promote this crime. Before all the evidence is collected and examined, then presented to a jury during a sound trial, a not uncommon reaction is to urge revenge killing: "shoot the man."

¹⁸⁰ In the case literature, this editor has not been able to find any evidence of this Gerald O'Brien taking any steps to assist Martin Bryant. And if this O'Brien did not realize Bryant had the intellect of an 11-year-old boy, then as a chaplain he was unfit for purpose. (Did he ever really speak with Martin?) It seems that this incompetent cross-carrier assisted the feeding of poor Martin Bryant into the maw of the corrupt legal system. Some chaplain.

181 His *Witness Statement* is dated 10 May 1996. This respected local businessman confirmed that the **gunman was not Martin Bryant**.

182 His *Witness Statement* is dated 7 May 1996. He described **a person who was not Martin Bryant**.

183 This corrupt alleged evidence is commonly identified as the Balasko video, after American tourist James Balasko who says he made the original at Port Arthur after the shooting in the café. The video was corrupted before it was broadcast nationally. It shows a blurred image of a gunman. No part of the Balasko video allows viewers to conclusively identify the gunman's face. But in their minds, viewers quickly replaced that unproved identity with the identity of Martin Bryant as they had been told it was Bryant. Another part of this video shows what seems to be a male person running. He too has been identified as the gunman and again wrongly as Martin Bryant. This running person was a PAHS staff member. The gunman in the video wears different clothes to those Bryant wore earlier that day and different to the clothes worn by Bryant at Seascope. A soundtrack of shooting has been added. This creates a false perception of when the video was originally made. For additional details on this corrupt video see the James Balasko section in the book: *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; 2001/4.

184 During his research for this book the editor spoke by phone with many people in Australia. He was shocked by all those who did not know there was **no trial**. Martin was just sentenced then incarcerated. It seems a large number, perhaps the majority of all Australians, **wrongly believe** guilt was proved at a trial. Officials have not taken any steps to correct this false understanding.

185 There was no public examination of all this alleged evidence because **it would not stand up to scrutiny**.

186 Corrupt cops say they found a cache of ammunition and arms at 30 Clare Street. But evidence confirms this alleged evidence was placed inside Bryant's home between 28 April and 3 May 1996.

I was later perplexed by one witness [James Laycock¹⁸¹] who had known Martin for many years and gave evidence. He stated: *I did not recognise the male shooter as Martin Bryant*. Another witness, an ex-RAAF serviceman [Graham Collyer¹⁸²] who survived being shot in the neck in the Broad Arrow Café, noted anomalies about the shooter. He noted that the shooter's hair was died blonde, evidenced by dark roots, whereas Martin's hair was naturally blonde. The witness also noted the shooter was suffering from acne, but Martin's skin was clear and free from any markings. These accounts were in contrast to the many witnesses who identified Martin as the shooter responsible. A video which was allegedly recorded at the time showed a gunman with long blonde hair in the carpark. This video, broadcast on national television, was later identified as a *cut-and-paste job*.¹⁸³

I did find it disappointing, and many people outside of Tasmania do not seem to understand this, that **Martin never had a criminal trial**.¹⁸⁴ His eventual guilty plea meant that he was simply sentenced for the offences **without a trial**. A trial would have been very hard on the small Tasmanian community, reliving the horrific events of those two days, but would also have required a presentation of evidence such as fingerprints, DNA and witness accounts and statements.¹⁸⁵ I was puzzled when, several days after the massacre, it was reported that the police had found a cache of weapons inside a piano at Martin's house. When Martin was away on trips I cleaned his house and would poke around, as mothers tend to do. Martin knew this and also knew that I did not approve of guns. He would never have dared to keep any in the house. It was reported that soon after the massacre two journalists from a prominent newspaper illegally entered Martin's house. **They apparently searched inside the piano and found nothing irregular**.¹⁸⁶

Various theories of conspiracy have existed since 1996, including that of government organisation of the massacre; some kind of group being responsible for the events; Martin being **set up as a patsy**; and even Martin being completely innocent and drugged at Seascope cottage. There were also conspiracy whispers about a **second yellow Volvo** being seen in the area on the day. It is my understanding that **both guns used in the massacre were damaged and could not be tested, and no DNA or fingerprints were taken from the Broad Arrow Café at Port Arthur or Seascope cottage**, which was destroyed by fire.

Colonel Ted Serong DSO OBE, former head of Australian Forces in Vietnam and one of the world's leading experts on counter-terrorist techniques, in an interview with Frank Robson in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on 10 April 1999, said of the Port Arthur gunman: "Whoever did it is better than I am, and there are not too many people around here better than I am. Whoever did it had skills way beyond anything that could reasonably be expected of this chap Bryant." Retired police officer Andrew MacGregor with Wendy Scurr, who was working at Port Arthur and was heavily involved on the day of the massacre, travelled the country giving talks about a **cover-up**. Andrew MacGregor wrote a book *The Massacre at Port Arthur*. [The correct title of this detailed DVD book is *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*.]

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Stewart Beattie, a professional gunsmith, also questioned the police interpretation of events in his [DVD] book *A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur*. In 2010 a social networking site posted a page that suggested a former Tasmania Police officer had been involved at Port Arthur. It was reported that this officer had stated that he had accompanied two detectives to my home on the night of the massacre before accompanying me to Martin's house at 30 Clare Street to deactivate the alarm. The report also stated that after we left to go to police headquarters he stayed at Martin's house by himself. I know nothing of this and the officer publicly denied it.

These theories have always been lurking amidst calls for an enquiry into the massacre as well as Martin's handling following the massacre. I can only say I do not know what happened at Port Arthur. I am only a mother.

There are many questions that I would love to have answered. After all that has happened, Martin is still my son. When it is your own child held responsible for such horrific events and you are desperately grasping at trying to make sense of things, you do consider everything that is presented with some slim hope that it may be a plausible alternative to the reality of the nightmare you are dealing with.¹⁸⁷

I would certainly have suffered a complete breakdown had it not have been for my **supportive friends and wonderful neighbours**, the late Marian and Terry. I was never left alone and always had a loving, caring friend by my side and a shoulder to cry on. Our Anglican parish minister was so very supportive also, and he came every morning for several weeks to bring me comfort.

The events at Port Arthur generated an enormous load of information with enormous implications. My heart went out to all those innocent victims and their families for the awful trauma they were facing. But on the other hand, it seemed to me as if I was being required to answer for these terrible crimes. In effect, I was being implicated in the events at Port Arthur because I was Martin's mother.

A number of kind people organised assistance for me in the wake of Port Arthur. There was always a friend to answer the telephone, which rang constantly, although most of the calls could go to the answering machine and were from the media. For a long time the media camped on the road opposite my home. With their huge trucks and large zoom cameras they waited for the opportunity to film me when I surfaced. I thanked the Lord that my Berriedale home was well back from the main road and very private. Even though the gate was locked, this did not stop one persistent female reporter from climbing over the fence, walking around the house, knocking on windows and calling out my name.

Late in May 1996 I decided that it was time to leave for a quieter place in the country. My neighbours made arrangements for me to leave very early one morning from their place, disguised. My friends met us in Campbell Town and took me to their cottage at Arthur River

¹⁸⁷ Carleen Bryant candidly admits that she does not understand everything she has been confronted with. She wrongly blames herself and says she is "only a mother." But she could not possibly understand everything because so much of what she has been told is a **deceptive cover-up** – lie after lie after lie. It has only been through painstaking investigations by the people* Carleen Bryant names in her book that the public has been given insight into **the most horrific planned mass-murder in modern Australian history**. (* There are other good investigators and expository writers who have worked on the case but who have not been mentioned by Carleen Bryant. There are also devious mongrels who push the official narrative through biased and inaccurate statements. Caution is required.)

188 In 1965, Carleen Cordwell and Maurice Bryant, an immigrant from England, were married at Montrose in Tasmania. From all accounts he was a good husband to Carleen and a good father to their two children Martin and Lindy. He died tragically in 1993. (Without any hard evidence to prove their claims, some people have said Martin was in some way negatively involved with his father's death. This unproved story was/is used in the demonization of Martin.)

189 This police process is understandable, but one that is fraught with potential corruption. If Carleen Bryant had not been able to confirm her son was with her on 12 March 1993, the death of that tourist could have been blamed on Martin. On his own, he probably would not have been able to disprove he caused that death and the cops would have then cleared up a long outstanding case. Clearly, corrupt cops had no qualms about improving their homicide case-resolution statistics at the expense of that (alleged) mass murderer Martin Bryant.

190 This little doorlock episode described by Carleen Bryant is telling. It reveals just how incompetent Martin really is. There he was unable to operate a simple doorlock on a bathroom door, yet the public is expected to believe that he planned and conducted all the incidents which took place at and near Port Arthur on 28 & 29 April 1996. Martin could not figure out a simple doorlock. Martin did not have a vehicle driving licence because he could not pass the test. He could not use a simple Meccano set. But planning then conducting a mass murder and keeping a team of SOGs at bay for 18 hours was just a snap. *No worries mate.*

191 This Tasmanian legislation was adopted with the primary purpose of taking all Martin Bryant's assets. His guilt was never proved in a trial, but regardless the State took everything he had because he had been declared guilty. In addition to being isolated, tortured, and incarcerated, Martin Bryant was then financially gutted to much public approval. It is **beyond outrageous**. What happened to all that money **has never been declared** on an itemized public list. Think about misappropriation.....

in the Tarkine Wilderness of North West Tasmania. I had only my two dogs for company. After 10 days at Arthur River, a feeling of intense isolation, despair and loneliness came over me, so much so that my friend's wife came to take me back to their home. It felt as if these were the loneliest days of my life.

After arriving home from the Tarkine, my only motivation was to hibernate from the world. I dreaded being seen in public, and was always looking over my shoulder, afraid of being recognised. I was even fearful of being seen by my parish church family. However, my wonderful and caring neighbour, Marianne, said to me: "You are going back to church, and I am going with you."

Over the years since his death, it still felt right to talk to my Maurice,¹⁸⁸ often asking him why he had left. I believe that if he had stayed, all of this may not have happened. Maurice's guidance for Martin was such an important influence in his life.

Later in 1996, two inspectors from Tasmania Police visited my home to ask if I could recall what Martin was doing on 12 March 1993.¹⁸⁹ This happened to be the date that Nancy Grunwaldt, a 26-year old German tourist cycling the east coast of Tasmania, was last seen. She, along with her bike and belongings, had disappeared without any trace.

Fortunately, I have kept a diary for many years. I know they needed to solve the crime and had thought, or even hoped, it had been Martin, and then they could proudly have said: "crime solved". On the day that Nancy disappeared, Martin had stayed the evening in my home and the next morning, after a shower, Martin had thought that he was locked in the bathroom. He could not unlock the door and started to panic. I called the closest locksmith who arrived very quickly. The lock was OK, but Martin had been unfamiliar with it.¹⁹⁰ The problem was resolved and Martin was rescued. Nancy's case remains unsolved.

After the massacre and Martin's conviction, legislation was changed in Tasmania to allow the seizure of assets of convicted criminals to contribute towards victims of crime funds. As a result, Martin's assets were taken. This meant that the Clare Street house was sold and Martin's Tattersalls income taken. I received nothing of Martin's assets.¹⁹¹

I received a letter from my brother [Michael John Cordwell; see statement at Part 7] that was hateful and hurtful. Obviously angry with Martin for what had occurred, he directed this hate at me. In his letter he promised me that the only time he would see me again would be at our mother's funeral, and that he would refuse to acknowledge my existence again. Although much anger has been directed at me since 1996, the hurt you feel when your own flesh and blood levels such an attack at you is beyond description.

Despite this, **I have also received many kind and sympathetic letters** since these horrific events, but there was one in particular that really touched my heart. Jane, a dear lady from Canberra, was

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

a gifted and intelligent lady who had been fostered out as a baby, moving from one place to another over the years in Tasmania. Jane would pray that a kind, loving family would adopt her. Unfortunately, and sadly, this never happened. Jane studied nursing and enjoyed singing, mainly Gospel music and also worked in advertising.

Jane later sent a tape of her songs and I have played it many times over the years. She sang to pay for her studies, as well as earning some extra money from modelling. Jane was lectured by the matron for modelling a bridal petticoat for a magazine, but Jane told her the money she earned from the modelling paid for the books she studied.

Jane moved to the mainland and married. The couple had a son. Jane's husband fought in the Vietnam War before returning home a changed person. Awful physical abuse started and poor Jane would spend 12 months in hospital. Her battering and abuse meant that she would never again be the same person, being unable to write and spell words coherently thereafter. To begin with, when we started to correspond, it would take a long time for me to understand her writing, but I now have no trouble.

About four years later Jane married her Prince Charming, Frederick from Norway. They had a beautiful daughter, Marian, who grew into a lovely lady like her mother. When Jane's son was 20, he was killed in a car accident and the family was devastated. When their daughter was 16 she met the wrong person, fell pregnant, and soon discovered that Stan was a drug user and dealer. Marian gave birth to a son. Many times Marian left this man only to be talked into going back. She worked while Stan sold all that he could, even the children's television, to raise money. Stan was served with a domestic violence order to stay away and spent time in prison. Stan sabotaged her work and she had to leave. The staff was very sorry to see her go.

Tragedy would strike again for poor Jane. In July 2003, Marian, along with her children, disappeared, never to be found again. Only her car was found empty in Lake Burley Griffin in Canberra. They were a delightful family. On my last trip away in June 2002, I met and stayed with Jane and Frederick.

This beautiful, kind young lady had sent me a white bear with gold wings and halo. It looked like an angel singing the Lord's Prayer. She also sent a full size white and sable Shetland Collie statue, and I sat him near a window. Those who saw it thought he was a real live dog. We developed a dear friendship and Jane wanted me to know how much her son resembled Martin. One would have almost believed that the pair were twins.

Life is very strange. In September 2008, Martin's lawyer John Avery was jailed for four and a half years with a non-parole period of two years for **130 counts of stealing and misappropriation of more than \$500,000 of clients' funds over a five year period**. John Avery is now in the same prison¹⁹² as Martin. ■

(amended; added emphasis; added italics)

192 It might be ironic that Avery ended up in the same Tasmanian prison into which he wilfully put Martin Bryant. But this Avery has had the last laugh – **at this time** – as he is now out on parole whereas Martin is still literally in a cage at Risdon Prison. But as Mrs. Bryant states, life is strange. Avery is now thinking about the pain and suffering he has inflicted on Martin and his family. The worm of guilt is crawling inside ex-lawyer Avery's guts – and he can't get it out.

ENDING

HERE, there is very little that can be added to what so many people have already declared. The intellectually-handicapped Martin Bryant could not have organized and executed the incident which took place at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, on 28 and 29 April 1996. All of it was beyond him. That he was at Seascap cottage is not denied by anyone. It is what officials claim he did there that is without proof. *Jamie* statements he made* over the Seascap phone are confusing and suggestive of innocence, just as the bizarre statements he made after being apprehended when he exited Seascap then in flames. (* It is believed at least one other male person who identified himself as *Jamie* used the same phone at Seascap.)

Martin Bryant is the **patsy** for the incident at and near Port Arthur. Officially, he is the one who is solely and totally responsible for the incident. This is **absolute nonsense**. Not merely because his dear mother does not believe it, or because many Tasmanians and other Australians do not believe it, or because people around the world do not believe it. It is absolute nonsense because the shocking facts of the incident **reveal and confirm another highly disturbing story**. And it is this story which officials do not want the public to know.

Primarily because of the horrific nature of the incident at Port Arthur, which resulted in the killing of 35 people and another 23 being injured, **the public reaction has been for revenge**. Instead of there being a full determination of the facts, there was an immediate condemnation by the State which encouraged the sensation-hungry media to feed the public's subjective need for harsh punishment. There never was a **reasoned and objective assessment** of everything that happened. Hate-filled accusations and threats of physical violence to Bryant were widely stated and accepted as appropriate.

Bryant was not permitted to plea innocent. The State could not allow a trial because it could not prove his guilt in a sound court. So after enforced isolation and intimidation, and without the presence of a guardian who he was entitled and legally required to have, the State had Bryant worked over by a **complicit criminal lawyer** whose behaviour was the antithesis of ethical legal representation. John Avery condemned then **coerced his client** to accept Avery's plea (guilty), which is what the corrupt State had to have. That the whole process was outside proper legal procedure is well documented. Nothing is more appalling and unacceptable than the fact that Bryant, with his very low IQ, was savaged by officials, some senior ones, under the sham pretence of administering the law. In reality, it was another shocking kangaroo court at work in Australia. **There was no trial**.

As you read this, Martin Bryant is being put to death in Risdon Prison. He is kept all alone in a cage spending long lonely days with the few memories of freedom that he retains. It is said he is a human wreck – **his death by despair, dementia, and/or drugging is inevitable**. Murderous officials in Tasmania want his death and they will get it. Collectively, those responsible will have his death on their conscience. Then, justified public condemnations and actions will begin because hard evidence confirms that **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!** ■

THE EVIDENCE

6



**BIG
WORM
BOOKS**

CONCERN

Evidence was manipulated, went missing, was wilfully misinterpreted, etc., not one bit was ever assessed during a trial – yet, this does not bother those whose unthinking minds are closed on Martin Bryant.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS	297
■ INTRODUCTION	299
■ PREPARATIONS FOR KILLING....	Jasher Team 301
ADVERTISEMENT TEXT	
ADVERTISEMENT ON INTERNET	Image
22-BODY TRUCK USED FOR....	Image
■ THE BREAK-IN	MacGregor 305
MARTIN BRYANT'S HOME	
STATEMENTS BY PETRA WILLMOTT	
■ WERE GOVERNMENT SECURITY....	Wollaston 311
WITNESS STATEMENTS	
■ STATUTORY DECLARATION EXTRACTS	MacGregor 317
GERARD DUTTON	Image
NEITHER OWNED NOR FIRED	
EVIDENCE SET UP AT 30 CLARE STREET	
BANG-UP, FIT-UP, FRAME-UP....	
■ PRIMARY FIREARMS & AMMUNITION	Beattie 329
DPP TAMPERS WITH & WITHHOLDS....	
CHAIN OF CUSTODY/EVIDENCE/....	
BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ	Image
NO EVIDENCE	
BENIGN BLUNDERS OR SINISTER....	
■ ALLEGED FIREARMS....	MacGregor 359
DEADLY DECEPTION OF CERTAINTY	
PETRA WILLMOTT	Image
■ JFK AND PORT ARTHUR	Schulze 371
PERVERTING JUSTICE	
OFFICIAL KILLING COMPONENTS	
■ ENDING	376

COUNTS

Images 5, Inserts 23, Notes 228, Pages 82

FORETHOUGHTS

■ "When [Gerard] Dutton was asked the same question in America by a Doctor at a seminar,¹ he replied truthfully – 'There is no empirical evidence to link [Martin] Bryant to the café'."

Adelaide Institute

People for a coronial enquiry into the Port Arthur massacre
Newsletter No. 227
November 2004

■ "There is **not one shred of evidence** that I have found that can positively link either of the DPP [director of public prosecutions] primary firearms entered into the court documents with any of those shooting murders. Inconclusive physical examination only was employed and that quote: 'No chemical tests were carried out and were not planned because of cost considerations and time considerations.' One person is murdered and they do these chemical tests. **Thirty-five people are murdered and they ignored them.**" (added emphasis)

Stewart K. Beattie²

in *Port Arthur massacre*
loveforlife.com.au
1 June 2008

■ "Even though a reliable *chain of evidence* may be established, physical evidence may have been altered prior to or during its collection and examination."³ (original italics)

W. Jerry Chisum, Brent E. Turvey

Evidence dynamics
in *Criminal Profiling*
2001: p. 102

■ "Martin Bryant could not possibly have been responsible for the Port Arthur massacre. All the evidence seems to prove that whoever was responsible for this massacre had to be a very very skillful marksman! Martin is also entitled to a fair trial just as any other citizen of this country would be. If this is what can happen to Martin it means it can happen to any one else! Our government must take action to find out who was really responsible for the Port Arthur massacre.⁴ **The relatives of the people gunned down on that day are entitled to know who really did kill their loved ones! Martin should not be left in prison as a patsy and his mother and sister should not be made to suffer.**" (added emphasis)

Helen Laxton

in *Were government security agencies involved in the setting up of the Port Arthur massacre?*
tasmaniantimes.com.au
3 May 2011

■ "Research indicates that most crime scenes contain much more physical evidence than is discovered. Fingerprints are the most common form of evidence sought in a crime scene search, and other items of trace evidence and materials are often overlooked. Trace evidence can establish a link between the perpetrator and the crime scene. Blood, saliva, footprints, hair, and fibres may be present. The suspect may also leave behind items such as **[cont.]**

¹ A reliable source has informed the editor that the seminar was arranged by a former US-military surgeon Dr. Martin L. Fackler. It was at this seminar that Gerard Dutton the Tasmania Police ballistics expert is alleged to have made his stunning revelation.

² It seems that Stewart K. Beattie, who is a gunsmith now retired in NSW Australia, also said this about one of the many firearms which officials allege, with **no** hard evidence, was used by Martin Bryant during the incident at Port Arthur: "The gun found at the Seascope cottage was a carbine and had been destroyed by a **special demolition round**, the gun was never forensically linked to Broad Arrow, Bus Park, or Jetty Road crime scenes." added emphasis; *A master gunsmith's take on the Port Arthur weapons*; blockyourid.com; 1 February 2013 A demolition round is described as follows: Take an empty cartridge, take a hotter powder, and fill it to the brim. The cartridge is too much for the gun, it explodes, and wrecks the mechanisms. There are only two ways such a *hot-loaded* cartridge can get into the hands of anyone: **i.** The shooter produces it him/her self with ammunition making equipment; or, **ii.** Someone who has ammunition making equipment makes a *hot-loaded* cartridges and gives it to the shooter. Bryant did not have such equipment. Another point raised by Beattie, but not mentioned in this article is the noise from the explosion of this *hot-loaded* cartridge when it is fired. It is extremely loud causing deafness (possibly for days). The explosion can also injure the shooter (face & hands) and lead to shock. Bryant had none of these injuries when he exited Seascope. All the evidence suggests that someone who knew something about firearms and *hot-loaded* ammunition – which includes Gerard Dutton and Michael Mick/Rick Dyson – fired a demolition round at some time in that carbine.

³ See the following Insert *CHAIN OF CUSTODY/EVIDENCE/POSSESSION*.

⁴ By their refusal to act, the Australian and Tasmanian governments then, as well as all subsequent governments to this day, are complicit.

[cont.] cigarettes, matchbooks, tools, clothing, or handwriting.... Bear in mind that what may seem trivial at first may later prove to be a key piece of evidence.... Although frequently overlooked, latent **fingerprints** represent a potential source of information that should not be ignored."

James W. Osterburg, Richard H. Ward

Criminal Investigation

2013: pp. 493, 494

■ "[T]he monstrosity of this crime is precisely what prevents many people from rationally considering the evidence, for even to do so one risks being judged as excusing the crime. The evidence directly implicating Martin Bryant is nonexistent, so, instead the case against Bryant (which was never formally put because there was **no trial**) largely centres on **supposed facts**...."⁵ (added emphasis)

James Sinnamon

An example of what may convince some of Bryant's guilt

candobetter.net

11 April 2010

■ "The few people that had met Martin Bryant prior to the murders that were in the Broad Arrow Café at the time all stated that the man who was seated was not Martin Bryant. Jim Laycock, who knew Martin personally, stated that the gunman was also not Martin Bryant. Graham Collyer said that the gunman was not Martin Bryant."

Reality Check News

coincidencesandinconsistencies.blogspot.co.at

10 November 2007

■ "[T]he media is firmly resolved to **suppress information** about the **alleged** perpetrator, 29-year-old Martin Bryant. The official line is that people shouldn't talk about Bryant because it's not good to give him any more 'publicity.'⁶ (The reasoning seems to be that mass murderers kill because they crave attention, and if we so delve into their backgrounds and their motives, we are helping them win by giving them what they want.) The public's intelligence is clearly insulted by this preposterous idea." (added emphasis)

Social Democracy Now

The Port Arthur massacre: the media cover-up continues

mathaba.net.news

30 April 2006

■ "Graham Collyer was in the Broad Arrow Café...and eyewitnessed the gunman enter the café carrying a long sportsbag. Later Graham was shot in the throat by this gunman, and was one of the few people to see him and live to tell about it. He described the gunman: '*He had long blonde bedraggled hair 3 - 4 inches below the shoulder. (Martin's hair was shoulder length.)* Collyer also mentioned that the gunman was '*...20 years old with a pitted acne scarred face. (Martin was 28 and noted as having an angelic face!)*'" (original italics)

William Wallace

Vote 1 John Howard for king! - 4th edition

itwillpass.com

2004

⁵ There are several phrases similar to the one used here by Sinnamon: **supposed facts**. It is these phrases, these **unproved assertions**, which government officials and the media keep stating as if repetition will convert them to truths. But repeating a lie never changes its lack of integrity. Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882-1945) told us this: "Repetition does not transform a lie into a truth."

⁶ The truth is officials do not want you reflecting on, or researching into, or communicating any facts about Martin Bryant and/or the Port Arthur incident because they fear you will realize **Bryant was set up** and you will see the whole incident necessitated the involvement of the State.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

WHEN the State decides it is going to initiate legal action against some party, evidence is marshalled for presentation in court where a trial is conducted. Never forget that the commission of a crime is not a prerequisite for a prosecutorial process to be initiated, as the **State answers to no one**. It can do as it likes. So, if it is considered necessary to the State, a prosecution can be initiated when no crime has been – with certainty – committed.⁷

Evidence, which can consist of almost anything, is meaningless until it is presented in a sound court and its relationship to the defendant is assessed. After which, the evidence is adjudicated upon by a jury in more serious cases, by a judge/magistrate in lesser cases. The significant point is that anything which is purported to be evidence is not, without being assessed and adjudicated upon, proof of innocence or of guilt. Any item can be evidential. But until that evidence and those alleged qualities **are addressed during a trial in a sound court**, that evidence cannot be said to be proof of anything.

This is a very simple fact, but one which was ignored by officials in the Port Arthur case. In this case, staggering numbers of items were listed as evidence and which were subsequently interpreted as being proof of the guilt of Martin Bryant. That not one item of all this alleged evidence was ever presented in a court – **there was NO trial** – has been completely overlooked by most officials and by the media.

Please think about this undeniable truthful fact. The case developed into a charade where weapons were held up as proof of the killing, by Martin Bryant, when all that could be said and should have been said, was this is evidence which will be presented in a court during a trial. And after Bryant declared he was **not guilty**, there should have been a trial – a full-on, full-up trial with no cartridge case left unturned. But that did not suit the State. So it set about badgering, browbeating, and bashing Martin's 66-IQ brain until he relented which got Australia's most corrupt and sick lawyer off Martin's back.⁸ This was the triumphal moment for the State. Because then, it did not have to present a single piece of its accumulated rubbish as proof in a court. Alleged evidence, much of which had no credibility whatsoever, instantaneously became proof after John Avery finished working over his innocent *client*. This lawyer was supposed to defend him, but Avery chose to **condemn Martin Bryant to a living hell**.

As you will read in the following articles, decent people who are qualified and/or experienced in their subject matter, and who have conducted exhaustive investigations into key pieces of alleged evidence, have confirmed there is not one shred of it which proves the guilt of Martin Bryant. That the State claims there is evidence which proves guilt, **proves nothing**. That the State amassed items it called evidence, **proves nothing**. That the State ostensibly went through the motions of preparing for a murder trial, **proves nothing**. And that unethical John Avery had his desired plea of guilty acknowledged by Bryant, who most probably did not have complete understanding of what was going on, or of what was being inflicted upon him by inhuman officials, does not confirm any alleged evidence proves guilt.

⁷ A good example in Australia is the Falconio case (2001). Bradley Murdoch was set up for the killing of Peter Falconio whose death was **not** proved with hard evidence. Read *FIND! FALCONIO: Concealing Crimes in Northern Territory, Australia*. The real victim in that case is Murdoch, now serving **28 years in prison with no parole*** for a crime that the State never proved took place. Like the case against Martin Bryant, the concocted case against Murdoch is based on assertions and unproved presumptions – *piss & wind* in the vernacular. And in both these cases, the defendants were assigned lawyers by the State – lawyers of appalling incompetence and staggering complacency. (* Murdoch must first serve **28 years**, then he must admit the killing, **before** he will be released. If he won't sign on the dotted line that he killed Falconio, he won't get out of prison. **NEVER.**)

⁸ Martin's exceptionally low 66 IQ puts him in the lowest 1-2 percent of the Australian population. Regardless, he had learnt how to live with his handicap. But he could never have fought off an intelligent, conniving lawyer like **John Avery** who no doubt was accomplished in the legal repartee of courtrooms. In the vernacular, John Avery could have *eaten poor Martin for breakfast* – and Avery did. Martin did not have the knowledge to defend himself. He did not have the intelligence to fight off verbal hammering, intimidation, threats, and everything else officials bored into his ear. Martin probably had no understanding of the fact **he was being set up** by a pseudo-art-connoisseur who wore expensive clothing and sported Patek-Philippe-type watches while his Mercedes-Benz was parked outside waiting to speed him away from his *client*. His *client* who naively thought he was being helped. From a Sunday morning swim at Roaring Beach, Martin ended up at Risdon Prison. It was Avery who put him there. **Forever.** *When he breaks from the relentless torture crying like the boy of 11 he really is, sobbing for his loving mother – then, he will pass on from us. Gone. Soaring out over the waves along Roaring Beach which he was at that sunny Sunday morning.* A pox on you Avery – a horrible, incurable, excruciatingly painful pox. **Forever.**

*The State
had "shit loads" of
alleged evidence
against
Martin Bryant,
but not one bit of it
would have survived
an examination
during a trial
– this is why
the State had
to avoid a trial,
not because
of sympathy
toward the families
of the victims.*

Compounding the whole appalling situation was **the complaisant media and a traumatized incensed public raging for revenge**. Court-assessed proof and beyond reasonable doubt were of no concern. **AN EYE FOR AN EYE!** was printed on an exterior wall of the Royal Hobart Hospital when he was there under guard, cuffed and shackled to increase the pain from his burns – *Fuck you Bryant*. Third-degree burns which too were evidence, but about which no official wanted to hear or prove anything.

*Everyone knows he burnt Seascope to the ground – he was there. He was the killer. He had **43 weapons and thousands of rounds of ammo** inside. There were witnesses. They know it was Bryant because he had blond hair and a yellow Volvo. They were there. They saw him. He should have burnt to death the bastard for what he did.*

It was Tasmania – terrorized and decidedly ugly. You can read all the literature and not see a thing about how every piece of evidence was handled and documented. There is nothing on complete and credible chains of custody/evidence/possession. Evidence was stolen out of Martin's home even before a cop fired an incendiary device into Seascope. Then some cop(s) took evidence to 30 Clare Street, stuffing it into pianos and back corners, dropping it here putting it there. Not one person cared a damn about chains of custody/evidence/possession.

Evidence was sent to Sydney. Someone found eight plastic bags of metal bits inside his yellow Volvo. And some of his targets. The cops have his shotgun. It's proof. He had it even though he didn't use it. (But someone used it, pellet wounds confirm this.) So they didn't bother to lift the fingerprints off that shotgun. Everyone knew that gun belonged to him, so you'd expect his fingerprints to be on it just like they were on that hunting knife with his DNA and everything else. There was so much proof he did it, the poor coppers didn't know where to start. Some of the evidence disappeared, but shit that's no big deal. Just because that lawyer Gunson got upset about the video-camera going missing is no sweat. That there's two of them sportbags doesn't matter. Everyone knows Bryant had one. Of course it's his, people saw him there with it. He bought some tomato sauce at Sorrell. Or was it Dunalley? The guy who sold it to him said he was sure it was Bryant. Everyone knows he did it.

Then there are all those *Witness Statements*. Though, the ones from Collyer, and Laycock, and Lynd (she sold marijuana to the gunman) were not so good for the State. But given there was never going to be a trial, those statements that conflicted with the official narrative could be ignored – **they all were**. The DPP chose to focus his box brain on other things. As far as he was concerned, it was all a push-over. The Bugg is alleged to have stated this lie: "An overwhelming body of evidence pointed to Bryant's guilt, and not one piece of evidence had since emerged that would in any way counter that."

But Bugg was sure not demanding to have his overwhelming body of evidence assessed during a murder trial. This State lawyer/liar actually **pushed his own lies** as proof that the innocent patsy Martin Bryant was guilty. What a dirty double-scum scumbag he is. – ed.

**PREPARATIONS FOR
KILLING BY STATE
22-Body Truck & Embalming Box⁹
The Jasher Team¹⁰**

Template for Terrorism at Port Arthur; c.2004: chap. 7

*Governments are the great
mass-murderers of our world.*¹¹

JUST as in the natural scheme of things, mortuary services appear in the closing stages of many of the sad events recounted above, so then perhaps it is fitting that we conclude this narrative about that "most outstanding team of people," of which Richard McCreadie¹² is so "eternally proud," with the story emanating from out of the Southern Region Mortuary Ambulance Service controversy.

The service's principal, Ray Charlton, operates his business from Hobart and he is the southern region mortuary ambulance service contractor, a contract contained within the Coroners Department but under the financial control of the Justice Department, the secretary of which is Richard Bingham. In the aftermath of Port Arthur, Charlton deservedly received a number of complimentary mentions within various reports in the Port Arthur Seminar Papers. (see *SUBJECT INDEX*)

"Removal of the bodies was greatly assisted because the Southern Region Mortuary Ambulance **provided a large vehicle capable of handling multiple bodies** - the only such vehicle currently available in Australia."¹³

"Pursuant to his contract for mortuary ambulance services, Ray Charlton...provide[d] his own vehicles.... [P]resent was a Chevrolet truck to the chassis of which Mr. Charlton had attached a refrigerated covered compartment capable of storing sixteen (16)¹⁴ bodies.... [R]egarded by many as an expensive aberration that would never have a use. At Port Arthur it was a highly prized possession. One cannot overlook that the road between Hobart and Port Arthur is narrow, undulating and about one hundred (100) kilometres long. In just two return trips the Chevrolet carried the majority of the disaster victims to the mortuary, a task that would otherwise have required eight (8) return trips by conventional mortuary ambulance. Mr. Charlton's foresight became a lesson in efficiency."¹⁵

Now if that is all there was to the mortuary ambulance story, then Charlton's efficiency could well have been deserving of even more recognition from the community, and simply left at that. However, that is not where the story ended. Posted on the World Wide Web on 29 September 1998, a most intriguing advertisement appeared the text of which read as follows:

⁹ The original title of this chapter is: Mortuary ambulances, writs & memorabilia.

¹⁰ A group of authors wishing to remain anonymous. The derivation of the word Jasher is as follows: *The Bible* (KJV); Joshua 10:13 & II Samuel 1:18. In *Strong's Concordance* it states: "**Jasher**, Hebrew - H3474, **straight, upright, true.**" (added emphasis)

¹¹ Mike Adams. Natural News; 5 October 2011.

¹² At the time of the Port Arthur incident, Richard McCreadie was the deputy commissioner of Tasmania Police.

¹³ T.J. Lyons, GRH. Kelsall, N. Mele. *Forensic overview of the Port Arthur tragedy*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: pp. 96-101.

¹⁴ Here it states the number 16. In the for-sale advertisement it states 22. Other numbers appear in the literature. What we can say with certainty however is - this vehicle was especially built for a need unheard of in Tasmania (in all of Australia). From a business perspective, a 22-body mortuary truck makes no sense at all. It would be a financial loss. This vehicle was built specifically to hold an abnormally large number of dead bodies, and after it did that - only once - it was advertised for sale. It was intentionally built before the official killings at Port Arthur. It was only used once to transport the dead bodies of those officially killed at Port Arthur. It was no longer needed after the official killings at Port Arthur.

¹⁵ Ian Matterson. *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: pp. 89-90.

ADVERTISEMENT TEXT

Vehicle for Sale.

Genuine Enquiries only.

Yellow Chevrolet 350 V8 truck with refrigerated body, holds 22, this vehicle was primarily used as the disaster vehicle in the **Port Arthur Massacre**. This vehicle is currently for sale and all reasonable offers will be considered. The vehicle has value as not only a refrigerated unit for body removal, it is the only one of its kind in the entire country. The memorabilia value of it for anyone making a movie/series or writing a book on Port Arthur is limitless. Not only would the purchaser be getting the disaster vehicle, but the whole Port Arthur Story would be given as well.

This vehicle is currently for sale and all REASONABLE OFFERS will be considered.

Email cwright@trump.net.au¹⁶

ADVERTISEMENT ON INTERNET


WHAT'S NEW

Vehicle for Sale.

Genuine Enquiries only.


Yellow Chevrolet 350 V8 truck with refrigerated body, holds 22, this vehicle was primarily used as the disaster vehicle in the **Port Arthur Massacre**. This vehicle is currently for sale and all reasonable offers will be considered. The vehicle has value as not only a refrigerated unit for body removal, it is the only one of its kind in the entire country. The "memorabilia" value of it for anyone making a movie/series or writing a book on Port Arthur is limitless. Not only would the purchaser be getting the disaster vehicle but the whole Port Arthur Story would be given as well.

This vehicle is currently for sale and all REASONABLE OFFERS will be considered.
Email cwright@trump.net.au



[Home](#) | [About Us](#) | [Background](#) | [Information](#) | [Services](#) | [What's New](#) |

If you have any questions, please contact our Webmaster or phone (81) 0418 561 740.
Copyright 1999 Porcupine Productions. All rights reserved.



¹⁶ See details about Chris Wright in: *PREPARATIONS FOR KILLING BY STATE*. Said article appears in the book *MASS MURDER: Official Killing in Tasmania, Australia*.

22-BODY TRUCK USED FOR OFFICIAL KILLINGS
Port Arthur, Tasmania – April, 1996



"THE fact that a **morgue truck with over 20 bays was built before the massacre....**¹⁷ **Two specially designed embalming machines** were sent to Hobart: 'One firm in particular, **Nelson Brothers** [7 Droop Street, Footscray, VIC 3011], had organised for an embalming machine box and a special large equipment case to be **manufactured ready for the incident**. These two containers were the envy of all embalmers and worked extremely well,' was recorded...."¹⁸ **All these facts were never reported, in fact they were suppressed and dug up by investigators afterwards because had we known about these preparations I think we might have become even more suspicious of just how ready the city of Hobart was for a traumatic incident of major proportions.... [T]here are people who planned a massacre and blamed an unfortunate intellectually handicapped man for the terrible crimes that took place in one of the most beautiful and peaceful places on earth. I have gathered innumerable pieces of information and facts which substantiate a cover-up of immense proportions over the past ten years. And even now, I am still uncovering more and more information. There is so much of it that it never ends. For instance, we know that a Mortuary truck with 22 body racks in a refrigerated unit was built before the massacre.... Why would Tasmania need a Mortuary Unit designed for a disaster of at least 22 bodies. Another example was the photo taken of a **black van** that somehow arrived before the ambulances and certainly the police and parked in front of the Broad Arrow Café where 20 people lay dead and others were wounded. This van was never mentioned in any reports and never seen again....**¹⁹ Thirty-five people were killed at one of the most beautiful historic sites in our country and only a few weeks later the Howard government [Liberal by name, but conservative by ideology] pushed through Draconian gun laws that **had no hope in hell** of getting passed without the emotional turmoil that followed the Port Arthur massacre. (amended; added emphasis; added italics)

Carl Wernerhoff

The Port Arthur massacre 10 years on the secrecy continues
members.iinet.net.au/~nedwood/Pam06.html

¹⁷ The Australian (29 April 1996) states that the refrigerated mortuary truck was driven to Port Arthur late Sunday (28th). And on p. 106 of the Port Arthur Seminar Papers it reads: "Day Four Wednesday 1 May 1996 ...First of the deceased persons leave the scene at Port Arthur and are removed to the Royal Hobart Hospital mortuary." Euphemistic words of the Australian Funeral Directors Association tell us the first load of bodies was trucked from Port Arthur to the Hobart morgue on Wednesday, three days after the incident. Charleton's purpose-built refrigerated truck had two functions related to the **bodies of the 35 people officially killed**: **i.** Storage; and, **ii.** Transportation.

¹⁸ Stephen Parry. *Port Arthur massacre 1996 – AFDA national embalming team – detailed report*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 112. It cannot get any more diabolical and shocking. Nelson Brothers had special *big-job* embalming equipment "**manufactured ready for the incident.**" Officials want you to believe they had no fore-knowledge about the incident at Port Arthur. But true facts tell the world another story – **35 people were killed with official approval and funeral directors in Victoria had the special embalming equipment that they would need in Tasmania manufactured ready for use after the killing was done.**

¹⁹ Images appear on the Internet. See Insert *BLACK VAN*.... following.

*Martin Bryant
did not order the
**22-body
refrigerated
mortuary truck**
and that
**special
embalming box**
to be
manufactured ready
for the incident at
Port Arthur.*

In light of the quotes in this chapter and above, extracted from the EMA Report, and considering the details of this advertisement many disturbing anomalies are exposed, which in turn in themselves raise a number of serious questions.

Inquiries late in January 2003, confirmed that the contact e-mail address on the advertisement – cwright@trump.net.au – at the time of inquiry lead to Chris Wright, of Hobart. At the time Wright was confirmed by phone as being a Tasmania Police Special Operations Group Officer. **Why are Tasmania Police SOG, involved in the resale of this unique mortuary vehicle with its 'limitless memorabilia value' that is the property of Southern Region Mortuary Ambulance Service contractor, Ray Charlton?**

Referring to the Internet advertisement it reads: "...not only would the [purchaser] be getting the disaster vehicle but the whole Port Arthur story would be given as well." What does the advertiser mean by the purchaser would be getting the "**whole Port Arthur story**"?

Surely is this not suggestive of a public being denied the 'whole story,' until the vehicle is sold? The reader can via the Internet sites listed below, become informed as to the extent of the conspiracy that was Port Arthur, but authors of material posted on these sites, admit their investigations have barely scratched the surface of the Port Arthur Massacre. So what details constitute the "whole story" that the associates of the above advertisement are privy to?

The delicate nature of the subject can be gauged by the fact that when Mrs. Scurr spoke about the mortuary ambulance on August 29, 2001, at the Max Fry Hall in Launceston, little did she realize what lay ahead. **Within 24 hours, Wendy was served a Writ**, No. 947 of 2001. How long does it take for the ordinary citizen to arrange and have a writ served? This writ alleged in part that Wendy Scurr had, "...made statements conveying a belief about that the plaintiff was directly involved in the massacre." Under the heading of Particulars the Writ further alleged: "b. In response to a question asked of the defendant about the plaintiff which was 'are you saying he was directly involved in the engineering of the massacre[?].' The defendant stated 'Yes I Do'."

Importantly, the taped record of this meeting demonstrates Wendy Scurr **never did make any such derogatory statements**. Of note is the fact that Mrs. Scurr has never held nor expressed an opinion that Mr. Charlton had involvement in the Port Arthur massacre other than that dictated by his position as mortuary ambulance contractor for the government of Tasmania, and she has never made any of the statements alleged in the *Writ* mentioned above. Eventually, but not before it had cost both parties a considerable amount of money no doubt, a sealed *Notice of Discontinuance* was issued, and the matter is now concluded, hence our ability to bring you this article. In passing, the legal counsel for Charlton was none other than **John Avery.... ■**

(amended; added & original emphasis)

THE BREAK-IN
30 Clare Street, New Town, Tasmania

Andrew S. MacGregor

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur; 2001-4

*I saw no evidence of violence
in any form present in his home.²⁰*

DOCTOR Ian Sale informed us during an interview with Judy Tierney on the ABC program Stateline, of the police search of Martin Bryant's home in Clare Street, New Town at about 10:30 p.m. on Sunday the 28th April 1996. At the same time, Mrs. Carleen Bryant and Petra Willmott were being interviewed at police headquarters in Hobart, in relation to Martin Bryant, and the Port Arthur massacre.

Tierney: Was there any evidence of ammunition or guns there?

Sale: There were wrappers to firearms and ammunition found in a sort of scullery room. [But who put them there?]

What Dr. Ian Sale informed the public was that police found a large number of wrapping and boxes for ammunition in parts of the house, but he **fails to mention anything** about the search uncovering the .223 calibre Australian Automatic Arms self-loading rifle.

However, Nick Perks informed the court that: "On the twenty-ninth of April and the third of May, 1996, police conducted an extensive search of Bryant's house in Clare Street, New Town. In the hallway of the residence, lying open, were two plastic gun cases, two gun cleaning kits, a third canvas gun case, together with a point two-two-three calibre Australia Automatic Arms selfloading rifle. [*sic*] Also recovered from this location was a large quantity of point three-0-eight calibre and point two-two-three calibre ammunition. I refer your Honour to photographs 448, 449, 450 and 451. In an upstairs bedroom, and in one of the lower front rooms, secreted in the bottom of two pianos were located two leather ammunition belts containing respectively two 308 calibre cartridges and thirty .223 calibre cartridges together with a number of boxes of ammunition and two magazines along with several other items – and I would refer your Honour to photograph 471 which shows the inside of one piano, and 476 contents of the second piano. Your Honour, in all **one thousand four hundred and ninety-one** .308 calibre and **two hundred and forty-six** .223 calibre live rounds of ammunition were seized from Bryant's home."²¹ (added emphasis)

It is interesting to note that **the initial police search of Martin Bryant's home, failed to find anything more incriminating than some empty gun cases, and some ammunition wrappers.** It is

²⁰ Carleen Bryant. *My Story*; 2010: p. 125. See Part 5.

²¹ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 1996: pp. 190-191.

not that this initial search was haphazard or brief, because at this stage, the police believed that the person they had at Seascope cottage was Martin Bryant, and they needed every piece of evidence that could possibly assist them in presenting a case to the court at some future date.

That this particular search was an extended search is demonstrated by Perks stating that the search took place on the 29th April 1996, which indeed part of it would have, but at the completion of that search, a constable was placed outside the building to ensure security of the premises, and all evidence from the initial search was taken to police headquarters in Hobart.

The firearm and **1,737 rounds of ammunition** were discovered during the *second* search of the premises on the 3rd of May, but it is the events that occurred between these two police searches that raise considerable interest. The police security of the Clare Street premises was breached. Thus, any further evidence relating to articles discovered by any further police search was inadmissible. The suspects for this breach of Police security were two Hobart journalists from The Mercury newspaper: Stuart Potter and Sue Bailey.²² In true journalistic fashion, these members of the press ignored the *dripfeed* system set up by the police SAC-PAV officers and went looking for their own story.

²² On their 2nd search of the house at 30 Clare Street, cops claimed they found a cache of firearms and ammunition. But this is what Martin's mother Carleen Bryant states about that allegation in her book *My Story*: 2010: pp. 135-136: "I was puzzled when, several days after the massacre it was reported that the police had found a cache of weapons inside a piano at Martin's house. When Martin was away on trips I cleaned his house and would poke around, as mothers tend to do. Martin knew this and also knew that I did not approve of guns. He would never have dared to keep any in his house. It was reported that soon after the massacre two journalists [Stuart Potter & Sue Bailey] from a prominent newspaper illegally entered Martin house. They apparently searched inside the piano and found nothing irregular." The public has been brain-washed into believe what cops say is the truth. When, in fact, police are **notorious liars** and this is well documented in the literature which deals with the lack of ethical behaviour in policing.

²³ Geoff Easton. *Port Arthur media management*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: pp. 120-122.

On the 30th April 1996, The Mercury, along with every Murdoch-owned Australian newspaper printed on their front pages a photograph of Martin Bryant in the front yard of his home. He was wearing a blue surfie style top. The reactions to the printing of this photograph were varied and required attention. The Police media liaison officer, Geoff Easton, gives us his account in his Port Arthur seminar paper:

"On the Tuesday morning the public were greeted by the front page of The Mercury newspaper that showed a picture of Martin Bryant claiming, 'This is the man!' The effect of this was to receive a barrage of calls from the media all claiming foul! And how I had favoured the local newspaper by providing them with a picture of Bryant. With my heart in my mouth I raced to the MIR [Media/Murder Incident Room?] and with relief found that none of the photographs we had, corresponded with the one in The Mercury. It certainly hadn't come from us! Later that morning I received a phone call from an employee of The Mercury who described with disgust how three staff members had distracted the cop on duty outside Bryant's house while one of them broke in to steal the photograph. An outraged Director of Public Prosecutions is yet to finalise proceedings against the Editor for *sub judice* and contempt."²³

This report was prepared for the Emergency management Australia seminar, which was held at Mount Macedon, Victoria, in March 1997. What is interesting is that the other Murdoch-owned newspapers that are distributed within Tasmania, being the Melbourne Herald Sun and The Australian did not receive any mention. This must discredit the story that other news media were critical of the Tasmania Police media officer for favouring a local newspaper.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

What is more important is the question of how the journalists, Stuart Potter and Sue Bailey being the main suspects, were able to obtain, this particular photograph. Every indication suggests that it came from Bryant's 30 Clare Street residence, but that had already been searched by the police under the leadership of police inspector Ross Paine, and he should not have missed such a vital piece of evidence. It must be remembered that there were no admissions that the photos were found inside Clare Street. They may have come from another source. Two photos of Martin Bryant were shown on the **A Current Affair** special (*Port Arthur, the inside story*) in November 1996, as they were in the possession of Bryant's ex-girlfriend, Petra Willmott. Was she the original source of these photographs?

MARTIN BRYANT'S HOME

MARTIN Bryant now has no home. He exists at Risdon Prison near Hobart. The house he legally owned, bequeathed to him by Helen Harvey, was, like all the other assets he had, taken by the Tasmanian government. This stopped him hiring a lawyer to defend himself. To date, officials have not released a written accounting of how all Martin's looted assets were disposed. – ed.

Yet in the book *Suddenly One Sunday* by Hobart Mercury journalist, Mike Bingham, there was a picture of a torn-up photograph of Martin Bryant in his white knitted jumper, that we were informed was torn up by Petra Willmott shortly after the Port Arthur massacre. A furious Damian Bugg appeared on television and voiced his displeasure at the blatant arrogance of the media in printing the picture of Martin Bryant. Part of the ABC's **Media Watch** program said: "The DPP, Mr. Damian Bugg QC placed all media outlets on notice yesterday, that he would pursue contempt actions against any broadcaster or publication whose coverage of the tragedy prejudiced the trial of the alleged gunman."²⁴

Furthermore, Damian Bugg stated on news coverage that: "and if any pre-trial coverage by the media in some enthusiastic desire to disclose as much as possible to the public, results in a person being deprived of a fair trial, I wouldn't call it a legal nicety at all." But which particular act was it that so infuriated the DPP. Was it the printing of the photograph, which immediately destroyed one of the basic procedures of formal identification of Martin Bryant, or was it the illicit entry of his premises, that destroyed any further discovery of evidence that may have been used in Bryant's trial?

You see, the procedure used by Tasmania Police to *identify* Martin Bryant as the Port Arthur gunman were photographs taken from a similar collection as that single photograph printed in the Hobart Mercury newspaper. It can be seen that Martin Bryant and especially his legal representatives cooperated fully with Tasmania Police, and yet there was never any thought of a proper identification parade, or similar device. The only means of identification used were photographs, which was far from ideal.

²⁴ No party was ever charged in relation to the publishing of images of Martin Bryant, which was/is **against the law**. This immediate publishing of his image – the literature says as early as Monday, 29 April 1996 – helped doom Martin. His image filling front pages of newspapers, with headlines screaming he is the killer, was fatal. A gullible public accepted every last cruel, inaccurate, and unproved word. And later, manipulated images of his face were published **widely and persistently** – the editor has been told that this manipulated image was used again by a Queensland newspaper in late 2012. This image with grossly accentuated eyes has helped **demonize** Martin Bryant. Members of the public have assisted the media with this cruelty. On 29 November 2011, onlineopinion.com.au posted an article written by a Brian Holden: *Psychopaths need to be put on a leash*. In his article, he refers to a cat-hanging episode which Holden deviously suggests is behaviour we can **associate** with Martin Bryant. In his article, Holden writes about Martin and "ongoing incidents of animal cruelty." This editor repeatedly emailed Holden asking for details. Eventually he replied. This is what Holden said in his emailed reply of 13 December 2011: "My mother related the event to me which was related to her by the cat-owner. All I can say is that the place was Matraville in Sydney and the time about 1960. I never forget it. Brian Holden." So what we have from this cruel mongrel Holden is hearsay about hearsay, about something that allegedly occurred c.50 years earlier for which Holden has **no** evidence, but about which he has **no** hesitation of suggesting Martin Bryant was also into cat-hanging and/or other cruelties to animals as Martin is a psychopath for which Brian Holden also has **no** evidence. It is writing by the likes of Holden that add to and perpetuate many untruths about Martin Bryant. People like Holden seem to have **no** qualms about making terribly cruel statements for which they have **no** supporting evidence other than their fixed negative **opinions**. (see *INDEX*; animals, Martin Bryant's concern for)

STATEMENTS BY PETRA WILLMOTT²⁵

■ "Martin didn't have a lot of friends but the only enemy I know he has is a **male called Tiger**. This male calls Martin up. Martin doesn't like to answer the phone as he thinks it may be this Tiger. I don't know who Tiger is or why Martin doesn't like him."

Petra Willmott

Witness Statement

28 April 1996

■ "Martin seems reasonably happy to me. He has schizophrenia, but seems to be OK. He doesn't remember a lot of things that I say to him and **he forgets what he's doing sometimes**. Martin has never been violent towards me or Carleen [Bryant]. He has never verbally abused me. He calls his mother stupid and silly sometimes but doesn't abuse her." (*sic*; added emphasis)

Petra Willmott

Witness Statement

28 April 1996

■ "I have never seen Martin with any firearms of any type."

Petra Willmott

Witness Statement

28 April 1996

■ "I have never seen any firearms or ammunition at Martin's place."

Petra Willmott

Witness Statement

30 April 1996

■ "We would often go to the theatre. We went and saw 'Casino.' In that they were torturing a man and they went to squash his fingers. Martin said it was too violent so we left."

Petra Willmott

Witness Statement

30 April 1996

■ "I have never seen handcuffs at Martin's house."

Petra Willmott

Witness Statement

4 June 1996

²⁵ Within the literature, this name is spelt in several ways – Willmott, Willmot, Wilmott, etc. Even within the court document (*The Queen v. Martin Bryant*) the spelling is inconsistent. The editor has accepted the spelling of Willmott which appears on the *Witness Statements* submitted by this young woman who was in an intimate relationship with Martin at the time of the incident at Port Arthur. Unjustified negative thoughts have been expressed about her credibility all because she told the truth which did not fit with the story officials wanted to hear – had to hear. To suggest she was lying, as people have, or to say her boyfriend had hidden an arsenal in his home and that she just never saw it is an assertion – nothing more. When she was questioned by the cops, Petra said unequivocally and clearly, as Martin's mother did too, she had never seen any firearms, ammunition, or handcuffs in Martin Bryant's home. The prosecution certainly would not have liked to have had Petra Willmott, or Mrs. Bryant, called to give evidence during a trial. All related evidence suggests that Petra was a decent young woman who had known Martin for several months. Who stayed with him in his home for days at a time. Who was with him for several days prior the Port Arthur incident, and who only left his home on the Sunday morning (28th). It seems she told the whole truth at a time when officials were over-revved and over-zealous to **set up Martin Bryant**.

*Tiger was the enemy of Martin Bryant. This fact is disturbing. The editor has not been able to determine anything about Tiger. Nor has the editor been able to locate any reference to any finding of the Tasmania Police arising from their related investigation of what influence or control Tiger had over Martin Bryant. Willmott's words say there was a negative dynamic between Martin and Tiger. From this, it is not unreasonable to conclude this Tiger could have played a **major if not the key role in the Port Arthur incident**. It defies belief that police investigators ignored Willmott's disturbing words. She had no reason not to tell the truth related to the fact of Tiger's existence and the negative relationship her boyfriend had with him. That not one minute seems to have been spent by cops to find and interrogate this Tiger says the worst things about their competence. Or, are the cops covering up what they know about Tiger? – ed.*

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

So it can be stated that the Murdoch **media** formally identified Martin Bryant as the Port Arthur killer, something that the director of public prosecutions, Damian Bugg, never did. If one considers the judicial process, where **the judicial system, the government and the media were all used to deprive Martin Bryant of any proper process, and at the same time depriving all Australians of knowledge of any of the facts relating to the events that occurred at Port Arthur on the day**, then surely this is a case of the pot calling the kettle black. Damian Bugg appeared on another interview on ABC television, and when a question was put to him regarding *that photograph* appearing in the Hobart Mercury he said: "It always devalues the quality of your identification evidence."

He was then asked: "Was that a real worry though, in this case, when you had 600 or so witnesses who could, quite a number who could identify him?²⁶ Was it ever a threat?" Damian Bugg replied: "Yes it was. When you've had criminal acts allegedly committed in about five different locations, you've got to link them, you've got to have identification, and if your identification evidence is 'muddied,' and you've got someone saying, '**I didn't do it. It wasn't me. I wasn't there**', the time to assess the impact it's likely to have is the time the publication occurs."

But as has been noted, it was the Murdoch newspapers with distribution within Tasmania – The Mercury, Melbourne Herald Sun, The Australian – that **published the photograph of Martin Bryant** which completely destroyed the form of identification which the Tasmania Police used, after that publication, for their formal process of identifying the offender.

With such a murderous crime, identity is of paramount importance. These newspapers ignored aspects of the law through their conduct. As Stuart Littlemore of ABC **Media Watch** said: "Dare I suggest, assuming that the authorities would lack the courage to take on the most powerful media corporation on earth. As to that, we shall see."

However, there were still other more positive means open to the Tasmania Police to formally identifying the offender as Martin Bryant, but in the most [allegedly] thorough police investigation ever undertaken in Tasmania, these methods were not used. The Tasmania Police still continued to use the simplest of means of identification even after it had been well and truly compromised, and ignored every other identification procedure.

And as we have seen, there have been some threats, with the DPP giving notice of prosecution to The Australian, The Mercury, The Age and the ABC, but little else. In April 1998, when Easton appeared before a Senate inquiry, his story was still much the same. What he was able to inform the Senate inquiry was that the DPP **had still not finalised proceedings against the editors**. Four years after the event, and of course **still nothing has been done** by Damian Bugg who is now the Commonwealth director of public prosecutions. And nothing will be done, as he has been replaced in Tasmania by Tim Ellis who is not in a position to continue looking into that matter.

²⁶ This is a good example of how the highly significant matter of identification is very quickly rendered inaccurate. Most people prefer a definitive answer to anything, rather than an answer that is ambiguous or uncertain. The human brain seems to be wired this way. In his book *How We Know What Isn't So*; 1991: p. 186, Cornell University psychology professor Thomas Gilovich states this fact: "People will always prefer black-and-white over shades of grey, and so there will always be the temptation to hold **over-simplified beliefs** and to hold them with confidence." To the 600 something witnesses, the blond-haired person at Port Arthur Historic Site on 28 April 1996 was Martin Bryant. Their reasoning: *they were there, they saw him, it was on the news, etc.* Added to this, was their fear/terror and that human trait of **vengeance**. Given this heady mind-imbalancing mix, plus all the killings and all the wounded people, and the two **dead children**, it would have been considered totally unacceptable to even suggest those 600 *sightings* might be inaccurate. All those people would have described themselves as eyewitnesses, just as the media described them. Presence was interpreted as recognition; conviction became certainty. That witnesses who looked into the face of the gunman did **not** see Martin Bryant has been widely ignored. That the only witness who personally knew Martin Bryant said **in writing** that he was not the gunman is **conveniently forgotten**. And it goes far beyond reasonable doubt. But people cling to their misconceived opinions and subjective black-and-white conclusions because to relinquish that will leave them with ambiguity, thus uncertainty. It is always difficult for any of us to admit, even internally to ourselves, that we are wrong. This is **killing** innocent Martin. Can you hear the jeering from all those who (think they) saw him? From those who are not interested in *Bryant is innocent bullshit* – because they know, they were there, they saw him.

*Making people
look guilty
by setting them up
with weapons
is nothing new in
police work
– drops, plants,
throw downs
– to get convictions
this is what
corrupt cops do.*

In the initial police search of the house in Clare Street, one of the police requirements would have been to gather up any photographs of the suspect, Martin Bryant, so then how was it that the police missed this particular picture? Again it has been documented that the police on the initial search failed to locate the firearms supposedly hidden in the piano, be it the piano upstairs or the piano downstairs, they are normally one of the more obvious places to consider during a police search. That the police search missed the photo is bad enough. But actually **missing two weapon caches** is of serious concern, unless these items were not present during the initial search.

Now comes the crunch of the matter. On the Monday, apparently three journalists from The Mercury newspaper attended at Bryant's house in Clare Street, which was being guarded by a uniformed policeman. One or more of these journalists were then able to enter into the house and complete a detailed search of the premises, and so not only obtain a graphic description of the house in its entirety, but also apparently located a photo. They however **did not locate the firearm or any of the ammunition or the several other items mentioned by Nick Perks in his statement to the court.**

In relation to the criminal charge of possession of firearms, *etc.*, the police would be required to prove that Martin Bryant was the only person to have control over the property. However, once the journalists were able to breach the household security, and enter the premises, then that disperses any proof that Martin Bryant had sole control of his property. The break-in demonstrated the possibility of the firearm and ammunition being planted inside the house sometime after Martin Bryant had left the premises.

In fact, considering that **the first police search had failed to locate the rifle and ammunition**, then this suggests more than a possibility of these items being planted in the house, either that or the Tasmania Police were completely incompetent. What becomes even more interesting is that during the second police interview of Martin Bryant on the 4th July 1996, when asked how many firearms did he own, Martin Bryant stated three, and named them, the Colt AR-10, the Colt AR-15 and the Daewoo shotgun.

Neither police interviewers, John Warren or Ross Paine, raised any questions in relation to the Australia Automatic Arms self-loading rifle or the large quantity of ammunition that had been found in Bryant's home. This in itself must raise **serious concerns** about the validity of the material *found* by the police at 30 Clare Street, New Town, Tasmania. ■

(amended; added emphasis)

WERE
GOVERNMENT SECURITY AGENCIES
INVOLVED IN THE SETTING UP OF
THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE?

John G. Wollaston²⁷

tasmantimes.com.au

14 December 2010

*The relatives of the people
gunned down on that day are
entitled to know who really did
kill their loved ones!*²⁸

THE date of the 28 April 1996 is deeply etched into the minds of all who in some way became involved in the tragic story of what happened in Port Arthur, on that day. Thirty-five innocent people were massacred, supposedly by a registered disabled, intellectually impaired, left-handed [shooter] invalid.... Confused and disoriented, Martin Bryant, was charged, **without trial**, for the offence and taken to serve 35 consecutive life sentences in Risdon Prison – where he now spends his endless days in a drugged haze, trying to make sense of what actually happened on that day. To understand why he couldn't possibly have committed this crime, let us first look at some of the many bizarre events leading up to this tragedy....

It is said that Bryant met the Tattersalls²⁹ heiress, Helen Harvey, in 1992.... He moved in with her and a year later she was killed in a *freak car accident*³⁰ not far from where they lived. Bryant inherited the house and a very large sum of money from her estate. The next year his father, a waterside worker from the mainland, visited Bryant. His [father's] body was later fished out of a nearby dam. In spite of the fact that he had a gunshot wound and a diver's weight belt around his waist and no weapon was ever discovered, the coroner strangely found no evidence of foul play....³⁰

A mortuary truck, **with 22 body racks** in a refrigerated unit, was commissioned and specially built in Tasmania before the massacre and then [advertised for sale] shortly afterwards. **Seven hundred reporters** from 17 nations attended a seminar in Hobart on that weekend, ready to take the story to the world media. On the day of the massacre some 25 specialist doctors from the Royal Australian College of Surgeons...attended a training course in Hobart. Their last lecture was on **Terrorist Attack and Gunshot Wounds**. They stayed on to take care of the wounded victims. Two hours before the murders, ten of the senior managers of Port Arthur were taken to safety many miles away on the east coast, on the pretext of a two-day seminar with a vague agenda and no visiting speakers.³¹

²⁷ John G. Wollaston is a Fellow of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. In 1978, he was headhunted by the Australian federal government to head up its world-wide property directorate. Because of his involvement with embassies and defence facilities, he was cleared above *Top Secret* by the Australian security organizations ASIO and ASIS. His books (*Conspiracy; The Face of Evil*) appear on: blackhorsepress.com

²⁸ Helen Laxton; comment posted after Wollaston article; 3 May 2011.

²⁹ Established in 1881, Tattersalls* (*Tatts*) is a privately-run government-approved company which conducts gambling systems within Australia. (* Originally spelt with apostrophe: Tattersall's.)

³⁰ Some have suggested that Martin Bryant caused this accident. There is **no hard evidence** proving he did and he himself was severely injured and hospitalized. It has also been suggested that Martin was involved in some way in the death* of his own father who died in 1993, officially of suicide. There is **no hard evidence** proving he was involved. Many forms of **demonization** were used to give the public the false impression that Martin Bryant was a monster. (* The editor has not been able to confirm the use of a firearm in this death. Wollaston's claim might be a mistake, a misunderstanding, or a fact not commonly known.)

³¹ See the *MY DAY* Insert by Robyn Cooper in Part 3.

On the 27th March, Martin Bryant is said to have entered Terry Hill's gun shop in New Town, Tasmania, carrying a fully loaded AR-10 assault rifle wrapped in a towel, saying that there was something wrong with it. Hill, realising that Bryant had no idea of how to load, unload, or even handle an assault rifle – even though he somehow obtained a photo licence³² for prohibited and automatic firearms. Hill disarmed the weapon and kept it for repairs.

Hill, at his police interview on the 6th June, 1996 denied having sold arms and ammunition to Bryant. The next day he received a letter from the attending lawyer, containing veiled threats: "unless you are prepared to in effect change your story, they (Tasmania Police) will press on and try and find sufficient evidence to charge you with some offences...." It finished with: "However, it was also made abundantly clear that the Director of Public Prosecutions is prepared to offer you an indemnity against prosecution if you are prepared to accept that you did sell guns to Bryant...."

Hill refused to admit **the lie** and a week later his shop was raided by police and his licence revoked. His determination to maintain the truth and not provide the DPP with a vital missing link in the trail of evidence cost him his livelihood.

On the day of the massacre an anonymous phone caller lured the only two policemen on the peninsula away from the site on the pretext that a cache of heroin (later proven to be fictitious) had been discovered in a remote location at Saltwater River on the far west coast, some 30 minutes by car. As though **waiting for this signal**, four minutes after the police radioed their arrival, the massacre at Port Arthur began.

When the gunman began pulling out his weapons in the café, a man (Anthony Nightingale) stood up shouting "No, no, not here!" Nightingale was shot by the assassin for giving the game away. With professional precision the gunman killed 32 people with just 29 rounds, shooting, without benefit of laser sights, from the **right** hip – an almost impossible task for even the best of the world's top 1% of combat marksmen, let alone a mentally-impaired **left** hander.³³

Of the 20 fatalities at the Broad Arrow Café, 19 were due to a single shot to the head from an Armalite AR-15 assault rifle. The percussion and recoil of such a weapon in a confined space would have disoriented even a highly-trained marksman – unless he was wearing combat earphones under his long blonde wig. The killer left the café and swapped over to a Belgian FN assault rifle – a heavier weapon with twice the recoil – and yet he somehow immediately compensated to maintain his awesome 1.6 to 1 killed-to-injured ratio – 35 dead to 22 [*sic*] injured. An almost impossible task for someone with Bryant's low IQ and lack of weapons training.

As Brigadier Ted Serong DSO, OBE, the former head of Australian Forces in Vietnam, and one of the world's leading experts on counter-terrorist techniques, said, in an interview³⁴ with The Sydney Morning Herald:

³² Who issued/gave this licence to Martin Bryant is not known. This editor has not been able to find a copy of this licence. Everything about it is suspect and it should have been addressed in a trial.

³³ During the police interrogation with Ross Paine and John Warren, Martin Bryant demonstrated how he fired weapons from his left shoulder. He told the cops he never shot from his right shoulder or from his right hip as the gunman did in the café.

³⁴ The editor has not been able to check these quoted extracts (this page and the page following) with the original article (title?) said to be authored by Frank Robson of the Sydney Morning Herald, allegedly published 10 April 1999. It seems as if that article might have been removed from the Herald's archives. A shorter secondary source appears in an article by John Farquharson. *Counter-insurgency jungle warrior*; The Sydney Morning Herald; 12 November 2002. smh.com.au/articles/2002/11/11/1036308630203.html

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

"Martin Bryant could not have been responsible for the mass murder at Port Arthur. There was an almost satanic accuracy to that shooting performance. Whoever did it is better than I am, and there are not too many people around here better than I am. Whoever did it had skills way beyond anything that could reasonably be expected of this chap Bryant...if it was someone of only average skills, there would have been many less killed and many more wounded. It was the astonishing proportion of killed to wounded that made me open my eyes first off."³⁵ Brigadier Serong believed that for this to have been carried out in this way, more than one person would have been involved. He went on to say: "It was part of a deliberate attempt to disarm the population, but I don't believe John Howard or his government were involved. Howard is being led down a track. He doesn't know where it's leading, and he doesn't much care...."³⁵

The killer's prowess was further confirmed when he shot at Linda White and her boyfriend driving towards him in their four-wheel drive. From an unsupported standing position, he fired a 'sighting shot', a 'kill shot' and then disabled the vehicle with a single shot to the engine – typical counter terrorist training for 'Special Forces' personnel. The trail which led the authorities to the Seascope cottage, where I believe Bryant was already installed, was staged. Just to make it absolutely clear who they were looking for, Bryant's [alleged] car was left at the tollway with a bag of ammunition for the FN rifle, a combat shotgun and, guess what, his passport – just like 9/11.³⁶

In spite of his awesome reputation as a combat marksman, not one of the 250 rounds apparently fired from the Seascope cottage, actually hit anyone! On the pretext that this was a *Terrorist Attack* and not some crazed gunman running amok, ASIO, **way out of their jurisdiction**, took charge of the site and prevented the Tasmanian Police from attending for just over six hours. The time delay was obviously crucial **to allow certain people to escape over the Dunalley swing-bridge**, which, according to emergency procedures, should have been closed to prevent anyone from leaving the crime scene or contaminating it. To this day nobody knows the identity of those who escaped at the time.

At 8:30 a.m. the next morning [Monday], Bryant stumbled from the now *mysteriously* blazing Seascope cottage. Unarmed and confused, with third degree burns to his back and side, his first words to the arresting officers indicated that **he had absolutely no idea what was happening or had happened**. The guns that were supposedly used in the massacre were completely incinerated in the inferno and yet on November 9, 1996, Channel 9 showed two immaculately preserved assault rifles that had purportedly been used by Bryant.

With **no** ballistic information, **no** fingerprints, **no** DNA, **no** blood splatter, and **no** undeniable eyewitness description, he was indicted but **never taken back to the crime scene[s] for questioning**. (Standard police procedure in such cases.) Forensic detective sgt. Dutton later admitted to the media that there was actually no forensic evidence to place Martin Bryant at the Broad Arrow Café. It is also interesting to note that the only real eyewitnesses to the

³⁵ "Knowing that the anti-gun legislation had already been prepared in advance, I tend to disagree with this last statement." (John G. Wollaston)

³⁶ This refers to another fact in the Port Arthur case which lacks credibility. Wollaston's reference to 9/11 here is, more specifically, a reference to the passport which U.S. officials claimed was found on a NY street after it was – **allegedly** – blown out of a World Trade Centre building during the 9/11 incident. In addition, another passport and an ID card are **alleged** to have been found at two other 9/11 locations, all revealing the names of the **alleged** terrorists. (But like all the other so-called terrorists, those names are **not** on the passenger lists prepared by the airlines.) Given the circumstances, those two alleged findings lack all credibility, just as the alleged finding of a passport in a Volvo alleged to belong to Bryant. It reeks of a set-up. Added to this, there is bizarre dialogue between Bryant and police negotiator McCarthy in which *Jamie* (but which one?) refuses to identify himself with his real name, but agrees to provide the number of a passport which has Bryant's name in it. So, in the middle of the silly SOG siege of Seascope and after allegedly killing 35 people and injuring 23 others, one of the *Jamies* calmly relates the passport number to McCarthy the negotiator:

McCarthy: Now if you don't want to tell me your name that's fine but how about giving me your passport number and we can do a check on that?

Jamie: I think it's H02 4967 if I can remember it...

Yet during a police interrogation with Ross Paine & John Warren, Bryant says he cannot recall the shorter registration plate ID of his own vehicle:

Warren: The registration number of this vehicle is I think is CG 2835. [*sic*]

Bryant: I don't remember the registration.

What the police had to do was link *Jamie* (the one they want you to believe was Bryant) to Bryant's passport which they say was found in a Volvo at the tollgate. But there is no proof of that. It could have been found by cops at 30 Clare Street, New Town – where Martin lived.

WITNESS STATEMENTS

SINCE these statements come from the DPP's brief, that is the prosecution brief, we must consider that this is the evidence that Damian Bugg QC was to base his case on against Martin Bryant. Since there are no statements from any of the ballistics or forensic witnesses that Bugg has referred to in his address to the court, we can assume that that evidence was not part of his brief, strange though it may seem.

Bugg makes many statements that do not seem to be supported by the witness statements. Statements such as what the gunman apparently said to Neville Quin, immediately prior to shooting Quin in the back of the neck, and to Major Vandeeper. Statements from the saleslady who apparently sold Martin Bryant the Prince sportsbag. In fact, **this person was not even part of Bugg's brief.** The evidence that Bugg had to present to the Hobart Supreme Court was directly from the witness statements taken by police from witnesses after the event.

During their training, police are taught that statements must be clear, precise and within the witnesses vocabulary. **Every statement taken by police, or any other person is affected by, or indeed at times, controlled by the person taking the statement from the witness.** How competent those people are in taking statements can be recognised from the statements themselves. To overcome some of the defects found within witness statements it is sometimes required for witnesses to be reinterviewed three or four times, such as in the case of the Port Arthur Historic Site witness, Ian Kingston, or Martin Bryant's girlfriend, Petra Willmott.³⁷ However one of the most intriguing statements was that of Roger Lerner, which was taken by P. J. Lyons, constable 1796 and was concluded at 11:45 p.m. on Sunday the 28th April 1996, **well before the arrest and formal identification of Martin Bryant** at Seascope on the following morning.

After such a traumatic event as the Port Arthur Massacre, **certain events would have registered differently with different witnesses**, as each would have seen things in his or her perspective, angle and relevance. Most witnesses described the coat worn by the gunman for example in completely different colours and fashions, the main reason being that when you are being shot at, you don't stick your head up to see what the person is wearing. However most people also described the firearm used as a black long barrelled rifle. The firearm was far more pertinent to the witnesses than clothing.

It was however after the event that the **contamination was introduced.** First, witnesses started talking amongst themselves, and to some degree this would have inter-reacted with other witnesses. The "counselling" of witnesses after the event would also have brought with it **more contamination**, for as different people described their episodes of what had happened, it could have caused others to either build up on this or that aspect, or

(cont.)

³⁷ Clarifying unclear points within statements is one reason witnesses are reinterviewed. However, another and sinister reason is to manipulate the witness into stating what the cops want to have on paper. All interview statements need to be questioned and if at all possible checked against another reliable source. And all subsequent (that is 2nd, 3rd, etc.) interviews should be considered highly suspect. A verbal signal that the witness might have been coerced to change her/his statement(s) is the phrase: *I have reconsidered my first statement....*, or any similar phrase confirming what the witness first declared has changed. These changes might be innocent and accurate, or they might be subtle, or they might be different in very significant ways. Colours, comments, names, numbers, times, etc. can change, and in some cases even subtle changes are enough to convict. Any change in a statement could have arisen from officials coercing the witness to make a statement more suited to or supportive of the official narrative.

bury their own story. To overcome the problem of contamination, witness statements should be taken as soon as possible after the event. Delays of months are really not helpful, especially in such important matters, and yet many witness statements were taken in June and July.

Far more contamination was created by the media, and the release of the image of the suspect Bryant created much more contamination to the witnesses' perception. Had a witness believed that the gunman was not Bryant, then he/she had to **battle against that belief held by the majority**, a most uncomfortable position to be in. In the end, **many witnesses who were never able to identify the gunman were adamant that Bryant was the gunman, because we had all been told that he was.**

Other clues though are gleaned from the witness statements as to the competence of some of the police in recording these statements. Undeniably on the day of the event, some of the witness statements are far from satisfactory, yet they were **not followed up** so as to clarify some situations, the ambiguities or mistakes. As an example, there was no mention by some witnesses of the gunman carrying with him his Prince sports bag as he exited the café. But other witnesses have told us that they did see the gunman carry that sports bag away from the café, and actually **saw the gunman place the bag into the boot of the Volvo.** Lack of corroboration of witness statements was also ignored especially on many of the *important* little aspects of the story. These missing points **add up to something completely different** to what the state attorney-general...Ray Groom MHR described as "the most thorough investigation ever made by the Tasmania Police."³⁸

The prosecution used videotapes taken by four different people. Balasko, MacLeod, Turner, and Wilkinson who all took video footage either during or after the event. Yet in their original police statements taken by the Tasmania Police, neither Balasko nor Wilkinson mention they had this evidence which was vital to the police case. Balasko's video was only mentioned in his statement to the New Jersey Police [USA] in August 1996, and the Wilkinson tape only became known when interviewed by the Victoria Police homicide squad. So both these tapes had left Tasmania, and may have been missed as evidence. Even more surprising was the fact that Turner's statement was **not** even part of the prosecution brief.

The statements made by some prison officers are also incredulous. By their own regulations these personnel are not permitted to interact with prisoners, but this occurred on more than one instance and it opens a minefield for the prosecution **had there been any proper defence for Martin Bryant.** But through all of this there are many pearls, the description of the gunman, the description of the firearms used, the behaviour of the gunman all **add up to the opposite of what the media tells us.**

Andrew S. MacGregor

Deceit and Terrorism

2001-4: pp. 310, 311

(amended; added & original emphasis)

³⁸ Groom's comment either reflects his stupidity or complicity. It seems the cops failed to take any fingerprints during their entire investigation. There was the Daewoo shotgun covered with the gunman's fingerprints, but the **cops ignored it.** The cops actually stopped Wendy Scurr from speaking and did not want to hear what she experienced at and in the Broad Arrow Café. Search the literature carefully and you will not find any official description of the **black van** which arrived at PAHS, its load in and load out kept secret from the public. (see the *BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ* Insert) And what about **Tiger?** It seems the cops completely ignored investigating his role in all the shooting. No. Groom made one of the most deceitful statements in the entire case, as the official investigation was biased, incomplete, and unethical. Good people of Tasmania (and Australia) have not been told the whole truth about the Port Arthur incident, and Tasmania Police played a/the major role in this sickening deception. So Ray Groom, if you don't like what I have written here about you, tell all of Australia who **Tiger** really was and what his role was in the killing/wounding of all those men, women, and children. If the police investigation was so professional, then information about **Tiger** will be readily available to you. So come on Ray - millions await your truthful words revealing exactly who **Tiger** is/was. And while you are at it Ray, tell all of us the name of that naked woman with black hair, the one seen by the cops running in the yard of Seascope late Saturday afternoon, 28 April 1996. Your corrupt mate Bugg said (with **no** proof) Mrs. Martin was shot before midday. So Ray, who was that woman? Why was she naked? And why was she running and screaming at c.6:00 p.m.? Tell us who was doing all the shooting at Seascope. And who fired the handgun at Seascope? Tell us about the embalming equipment which the funeral directors Nelson Brothers in Victoria had built ready for all the official killing at Port Arthur. And explain the refrigerated mortuary truck built to hold 22 dead bodies. In little Tasmania? Come on Ray. You were attorney-general at the time, and you said (with **no** proof) the police did "the most thorough investigation." Are you stupid Ray, or complicit?

tragedy, two people who survived the shooting, Graham Collyer and Wendy Scurr, described the killer as being shorter than Bryant, that his hair was longer, probably a wig, and that he had a pockmarked face. **Neither, despite volunteering to police, was ever placed on the witness list or interviewed further.**

Despite his continued plea of innocence – even under the relentless pressure of non-stop questioning and harassment by a team of interrogators and psychiatrists while in solitary confinement – Bryant was finally forced to plead guilty when his mother, Carleen, was pressured to tell him that **she and his sister would suicide if the matter ever went to trial.**³⁹ In a Sydney Morning Herald article, his mother states. “I regret asking him to plead guilty, which denied him the chance to answer a lot of questions. There are conspiracy theories that Martin was not, and could not, have been the gunman. These would have been addressed with DNA, witness statements and fingerprints, to prove it one way or another.”⁴⁰

Considering that Bryant had been diagnosed with Asperger’s syndrome and that the Tasmanian Supreme Court was told that he had the mental capacity of an 11-year-old, it’s hard to believe that this person could ever have organised, let alone carried out, such a spectacularly horrific event in such a coldly professional manner.

In November 1996 and just the night before Bryant’s sentencing, amateur video footage of the massacre, which *just happened* to turn up from America, was given to the media by the police. It showed someone who looked like Bryant leaving the Café carrying what appeared to be an automatic weapon. The only problem was that according to the weather at the time, it was taken on a totally different day, there were missing vehicles in the shot, and three men [allegedly **Justin Noble, Hans Overbeeke, Joe Vialls**] were seen lounging in the background; one smoking a cigarette and another filming with a video camera as they calmly watched the gunman leave the Café. Not the sort of behaviour one would expect during such a horrific massacre.

Gun Control legislation was enacted with extreme haste in May 1996 – destroying over half a million legitimately-purchased firearms and virtually leaving all of the remaining illegal or unregistered weapons in the hands of those who had reason to hide them. A high-security notice (**D Notice**) was later issued by the federal attorney general’s department (controls our intelligence agencies, ASIO and ASIS) to **stifle any contact with Bryant or any further detailed investigation into what actually happened at Port Arthur.**

We’ll probably never know who really committed those atrocities – but, in my opinion: **It wasn’t Martin Bryant!** ■

(amended; added emphasis)

³⁹ Reader, please think about this. Carleen Bryant had her life turned upside down then crashed into some sort of purgatory of pain from which now she cannot escape. Cruel people lashed out at her for writing a small book on the case in an effort to convey some of the truths about herself, her family, and her dear Martin. She is a good decent woman, yet it seems some official mongrel(s) pressured her to tell her son that “he would never see Lindy or me again unless he pleaded guilty.” *My Story*; 2010: p. 133. You do not have to be told what impact such soul-shuddering words must have had on poor Martin whose mind was already in utter turmoil. It was **psychological torture**, and to believe John Avery was behind it all is not some unreasonable belief. Avery saw his responsibility as assisting the prosecution get Martin imprisoned for life – **FOREVER**. So was it John Avery who pressured Carleen Bryant to **threaten** her own son? Or, was it some other mongrel doing the bidding of Damian Bugg?

⁴⁰ Megan Neil. *Killer’s mum still has regrets but she still loves him*. The Sydney Morning Herald; 5 December 2010.

STATUTORY DECLARATION⁴¹ EXTRACTS⁴²

Gerard Dutton – 9 September 1996

Andrew S. MacGregor

*Telling lies was easy
– [people think] policemen don't tell lies –
and my targets never stood a chance.⁴³*

GERARD DUTTON⁴⁴



**Tasmania Police ballistics officer
during Port Arthur incident**

■ DUTTON'S DESCRIPTION OF HIS⁴⁵ AR-15 MURDER WEAPON

Although the butt-stock is visually similar to some Colt AR-15 rifles that have collapsible stocks, the butt-stock on the exhibit Colt is fixed permanently in the shortened position.⁴⁶

ANALYSIS

In other words, what Dutton is stating here is that the AR-15 that he states was the murder weapon used inside the Broad Arrow Café didn't have a proper stock as such. It was a weapon primarily to *shoot from the hip* rather than be used for taking aimed shots. This fact should be compared with some of the witness statements⁴⁷ inside the café as in Mick Sargent's statement which states that the gunman raised the rifle to his shoulder and shot at him from that position. In other words, the rifle that shot Sargent had a stock, and the rifle recovered from Seascope didn't.

⁴¹ Gerard Dutton. *Statutory Declaration re: Martin BRYANT*. 9 September 1996.

⁴² *Extracts bold-face type, verbatim.*

⁴³ Patrick Obrien. *Undercover cop's lies sent 150 to jail*; The New Zealand Herald; 12 October 2008. And if you do not find that upsetting, read the book *Hey Cop!* (2008: pp. 147, 150) by an ex-cop in Canada. Brian Day states: "Lying gets easier the longer you stay on the police service," and how about, "[E]verything internal is built upon a system of intricate lies." Words of a US cop support these revelations – Mike Redmond let the cat out of the bag with his statement in *The Making of a Detective* (1995; p. 97): "And when you lie, people will believe you. You know why? Because you're the law. People think you have to tell the truth, but you don't. You just got to convince people that what you're saying is fact, even though it may be a **load of bullshit.**" (added emphasis) So now, please decide whether Dutton has told nothing but truths, or....

⁴⁴ Although the eyes in this image seem demonic, the image has not in any way been manipulated.

⁴⁵ On the Internet and in numerous publications, it is stated that members of Tasmania Police were actively involved in the execution of the Port Arthur incident. This reference to Dutton's weapon must not be interpreted to mean this person was directly involved with any of the shooting during the Port Arthur incident. "HIS" refers to the weapon he has described – not accurately so it seems.

⁴⁶ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 23. added emphasis

⁴⁷ Unless declared otherwise, all the words quoted herein are taken from the *Witness Statements* submitted to Tasmania Police by Port Arthur incident witnesses.

Michael Sargent said: "I looked at him and I saw that he was sighting the rifle up on me. He was holding the rifle at chest height aiming at me from a distance of approximately four metres. He was actually looking through the sight"⁴⁸⁽ⁱ⁾; "I saw him pull the rifle into his right shoulder and brace himself for the kick of the rifle when fired. As I stated in my previous statement, the gunman was aiming at me from a distance of approximately four metres looking through the sight mounted on the top of the rifle."⁴⁸⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Now for this part of Sargent's statements to be physically correct, then the AR-15 used inside the café had to have been fitted with an extended butt-stock in place. So, according to Sargent's statement, the AR-15 that Dutton possessed was not the weapon used inside the café.

Now an AR-15 without the extended stock is a small weapon. So how do other survivors from the café who actually saw the murder weapon describe that weapon? Robert Elliott said: "The weapon the man was holding was large, modern and black"⁴⁹⁽ⁱ⁾; "It looked to me like a big weapon, it was all black, I can't really describe it other than it looked bulky, it was a big weapon"⁴⁹⁽ⁱⁱ⁾; "He seemed to be so close to me, and his face is vivid and the gun is vivid."⁴⁹⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ What the witness is describing here is not the small AR-15 but the **Daewoo shotgun**, which is not a rifle. Carol Pearce said: "He had in his hands a big gun. I can't describe the firearm any better than just big and long."⁵⁰ **Again the Daewoo shotgun.**

Now the following three descriptions of the firearm which was used inside the café reveal a rifle with the **butt-stock attached** and extended which is contrary to what Dutton would have us believe.

Colleen Parker said: "He got to the end of the table, he was about a metre from me and he produced what I believe was a shotgun from the left side of his coat. It was lighter in colour, **wide butt** and had a scope attached"; "I saw him fire the weapon."⁵¹ John Riviere said: "The gun was a dull black thing"⁵²⁽ⁱ⁾; "I then got a good view of the firearm and saw that it was black in colour. It resembled a high powered rifle with a cartridge protruding from the bottom. It was a long rectangular cartridge. The **butt** was tucked into his side."⁵²⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Mervyn Schadendorff said: "I do remember the firearm, it was a **military type weapon** similar to an SLR. It had a long magazine."⁵³

What we should now consider is that part of Martin Bryant's police interview at Risdon Prison on the 4th of July, 1996, by inspectors John Warren and Ross Paine, where Martin Bryant was interviewed in regard to his use of his AR-15.

Q. Circles. And umm, when you practised your shooting, did you, where did you hold the gun?

A. Up like this, on my left.

Q. So you're left-handed?

A. Umm, I write with this hand

Q. Ohh that's right, sorry, yeah.

A. I, but this is me finger.

Q. So if you held a gun, you would pull the trigger with your, a finger on your left hand?

(cont.)

⁴⁸⁽ⁱ⁾ Michael Robert Sargent. *Witness Statement*; 29 April 1996.

⁴⁸⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Michael Robert Sargent. *Witness Statement*; 29 May 1996.

⁴⁹⁽ⁱ⁾ Robert John Elliott. *Witness Statement*; 29 April 1996.

⁴⁹⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ Robert John Elliott. *Witness Statement*; 27 May 1996.

⁵⁰ Carol Marie Pearce. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

⁵¹ Colleen Maree Parker. *Witness Statement*; 2 May 1996.

⁵²⁽ⁱ⁾ John Michael Riviere. *Witness Statements*; 29 April 1996.

⁵²⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ John Michael Riviere. *Witness Statements*; 1 August 1996.

⁵³ Mervyn Schadendorff. *Witness Statement*; 29 April 1996.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A. Yeah that's right, yeah.

Q. Ohh right. And aah, did you ever practise shooting from the hip?

A. No never.

Q. Never?

A. Uhh uhh.

Q. Ohh right. And did you get pretty accurate?

A. No not really 'cos like I said I only used that AR-15 about twenty rounds in that one and, and not many round, more rounds in the AR-10. So, and I, I never got round to using the shotgun because of it...(inaudible)...I heard from Terry [Hill] that it had a bit of power to it.

NEITHER OWNED NOR FIRED

RIGOROUS analyses of actions, ballistics, documents, facts, statements, etc. have proved beyond all reasonable doubt that Martin Bryant neither owned nor fired the two assault rifles at or near Port Arthur, Tasmania, on the 28 and 29 of April 1996, as the State claims – **with not one shred of proof.** – ed.

In other words, the AR-15 owned by Martin Bryant had an extendable stock, as Martin Bryant only shot this firearm from the shoulder. This means two things: **i.** That the AR-15 found at Seascapes cottage was **not** the AR-15 owned by Martin Bryant; and, **ii.** That the AR-15 found at Seascapes cottage was **not** the AR-15 used in the Port Arthur massacre. There is **no evidence anywhere** that any of the AR-15s associated with the Port Arthur Massacre were ever owned by Martin Bryant. There is evidence that Martin Bryant owned an AR-15, but there is **no evidence** of that particular weapon's serial number, and there is **no evidence** to actually identify the AR-15 owned by Bryant.

■ DUTTON'S DESCRIPTION OF HIS⁵⁴ FN-FAL MURDER WEAPON

The Fabrique Nationale (FN) rifle...was not in working order when recovered from Seascapes Guest House. Various parts of the rifle, specifically the fore-end, barrel and bolt cover had suffered impact damage, indicative of being struck with force against a hard object. The damage to the bolt cover jammed the bolt assembly in the open position and was sufficiently hard enough to lift the rear of the bolt cover from its guide within the upper receiver. In addition the barrel was bent slightly to the left.⁵⁵

The entire return spring tube assembly was missing from the rifle, having been snapped off from within the lower receiver. The butt-plate was missing from the rear of the butt-stock and its absence has allowed the return spring tube assembly to fall from the rear of the butt. This assembly was not found. Only a single small screw now holds the butt-stock to the lower receiver from the underneath; this screw is also damaged and twisted.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ On the Internet and in numerous publications, it is stated that members of Tasmania Police were actively involved in the execution of the Port Arthur incident. This reference to Dutton's weapon must not be interpreted to mean this person was directly involved with any of the shooting during the Port Arthur incident. "HIS" refers to the weapon he has described – not accurately so it seems.

⁵⁵ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: pp. 23-24. added emphasis

⁵⁶ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 24. added emphasis

see following page

⁵⁷ This brand name entered here by Dutton is **wrong**. The correct brand is Redfield. This is one of a number of inconsistencies appearing throughout his brief *Statutory Declaration*.

⁵⁸ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 24. added emphasis

⁵⁹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 37. added emphasis; original italics

⁶⁰ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 219. added emphasis

⁶¹ *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 220. added emphasis

see preceding page for notes 57-61

62 Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 220. added emphasis. The phrase “accuracy tests” is deceptive. (wilfully used by Dutton?) It suggests the concern is sighting accuracy. But accuracy of bullet placement is not the significant concern. The barrel was bent to prevent any comparisons of rifling marks on projectiles (bullets). Such comparisons must be made carefully before any statements can be made about whether any rifle is, or is not, the weapon used in a particular incident. Dutton could not compare any rifling marks because the bent barrel would have distorted the rifling inside that barrel. This means that in relation to that particular rifle, Dutton could not make a definitive statement about any projectile (bullet) retrieved after the Port Arthur incident. Clearly the barrel was bent (who by?), most probably to prevent any rifling comparisons. That Martin Bryant with his 66-IQ had any knowledge of all these facts about rifled weapons is very much doubted. Regardless, it was never proved in a court that he knew about identifying rifled firearms by barrel rifling comparisons – more specifically, comparing score marks on discharged projectiles.

see following page

63 legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/perjury gives the meaning as: “[T]he crime of intentionally lying after being duly sworn (to tell the truth) by a notary public, court clerk or other official. This false statement may be made in testimony in court, administrative hearings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, as well as by signing or acknowledging a written legal document (such as affidavit, declaration under penalty of perjury, deed, license application, tax return) known to contain false information.” At the base of Dutton’s *Statutory Declaration*, the following standard wording appears: “And I make this Solemn Declaration by virtue of Section 132 of the Evidence Act, 1910.” So it seems that the crime of **perjury** is something Gerard Dutton should have kept in mind when he prepared then submitted his *Statutory Declaration*.

A brown leather sling is fitted and the damaged bolt cover has three holes drilled in it to accept a telescopic sight mount. The Redford⁵⁷ telescopic sight...is attached to a metal mount drilled with three corresponding holes and it is consistent with having been formerly attached to the FN rifle.⁵⁸

A 3x–9x Redfield telescopic sight.... (Located in top floor in hallway of building to south of burnt house.)⁵⁹

Various parts of the FN rifle, specifically the fore-end, barrel and bolt cover, had suffered considerable impact damage, indicative of being struck with force against a hard object.⁶⁰

The damage to the front of the bolt cover had jammed the bolt assembly in the rearward position, leaving the action open. The blow had caused the rear of the bolt cover to lift from within its guide slots in the upper receiver and dislodge a 3x-9x Redfield telescopic sight and mount that had been attached. The entire return spring tube assembly was missing from the rifle, having been snapped off from within the lower receiver. The butt-plate was also missing, which allowed the broken return spring tube assembly to fall from the rear of the butt; the assembly was never found. Only a single small woodscrew now held the butt to the lower receiver from underneath. Overall, the damage occasioned to the FN rifle had resulted in the barrel being bent noticeably towards the left side.⁶¹

The FN was reasonably easy to modify to allow normal discharge of test cartridges.... This allowed test cartridge cases and bullets to be obtained for comparative macroscopy...although the bent barrel meant that any accuracy tests would now be meaningless.⁶²

ANALYSIS

Now this part **is very interesting**. The damaged dust-cover (or as Dutton refers to it as “the bolt cover” is reported by Dutton as having three holes drilled into it, thus inferring that the Redfield sight were in fact mounted onto the FN-FAL via the dust cover. However, this particular dust cover was never listed as an exhibit by itself, and thus this statement is not corroborated. What happened to the original dust-cover? Why has it gone missing? Why was it not presented to the court as an exhibit?

Now several witnesses stated that the .308 rifle was fitted with a telescopic sight, and if the FN-FAL was that murder weapon, then the telescopic sight should have remained on the rifle. However the FN-FAL was found in the gutter of one of the surviving buildings, and then we are told that the Redfield sight was then found within that same building in the hallway on the top floor.

Thus we are supposed to conclude that the gunman, prior to deliberately damaging the FN-FAL carefully undid the screws, nuts and

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

bolts, or whatever were used to fasten the Redfield telescopic sight to the dustcover of the FN-FAL and only after the telescopic sights were removed did the gunman destroy the FN-FAL. Why destroy the FN-FAL but saved the Redfield telescopic sight?

A constable Standen apparently found the Redfield telescopic sight, but what didn't he find? Well for a start, he didn't find the three screws, nuts and bolts or whatever had been supposedly used to fix the sights onto the dust cover of the FN-FAL, and they should have been there if their story was true. Nor was the place found where the gunman deliberately smashed the FN-FAL, and within that area would have been found those missing parts of the FN-FAL listed elsewhere by Dutton. In other words, the Redfield sight seems to have been planted within this crime scene.

There is one last item to consider in Dutton's evidence here, as well as the evidence presented by Don Standen, Dutton's junior, and that is the photograph of the FN-FAL as per the article written by Dutton and published in the Australian Police Journal. This photograph also shows the "dust cover" or as Dutton refers to it as the "bolt cover" and what is noticeable is the lack of any holes drilled into this vital piece of evidence.

What we now have is empirical evidence of sergeant Gerard Dutton of committing the felony called **perjury**⁶³ as his statutory declaration was a sworn document. As it is for the Colt AR-15 rifle, there is absolutely no evidence to link this FN-FAL rifle to Martin Bryant.

■ DUTTON'S DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE FROM A VOLVO

Recovered from Bryant's Volvo⁶⁴ **Reg: CS-2835.**⁶⁵

A 12-gauge Daewoo self loading shotgun S/No. F500218, with magazine containing nine 12-gauge cartridges.⁶⁶

2 box magazines (FN-FAL rifle, both capacity: 20), one empty, the other containing 17 .308 calibre cartridges.⁶⁷

1 box magazine (Colt AR-15 rifle, capacity: 20), containing 12 .223 cal cartridges.⁶⁸

1 .308 cal fired cartridge case.⁶⁹

Bullet fragments (8 bags).⁷⁰

A homemade target with bullet damage.⁷¹

A casserole lid with bullet damage.⁷²

A cardboard box containing a q[uan]t[it]y (439 cartridges) of .308 cal. ammunition. (All items recovered from boot of vehicle except for .223 magazine (glovebox) and box of .308 cartridges – floor of rear right passenger seat.)⁷³

see preceding page for note 63

⁶⁴ original underlining. This yellow Volvo was never proved to be owned by Martin Bryant. On the Internet, there is a video clip of another yellow Volvo. There is also a *Witness Statement* (30 April 1996) record of a PAHS member of staff (Ashley John Law) having spoken to the driver of a similar yellow Volvo **after** the shooting at the café.

⁶⁵ This registration plate ID may not be correct. It is one of several inconsistencies in Dutton's declaration. It seems the correct plate is CG 2835. Note witnesses saw different plate IDs – at least three.* The ID listed here by Dutton is the fourth, CG 2835 is the fifth. (* see Part 7 The Witnesses)

⁶⁶ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 46. added emphasis. Note MacGregor says there is **no evidence to prove** this weapon was the same shotgun as was owned by Martin Bryant. (see *CHAIN OF CUSTODY*.... Insert)

⁶⁷ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 46. added emphasis

⁶⁸ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 46. added emphasis

⁶⁹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 46. added emphasis

⁷⁰ On page 18 of his *Statutory Declaration*, Dutton states this preposterous nonsense about the **alleged** fragments: "*In eight plastic bags, all labeled as having been located within the Volvo sedan Reg No. CG 2835.*" original italics. Martin Bryant was not a scrap-metal dealer. Why would he bother to collect bullet fragments – EIGHT PLASTIC BAGS FULL – and drive around with them in his car? **He wouldn't!** But Dillon wants you to believe Martin Bryant was such a gun-nut that he spent his time collecting fragments of bullets and keeping them inside his vehicle.

⁷¹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 46. added emphasis

⁷² *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 47. added emphasis

⁷³ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 47. added emphasis; original italics

74 Recall it was Robert Salzman who, at the tollbooth, got out of the BMW and went and sat in the rear of the Volvo where he talked to the gunman **as if he knew him**. The gunman then shot and killed Salzman.

75 Not only are these three pieces of significant evidence **not** included in Dutton's *Statutory Declaration*, they are not detailed in a substantial way in any other official document. This alarming omission is added to by another. Dutton wrote articles in which he made many firearm-related allegations in an attempt to incriminate Martin Bryant. This was in line with the **psycho-political terror** incident which the State conducted at Port Arthur – the public was to be enraged, which would then allow the State to implement gun-control legislation. So the emphasis after the Port Arthur incident was always on firearms. But during a proper investigation of a crime involving human killing, the collecting and taking of fingerprints are essential investigative procedures. However in the Port Arthur case, these procedures were omitted. As there was **not** going to be a trial, fingerprints were **not** needed. And besides, Martin's fingerprints were **not** on any of the firearms.

76 This is 11:30 p.m. on Sunday evening, the 28th of April 1996. So in the middle of the night, and long before the siege at the cottage ended and Martin Bryant was apprehended, officials were distributing stolen images of him, which, no doubt, were accompanied by words about Bryant being the *GUNMAN*, the *KILLER*, the *MONSTER*, etc. Within the case literature, the first release date varies. But it is declared the media published Martin's image with negative comments on Monday, 29th of April 1996. At this time, Martin had no idea of what had taken place at PAHS, but officials and the media were telling the world that he was responsible – the *lone-nut* gunman. But when he was told something had happened at Port Arthur, Martin replied with: **"Was there anyone hurt?"** The tone of his voice tells us he was not being evasive or attempting to be deviously clever. Martin was being his naive childlike self. He did not know anything about what happened at the site as he had not been there – which he told the police again and again.

ANALYSIS

For those who have viewed the Tasmania Police *training video*, this represents some major problems. This video evidence shows the Volvo sedan found at the tollbooth at the Port Arthur Historic Site. At one stage on the video, a hand appears through the right rear passenger door opening (the door was open at the time of filming). The boot lid of the Volvo sedan was also open and the content of the boot also appears. This video shows a Daewoo shotgun resting upon a pink blouse type of clothing, a .308 fired cartridge case and a white piece of cardboard, which would have been the used target.

What was **not videoed** by this member of the Tasmania police were the two FN-FAL magazines, the 8 bags of bullet fragments, and the casserole lid with bullet damage. We are also aware of the presence of a police member within the back seat of the Volvo during the filming of this evidence, which suggests that the box of 439 .308 live cartridges was not present at that particular time.

We are also aware of witness statements that say that prior to his murder, Robert Salzman⁷⁴ had occupied that seat in the Volvo. Further to this, we are aware that no photographic evidence of this box of ammunition was produced until after the Volvo was removed to police headquarters in Hobart.

Mr. Perks stated in the Court sentencing of Martin Bryant that the body of Glenn Pears had two sets of Smith & Wesson handcuffs attached to it. This being the case, these two sets of handcuffs would have been handed over to Dutton, but he **makes no mention** of these handcuffs. Furthermore these handcuffs each have their own serial number. Thus they can be positively identified and traced back to where they were originally issued. There is **no evidence** to demonstrate these Smith & Wesson handcuffs were in fact factual. Also neither the knife supposedly found in the Prince sportsbag left inside the Broad Arrow Café according to the DPP Damian Bugg, nor the bag itself, nor Martin Bryant's video camera have any mention in Dutton's *Statutory Declaration*.⁷⁵

The first search of 30 Clare Street, New Town, took place at about 10:30 p.m. as per Dr. Ian Sale. There was very little found to implicate Martin Bryant with the Port Arthur massacre, but we are aware from police statements that Bryant's photographs were being circulated amongst police SOGs at Taranna at about 11:30 p.m.⁷⁶ These photographs came from the Clare Street property and according to Bryant, had been left by him on the dining table.

Now once Martin Bryant survived the fire at Seascope cottage, then further evidence to link Bryant with the massacre was required. Thus another more thorough search of 30 Clare Street, New Town, was required. Now none of the police who were involved in these two searches made statements that were attached to the DPP's brief against Martin Bryant. That's rather strange, but the *evidence* they accumulated was required to be passed onto sergeant Dutton, and it is from there that we can assess **what** was found, **when** it was found, and **where** it was found.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

■ DUTTON'S DESCRIPTION OF ALLEGED EVIDENCE
FROM 30 CLARE STREET, NEW TOWN, TASMANIA

3 MAY 1996

Received from Det. Keygan, Hobart CIB⁷⁷

Recovered from BRYANT'S home residence.⁷⁸

EVIDENCE SET UP AT 30 CLARE STREET

THERE are no records of Martin Bryant acquiring and storing an arsenal of weapons in his home or at any place in Tasmania. His mother was periodically in his home and never saw any ammunition, guns, or rifles. His girlfriend was with him constantly for several days before the incident, until the morning of 28 April 1996. She never saw any weapons, ever. But the cops want you to believe that, after several visits, they found an arsenal in that house. Planos were chocked full. Guns were lying around on the floor like dirty socks. There was *shit loads* of stuff. And two plastic bags.... – **ed.**

Three .308 calibre fired cartridge cases.⁷⁹

One .223 cal. fired cartridge case.⁸⁰

One .308 calibre fired cartridge case.⁸¹

A grey gun case.⁸²

A black gun case containing a 12-gauge cleaning kit, a .30 calibre cleaning kit, & 2 plastic bags.⁸³

A box containing 649 .308 calibre cartridges.⁸⁴

A box containing 658 .308 calibre cartridges [twenty-two of these cartridges were used for test purposes]; a Daewoo shotgun booklet, a white roll of fabric, a plastic container, 2 keys, canvas gun case, one box of 12-gauge cartridges.⁸⁵

An ammunition box containing sixteen .223 Rem. Calibre cartridges.⁸⁶

An ammunition box containing twenty .308 Calibre cartridges.⁸⁷

A patterned gun case containing: a .223 cal. Australian Automatic Arms (AAA) self loading rifle, serial number SAR020236, minus magazine.⁸⁸

Two paper bags containing a coloured woollen jumper, and a fawn parker.⁸⁹

⁷⁷ CIB – abbreviation for Criminal Investigation Branch.

⁷⁸ original underlining; original italics; added emphasis. No address for this residence is given. It is located at 30 Clare Street, New Town, Tasmania. (New Town is situated approximately three kilometers north-west of central Hobart, the capital.) This numbskull Dutton wants you to believe that compiling long lists of alleged evidence reflects good professional work. But in this case the exact opposite applies. Dutton wants his readers to believe that because all this rubbish was *found* at Martin Bryant's home it really belonged to him, and therefore he was the gunman at the Port Arthur incident. But Dutton could not, and did not, prove where a single cartridge came from. **He couldn't.** Just saying they were *found* at 30 Clare Street, after the 3rd entry to that premises by cops, proves the **set-up of Martin Bryant** by Tasmania Police – nothing more.

⁷⁹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 15. added emphasis

⁸⁰⁻⁸⁴ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 15. added emphasis. What are we supposed to make of Dutton claiming "2 plastic bags" were found? You could find plastic bags in every home in Tasmania, in Australia. So what?! **It proves nothing.**

⁸⁵ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 15. added emphasis. The following also appears in italics "(Box labeled in part, '30 Claire St, New Town.')

⁸⁶⁻⁸⁹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 15. added emphasis. What does a coloured woollen jumper (pullover or sweater) and a fawn "parker" (correct spelling is parka) have to do with the death of 35 people and the wounding of 23? **Nothing!** We are not told if there were bullet holes in any of this clothing, which would be significant if there had been coronial inquests. But there were no inquests. The clothing seems to be nothing but *extra stuff* jammed in by Dutton to make his list appear extensive.

21 JUNE 1996

Received from Sgt. Eastwood, Port Arthur Task Force⁹⁰

Recovered from Bryant's residence at 30 Clare Street....⁹¹

One .308 Win. calibre fired cartridge case.⁹²

A box containing 20 .308 Win. cal. Cartridges.⁹³

A box containing nine .223 Rem. cal. cartridges & four empty boxes.⁹⁴

A telescopic sight mount in box marked 'suitable for AR-15/M16.'⁹⁵

Leather ammunition belt containing 30 .223 Rem. cal. cartridges.⁹⁶

A bag containing 44 .223 Rem, and 11 .308 Win. cal. cartridges.⁹⁷

An empty detachable box magazine (AR-15, capacity: 30).⁹⁸

A wooden tea box containing 48 loose .308 Win. cal. Cartridges.⁹⁹

A plastic bag containing 41 .223 Rem. cal. cartridges.¹⁰⁰

A paper bag containing 3 .223 Rem. and 1 .308 Win cal. cartridges.¹⁰¹

Three boxes containing 55 .223 Rem. cal. cartridges.¹⁰²

A box (20) of .308 Win. cal. cartridges.¹⁰³

A bag containing an ammo belt & 20 .308 Win. cal. Cartridges.¹⁰⁴

ANALYSIS

Now it was during the second search of the residence that all these exhibits were located in various rooms. Some items were [allegedly] found in a piano in a room on the ground floor, while other items were [allegedly] found in a piano on the second floor.

The media were invited to film the various exhibits, with the gun cases, the leather ammunition belts the firearm(s) and thus **construct a media trial against Bryant**. However, I do not believe the media would have been invited to film the actual search, and it is amazing the number of small items that were not part of the cache filmed by the media. Parts of the exhibits were taken by Keygan and handed to Dutton on the following day (03/5/96), but the task-force retained their evidence until the 21/6/96, that is seven weeks after their search of the property.

⁹⁰ original emphasis Are you not impressed? **Port Arthur Task Force** – drum rooooooooooooooll. Get on the Internet and start looking for the public report from the Port Arthur Task Force. And **keep looking**. And **keep looking**. If you think you'll find a big comprehensive and credible report about what really happened at Port Arthur, and how the incident was thoroughly investigated, and how all the details about the identification, and all the *Witness Statements* (in which witnesses said the gunman was **not** Martin Bryant and others gave different details for the bag, the vehicle registration plate, the surfboard[s], etc.), and all the DPP analyses, and all the fingerprints that were not found, and all the purchase orders, and invoices, and receipts for the thousands of rounds of ammunition ("shit loads of ammo") identifying Martin Bryant of Clare Street, New Town, plus the night-viewing device and the telescopic sight they said Martin had, as well as two pairs of Smith & Wesson handcuffs – well, if you think you'll find all that, then you are greatly mistaken. There is no such public report because, the Port Arthur Task Force was a complicit bunch of officials tasked to protect and promote the official narrative – the **BIG LIE**.

⁹¹ On the **3rd** visit by corrupt cops. They never found any of this alleged evidence on their **1st** visit. And it seems it was on the secret **2nd** visit that the arsenal was planted inside Bryant's home at 30 Clare Street.

⁹²⁻⁹⁴ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 48. added emphasis

⁹⁵⁻¹⁰⁴ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 49. added emphasis

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

■ DUTTON'S DESCRIPTION OF BULLETS, FRAGMENTS, PELLETS

Treating ambulance personnel were quite convinced for some time that Bryant had used a shotgun in the Broad Arrow Café due to the significant number of *peppering* they noted. This later turned out to be bony fragments from other victims.¹⁰⁵

ANALYSIS

This view held by at least five qualified and experienced ambulance staff focussed upon the wounds of an American *tourist* Dennis Olsen who had **gunshot pellet wounds** to the face, neck, upper torso and arms. Now with this in mind, let us consider what the director of surgery, Dr. Stephen Wilkinson, stated to the media, specifically the *Today* show at approximately 7:25 a.m. on the 29th April 1996: "Well I know a number of people were shot in the arms and legs and know there were some gunshot wounds to the head, and just about any part of the body you wish to name, **we found some pellets.**" (added emphasis)

Gerard Dutton has always maintained that the Daewoo shotgun was never used by the gunman in the Broad Arrow Café despite many witnesses stating that a shotgun had been used inside the café, and that people had received wounds created by shotgun pellets.

The most controversial of such wounds were those received by the American *gun control advocate* Dennis Olsen, who according to records from the Royal Hobart Hospital and was utilised in Dutton's article in the American publication, *Wound Ballistics Review*.¹⁰⁶

P13 – Male, 54, (.223 – café), 1 day in hospital. Lacerations to right side of head, left eye and left chest from secondary fragmentation.

Now this being the case, then it must be assumed that the "secondary fragmentation," which is stated to be due to a .223 projectile, would have been removed and those fragments from the .223 bullet handed over to Dutton for further examination and safe-keeping as exhibits.

Also, we can now discard the comments used to placate the ambulance staff who believed that Olsen had been shot with a shotgun, as the evidence by the Royal Hobart Hospital and Dutton in the *Wound Ballistics Review* makes no mention of bony fragments but only of "secondary fragmentation" from a .223 bullet. But what is even more noticeable is that there is no record of Dutton ever receiving those secondary fragments that created Dennis Olsen's wounds. **This is very sloppy police work.**

However, we do have another piece of evidence to work with. Peter Crosswell received three different wounds to the buttocks whilst inside the Broad Arrow Café. At the time he was with two women, Thelma Walker and Pamela Law, and both of these women were also wounded and **Dutton did receive the projectiles** that created those wounds. I refer to 28 (64) and 39 (139) which follow.

¹⁰⁵ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 11. added emphasis

¹⁰⁶ G. Dutton, *et al.* *A review of the wounding effects of the Colt AR-15 and FN-FAL rifles used by Martin Bryant in the Port Arthur shooting incident April 26 [sic] 1996; Tasmania, Australia*; *Wound Ballistics Review* – vol. 3, no. 4; 1998: p. 42. In no document prepared by Dutton or by any other official, is there evidence which proves Martin Bryant owned or fired those two firearms, or any other firearms allegedly found by the police. The title of Dillon's egregious article is deceptive, and the editor believes this deception is intentional.

PATSY (n.):
a person
who is gullible
and easy to take
advantage of;
Martin Bryant.

**BANG-UP, FIT-UP, FRAME-UP,
RAILROAD, SET-UP, STITCH-UP**

- **bang-up, banged-up**
"To put someone in prison."
macmilliandictionary.com
- **fit-up, fitted-up**
"Incriminate someone on a false charge."
thefreedictionary.com
- **frame-up, framed**
"A scheme to incriminate an innocent person." &
"A conspiracy to incriminate someone on a false charge."
thefreedictionary.com
- **frame-up, framed**
"A frame-up (frameup) or setup is an American term referring to the act of framing someone, that is, providing false evidence or false testimony in order to falsely prove someone guilty of a crime. Sometimes the person who is framing someone else is the actual perpetrator of the crime. In other cases it is an attempt by law enforcement to get around due process."
wikipedia.org
- **railroad, railroaded**
"Railroaded means to convict with undue haste and by means of false charges or insufficient evidence."
chacha.com
- **set-up**
"Arrange the outcome of by means of deceit."
elook.org
- **set-up**
"To put (someone else) into a compromising situation by deceit or trickery."
thefreedictionary.com
- **stitch-up, stitched-up**
"To incriminate (someone) on a false charge by manufacturing evidence."
bing.com
- **stitch-up, stitched-up**
"Cheat someone or make them look guilty when they aren't."
usingenglish.com

*This list includes some of the common slang expressions for what cops do to get innocent people convicted. In Tasmania in 1996, a term that might have been used by corrupt officials in relation to Martin Bryant is **brick** – for example: He was bricked; Brick him. Never accept any facts are the truth when those facts are provided by police. The truth is, facts presented by cops can be concocted and the meanings that cops attached to facts can be lies which they use to compensate for their short-comings. Do not forget the meaning of the acronym POLICE: **P**aid **O**fficial **L**iar**S** **I**n **C**ourts **E**verywhere. – ed.*

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

28. Also on 2 May 1996, I received from Constable Burnett the Scientific Bureau, Hobart, the following exhibits:¹⁰⁷

(64) Four bullet fragments. (In two separate plastic jars, belled in part):

- (a) Crosswell, gunshot pellets, right buttock, x 3 fragments.
- (b) Walker, gunshot pellets right foot, right upper back x 2.

* The bullet fragments, 28(64), were in two separate jars and consisted of:

- (a) Two small pieces of copper jacketing. Both fragments are unsuitable for identification.
- (b) Two small pieces of copper jacketing. Both fragments are unsuitable for identification.¹⁰⁸

ANALYSIS

Understand this fact. Constable Burnett is simply the messenger carrying the plastic jars from the Royal Hobart Hospital to the office of sergeant Dutton. The “**gunshot pellets**” would have been labelled by the physician who surgically removed those pellets from Mr. Crosswell’s buttocks.

Forget the word “**fragment**” as that appears to have been a later addition to the label when we compare it with the next line, (b) “**Walker, gunshot pellets to right foot, right upper back x 2.**” And what the learned doctor calls gunshot pellets, Dutton states are pieces of copper jacketing, and then Dutton still gets it wrong. Peter Crosswell received three wounds, the doctor removed **three gunshot pellets** from Crosswell’s right buttock, and then Dutton tells us it was only **two pieces of copper jacketing**.

There are some major conflicts within this statement by sergeant Dutton the ballistics expert. There are even **worse conflicts** within the next few pieces of information, also extracted from his *Statutory Declaration*.

39. On the 28 May 1996 whilst in Sydney, I received from Sergeant Dickinson of the NSW Police Forensic Ballistics Unit, the following exhibit:¹⁰⁹

(139) Two bullet fragments. (In two plastic jars labelled in part):

- (a) Law, metal fragment R medial knee and
- (b) Law, metal fragment, R upper thigh.

* The bullet fragments, 39(139), were in two plastic jars and consisted of:

- (a) A small fragment of copper jacketing, unsuitable for identification.
- (b) A small fragment of copper jacketing, partially engraved with rifling characteristics, similar to the class characteristics found on bullets test fired from the Colt rifle.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 12. added emphasis

¹⁰⁸ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 13. added emphasis

¹⁰⁹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 17. added emphasis

¹¹⁰ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 17. added emphasis

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the policeman, and in this case, it is the sergeant John Dickinson, was only the messenger. A doctor at the Royal Hobart Hospital, would have removed the wound creating objects, placed these objects in the jar, labelled the jar, and then placed them in a secure area for collection by an authorised member of the Tasmania Police. This procedure would have taken place on either the 28th or 29th of April 1996.

“Sergeants Shaun Roach and John Dickinson, both experienced forensic firearms examiners with NSW Police, had responsibility for the Broad Arrow Café scene examination as well as providing expert assistance during all the autopsies in gunshot wound interpretation.”¹¹¹

Sergeant Dickinson arrived in Tasmania on the 29th April, 1996, and his first days must have been spent at the Port Arthur Historic Site. It is absolutely incredible to think, or even believe that such a competent person, one of two “**forensic firearms examiners**” would attend a hospital out of his jurisdiction, take possession of vital evidence, retain that vital evidence, return to his home interstate, lose all contact with that vital piece of evidence as he travels via aeroplane from Hobart to Sydney, and then hands that vital piece of evidence over to sergeant Dutton 28 days later.

Again, go back to the comments made by the Royal Hobart Hospital’s director of surgery, Dr. Stephen Wilkinson who stated this: “Well I know a number of people were shot in the arms and legs and you know there were some gunshot wounds to the head, and just about any part of the body you wish to name, we found some pellets.”

In regard to the wounds suffered by Dennis Olsen, there is no evidence whatsoever to refute the claims by ambulance staff that Mr. Olsen was **wounded with shotgun pellets**. In fact Dr. Wilkinson corroborates this belief.

In regard to the wounds suffered by Peter Crosswell and Thelma Walker, we have medical evidence that **they were both wounded by shotgun pellets**, and not as sergeant Dutton reports, fragmentation from unknown .223 bullets, outside the reputed 29 or 30 .223 bullets discharged within the Broad Arrow Café.

In regard to the wounds suffered by Pamela Law, we now have findings that imply **a deliberate manipulation of evidence related to the weapons used inside Broad Arrow Café**. For this Gerard Dutton and Tasmania Police, in the performance of their investigative duties within the Port Arthur massacre, it cannot get any worse than **the errors demonstrated within his sworn statement**. ■

(amended; added & original emphasis)

¹¹¹ G. Dutton, *et al.* *A review of the wounding effects of the Colt AR-15 and FN-FAL rifles used by Martin Bryant in the Port Arthur shooting incident April 26 [sic] 1996; Tasmania, Australia*; Wound Ballistics Review – vol. 3, no. 4; 1998: p. 35.

PRIMARY FIREARMS & AMMUNITION

Stewart K. Beattie

A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur; 2006

[T]he gunman or gunmen and their co-conspirators, are all still at large, rewarded, unimpeded, and that to you the reader, as it is to me, should indeed be a disturbing prospect.¹¹²

DAMIEN Bugg with his assistant Nick Perks, prosecuted the Crown's case. Although (fortunately for Bugg) the statements establishing facts read before judge¹¹³ Cox were **never tested under oath**. The witness statements were likewise **never tested under oath**. Most witness statements, gathered by Police are understandably vague: few among the witnesses were experienced in firearms of any type. But from earliest reports, and continuing right into the *court document* the primary firearm identified was a Colt AR-15 rifle. But as this wasn't the firearm recovered from the ashes of Seascope, which Police and DPP appointed as the primary weapon, any identification by witnesses as to the firearm they saw used being different, were simply **ignored by officials**. Though from reliable witness identification, I can positively identify it was a rifle used by the gunman inside the Broad Arrow Café as follows:

Colt AR-15 a1 223Rem rifle This is identical to the variant used by the gunman for some of his shooting inside the Board Arrow Café. Though Tasmania Police sergeant Gerard Dutton was compelled to identify the variant recovered damaged in the ashes at Seascope cottage, as the "rifle." A reliable witness, whom I shall not name at this time, drew a quick sketch and described in detail the rifle used inside the café. Initially, I believed he'd drawn the above mentioned rifle. But in fact upon more questioning and study of his recollection of when he was shot in relation to the other victims in the dining room, I firmly believe this witness was shot with the AR-10 rifle.¹¹⁴

Colt AR-15 SP-1 carbine¹¹⁵ S/No. SP128807 This was recovered by police in the burnt ruins of Seascope cottage. It is erroneously referred to as a "rifle" by Dutton. It was never used by the gunman; it was simply Martin Bryant's and a *throw-down*.¹¹⁶

Along with the Colt AR15 SP-1 Carbine, one of two other primary firearms identified in the court documents was: **"G" series FN-FAL** identical to the rifle in the gutter at Seascope, S/No. G3434; a self-loading rifle, in .308Win calibre. In two photographs published in the Australian Police Journal, the firearm above described as a **Carbine** is identified as a "rifle."¹¹⁷ That wrong description, which is very significant, is embedded throughout the *court documents* as well and only ever served to confuse everyone.

¹¹² Stewart K. Beattie.

¹¹³ All those keen public servants in this **psycho-political** exercise received their rewards for services rendered. At time of the massacre, Sir William Cox, a colonel in the army reserve, was Tasmania's chief judge. But at the age of 68 years and on 15 December 2004, he was sworn in as Tasmania's 26th governor after former UN weapons inspector Richard Butler was forced to resign amid raging controversy on 9 August 2004. (Beattie) In his original work, Beattie uses Justice as the title for William Cox. Describing that mongrel with that title is beyond the editor's level of tolerance. He, Cox, sentenced a *boy-man* with a 66 IQ to be imprisoned until he dies – for crimes committed by the State. Cox is another mongrel like Avery, Bugg, Dutton, Dyson, etc. Refer to Cox as Justice – **not from my cold dead lips...**

¹¹⁴ *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: pp. 207-228.

¹¹⁵ The editor is not a firearm expert, nor is he a member of a firearm association, nor does he own a firearm. But he believes the primary difference between a carbine and a rifle is barrel length. A carbine has a shorter barrel.

¹¹⁶ A throw-down is policepeak for a deception: depositing a weapon (or other significant thing) which can be used as evidence against some innocent person. In other words, a set-up by corrupt cops.

¹¹⁷ *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 218

POINT 1

After considering carefully witness statements and later conversations with witnesses, it is now my firm conclusion that the firearm primarily used inside the Café, was a **Colt AR-15 a1 rifle** of around 1967 manufacture. There are **so many errors** regarding technical firearm related terms and conclusions embedded in many documents associated with this case I find it hard to excuse it as less than intentional, on the part of so-called professionals, but as stated elsewhere, these errors certainly enhanced the confusion.

But the firearm described by police, as a "Colt AR-15" is a variant of the "rifle" model, being even rare for Australia at that time, and in fact should have been described as a **Colt AR-15 a1 SP-1 carbine**. This variant is distinct from yet another called Colt Commando, both of which come standard with a 30 round pressed metal (PM) slightly **bent** detachable magazine. Only the law-enforcement version of the AR-15 carbines come standard with a 10 shot PM magazine. Compared with the Carbine variant, the Commando has a noticeably longer hand guard, while its barrel is in fact shorter by just 2 inches than the SP-1 Carbine at 14 inches.

POINT 2

The DPP and Tasmanian Police ballistics section's forensic firearm examiner sergeant Gerard Dutton does **not** correctly identify the Colt firearm he is referring to in the court documents, or indeed in the Australian Police Journal article,¹¹⁸ or the police *training video*.

Is it any wonder, the media never did get this firearm's description right either. But they may very well never have been told the truth at the outset, and so continued in ignorance to use the Colt AR-15 "rifle" tag adding to the confusion. Joe Vialls on the other hand, got the firearms **right**, first time. His article appeared in a newspaper.¹¹⁹ But the first photographic evidence available to the public authored by Dutton, appeared in the Australian Police Journal corresponding forensic information appeared in the journal of the International Wound Ballistic Association.¹²⁰ When he wrote his article, Vialls could not have considered a single witness statement as he never had any. So his information must have come from an **inside official source!**

This conclusion alone, I believe, is a damning indictment of the real agenda of Vialls as a prolific writer and confirms his boast of having influential "friends" in the *intelligence community* families – as to what nationality these "friends" were I can but speculate. In the latter WBR article I refer to, Dutton (and his three co-authors) firstly claims the Colt to be a "rifle" then an "AR-15 SP1." This confusion is a consistent factor throughout the entire case: *The Crown v. Martin Bryant*. When lies are told, legions of fibbers are required to support these lies.¹²¹

The first cop delivered to the Broad Arrow Café by a colleague is referred to in some reports as detective constable Peter Hesman (yet in other documents as simply a constable). He provides us with a significantly different view of the primary firearm deployed by the gunman in the café:

¹¹⁸ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: pp. 207-228.

¹¹⁹ The Strategy; May 1998. Evidence strongly suggests that this Joe Vialls was/is an evil professional deceiver. Be warned.

¹²⁰ G. Dutton, *et al.* *A review of the wounding effects of the Colt AR-15 and FN-FAL rifles used by Martin Bryant in the Port Arthur shooting incident April 26 [sic] 1996; Tasmania, Australia*; Wound Ballistics Review – vol. 3, no. 4; 1998: pp. 35-48.

¹²¹ It was Terence, the Roman playwright of the 2nd cent. BCE who said: *One falsehood treads on the heels of another.*

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

"It became Hesman's crime scene: the first cop there and **the only senior officer present for most of the afternoon**. Paramedics led him around the dead, dying and wounded in the car park. Then Hesman walked the 50 metres and climbed the steps to the Broad Arrow Café."¹²² The article continues:

"When Hesman first entered the café, he recalls: 'I went around and did a count and there were 20 bodies. I was surprised, but I wasn't shocked.'" He began securing the crime scene, ordering friends and relatives of the dead from the building. Then it was copybook detection. He noted the shells and empty magazines on the cafe floor were two different calibres, from two military weapons. Hesman feared there were terrorists. He examined the victims, killed by shots to the head, and his suspicions grew."¹²²

So here we are clearly told several vital pieces of evidence. Evidence incidentally that has been preserved on the Tasmania Police *training video*. Why was this evidence apparently ignored by the fair-haired boy of Tasmania forensic firearm examination (Dutton), the courts and prosecution alike? For evident on this video tape and clearly visible are "shells" of differing calibres and when combined with Hesman's "empty magazines" – also plural – there on the floor inside the Broad Arrow Café, understandably the scene was suggestive to this trained policeman a presence of *terrorists* – also in the plural and a suspicion by Hesman's that was growing. So what of the official line on the primary weapon?

Well the Colt AR-15 SP1 Carbine variant I now believe was **not** the primary firearm. My research and investigations lead me to conclude **the primary firearm was a Colt AR-15 SP1 rifle**. The rifle variant has a noticeably longer forearm hand guard and the barrel is longer also than that of the Carbine. Also the flash suppressor is of a smaller muzzle outside diameter (OD), and is longer than that of the Carbine.

POINT 3

Importantly, not a single witness describes the butt-stock of the firearm used in the Café as being that of a Carbine with its distinctive collapsible, tubular section.

Significantly, the butt-stock of the "rifle" variant is a non-adjustable dark coloured polymer plastic material. It gives an impression of the firearm being of more bulk than the Carbine variant. All models display the manufacturer's emblem, identification, model and serial number, stamped into the metal on the lower left side of the magazine housing.

Sergeant Gerard Dutton has been described by Richard McCreadie¹²³ as "the best ballistics expert in the nation." What a pity Dutton chose not to show a photograph of the left side of the action of the Carbine recovered from the margins of the ruins at Seascope for if he had there would have been no confusion whatsoever – but of course this disclosure may well have not served the prosecution's case in the long run.

¹²² *Casualties of war*; The Bulletin: 29 April 1997.

¹²³ At the time of the Port Arthur incident, Richard McCreadie was the deputy commissioner of Tasmania Police.

The Colt AR-15 SP-1 when recovered had a, "3x20 Colt telescopic sight...fitted along with a black nylon sling...."¹²⁴ The sling I can identify as a non-genuine #2676 nylon Ultra Sling, by Uncle Mike's, originally having an overall length of 48 inches. For this very flammable sling to have partially survived the conflagration that was Seascope, I'm firmly of the opinion the firearm must have been placed there by someone **after** the intensity of the fire had waned, as the photograph suggests.

Of importance here too, is the fact that the Colt AR-15 SP-1 at the time of its recovery among the ashes at the periphery of the Seascope cottage, had in battery a 20 shot capacity straight magazine, not the model's standard issue 30 shot capacity **bent** magazine, claimed by the prosecution to have been used at the Café.

At least two witnesses counted the shots, and from the number knew the first magazine had to be of a 30 round capacity. There was a magazine change recorded as occurring while the shootings were in progress inside the Café. As I noted earlier, a most reliable witness observed the gunman carefully and for a considerable time, he has drawn a notebook sketch indicating a straight 20 shot pressed-steel magazine in battery when he sighted the rifle held by the gunman.

Considering the Crown's [State's] case would have us accept that intellectually impaired Martin Bryant shot and killed 20 people and wounded 13 others within the confines of what was in reality a relatively small, congested café and souvenir shop, crowded with an estimated 60 visitors (plus staff), then for a professionally trained lone gunman, this segment of the shooting was for him a dangerous time; he could well have been overcome if charged by numbers of people at once.

Therefore, in the middle of this risky environment, why would the shooter have downgraded his firepower by installing a magazine of a lesser capacity? Such a conundrum is deserving of more consideration, as "the nation's best ballistic expert" fails to tell us of the capacity of the replacement magazine, it surely must have been another magazine of 30-round capacity. We're informed of one Colt .223Rem 30 shot capacity magazine having been recovered from the boot of the yellow Volvo which the gunman abandoned at the tollbooth.

So could this not mean there is one 30 shot Colt .223Rem magazine which remains unaccounted for? Dutton requested assistance from the Colt Company of the USA to determine the reasons for the AR-15's horrific damage, and it is interesting to note the Colt's expert Mr. Taylor alludes to the above Colt AR-15 as being a Carbine, but gives no indication of accurately identifying the model.¹²⁵

The following additional firearms were introduced as evidence in the Court Documents as well as being dealt with in the Australian Police Journal article by sergeant Dutton. It would seem to make a more complete report if we detail them also as follows:

¹²⁴ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 222.

¹²⁵ *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 224.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- The Daewoo 12-gauge self-loading shotgun.¹²⁶
- The SKK 7.62x39 Norinco selfloading carbine, discharged inside Seascope.¹²⁶
- Among *various other firearms* mentioned was an Australian Automatic Arms, **AAA-SAR** (.223Rem), **allegedly** found by Tasmania Police on the hallway floor at Martin Bryant's Clare Street home on the 3rd May 1996 when they [officially] **entered the premises for a second time**.¹²⁷

Also mentioned among these *various other firearms* was yet another (coincidentally of course), self-loading carbine of military origin: **30-M1 carbine**. And also, regarding these *various other firearms* the ballistic expert and forensic firearms examiner Dutton and the DPP are **deliberately vague** on specifics when describing these firearms so described, including the AAA-SAR. This firearm was photographed by police on their **second raid** of Martin Bryant's home conducted on Saturday 3 May 1996 – **six days after the first raid**.

Remember, lead by inspector Ross Paine, police forced an entry to the Clare Street premises on the evening of the 28th April accompanied by psychiatrist Dr. Ian Sale (and some journalists) but police failed to retrieve anything of substance **other than some labels from ammunition boxes**. There were two more subsequent raids on 29th of April and four days later on the 3rd of May. How possibly could this *entourage* have not tripped over all this evidence lying in the hallway of Bryant's Clare Street premises the first time?

But even cops-in-the-know are coy about these *various other firearms* for the police *training video* evidences just a single frame to confirm the .223Rem AAA-CAR carbine, next to a camouflage, zippered gun-bag was *found* there. That video also shows us the claimed **thousands of rounds** of ammunition, pictured there by police on the later official raid. Or if police moved the evidence to the hallway for photographic reasons, would they dare to seriously suggest this *cache* was found by them concealed within a piano (the pianos?) at the Clare St. premises? It was during this first forced [illegal] entry, coloured photos belonging to Martin Bryant were stolen and published by the media across the nation.

As other police photographs demonstrate, the innards of the Clare Street piano were rather too cramped for space, what with all the mechanism for making music contained therein. I'm unconvinced Martin concealed any of the thousands of rounds, various ammo belts (with their few rounds) and cleaning rods *etc*, inside his two pianos. It becomes obvious that, like the overlooked amendment of the *Bundeena* ferry schedule to the Isle of the Dead that day, someone had also overlooked **planting supportive evidence** in the Clare St premises before the 28th so it would be found on the first raid. For police to discover or trip over this cache only on the second raid is **all too transparent, too convenient, and quite unconvincing**.

A former journalist of The Mercury now residing on the mainland confirmed to this author that police accompanied by psychiatrist Ian Sale, "**forced an entry into Martin Bryant's Clare Street home,**"

¹²⁶ Damian Bugg. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 1996: p. 141.

¹²⁷ Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 1996: p. 189. In fact, the police would have had to enter Bryant's home at least three times: **1st** on 28 April with Dr. Ian Sale; **2nd** on a date kept secret with the arsenal of weapons and ammunition to disperse throughout the house; & **3rd** on 3 May when they claimed to have found that (planted) arsenal there at 30 Clare Street.

DPP TAMPERS WITH & WITHHOLDS EVIDENCE

AT the **sentencing hearing** for Martin Bryant, Tasmanian director of public prosecutions (DPP) Damien Bugg told the Court the following:

"There were two interesting observations made late in the morning [Sunday, 28 April 1996] and at about midday by two people who reside in the area, one Mr. Simmons, heard at about 11 a.m. two shots. He knew the Martins well and he knew on that day that it was Mr. Martin's birthday. Further down towards Port Arthur and near the boat ramp, a Mr. Doug McCutcheon heard a series of rapidly fired shots and his best estimate of the time of that was about twelve o'clock to twelve thirty. He estimated that the calibre of the rifle used was larger than .22. He has some experience with firearms and some sensitivity about it, being involved in the operation of a fish farm. He claimed that whenever gun shots went off in the district he was blamed for shooting seals. But he estimated that in that volley of shots there would have been six, at the most twelve shots. Later in the day he heard further shooting when [the gunman] was at Port Arthur. In that late morning how many shots were fired and precisely when is difficult to determine but these two residents heard shooting on that day in the pre-lunch period and the Crown case is that Bryant shot Mr. and Mrs. Martin at about that time." (*Court Transcript*; 19 Nov 1996: pp. 62-63.)

What is wrong with this is that the claim that shots were heard by Mr. McCutcheon about 12:00 to 12.30 p.m. **is a lie**. McCutcheon heard the shots between 10:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. [see the McCutcheon *Witness Statement*] The question must be asked why did the DDP change this? Was it to rule out any suggestion someone else killed the Martins between 10 a.m. and 11 a.m. well before Martin Bryant [allegedly] arrived at Seascope? It would appear so because right after this lie the DDP went on to say: "Tourists to Tasmania at the time, Donald and Stephanie Gunn, had spent the night at 'The Seascope.' They departed at about 11:15 to 11:20 a.m., and at that time David and Sally Martin were in residence all the other guests had departed. The Gunns stayed chatting to Mr. & Mrs. Martin and then later when they departed they noted that both of the Martins were engaged in chores about 'The Seascope.' So at about 11:20 a.m. the Crown case is that Mr. & Mrs. Martin were at the premises on their own." These witnesses claim everything was fine at Seascope until around 11:15 a.m. when they left. But what needs explaining is the fact that the Gunns do not mention the gunshots that the other two witnesses said occurred before 11:00 a.m. emanating from Seascope when they would have been there. This raises a question mark regards their presence at Seascope.

The key point is **NOBODY** heard shots at Seascope between 11:45 a.m. and 12:40 p.m. when the DPP alleged Martin Bryant was there and shot and killed the Martins. McCutcheon who was 500 metres away would have heard them but he says they occurred between 10 a.m. and 11 a.m. It is unlikely McCutcheon could be two hours out in his timing. And witness Simmons, who lived opposite Seascope and was watching the clock because he was waiting for a ride, also heard shots between 10:45 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. – **WELL BEFORE BRYANT ARRIVED**. [see *Witness Statement* of Simmons]. The DDP alleged Bryant arrived after 11:20 a.m., yet other evidence indicates Bryant never got to Seascope until 12:20 p.m.).

If the only shots* fired that morning were just before 11:00 a.m., then it is a substantial alibi for Bryant in respect of the allegation he killed the Martins. These two witnesses statements are reinforced by the fact Bryant was [allegedly] witnessed being up to **58 kilometres to the north of Seascope** when the shots were heard. This is because he was witnessed at Midway Point newsagency **between 10:30 a.m. and 11:00 a.m.** [see the Kessarios *Witness Statement*].

(cont.)

Another witness saw him around the same time frame (11 a.m.) at the Shell Service Station at **Forcett** where Bryant spent 8 to 10 minutes having a cup of coffee. [see the King *Witness Statement*]. That would put Bryant leaving Forcett at 11:08 a.m. at the earliest. Shots had been heard at Seascope, 58km away, some 20 to 30 minutes earlier. Martin Bryant cannot be at both places at the same time. **NONE OF THIS WAS DISCLOSED TO THE COURT BY THE DPP.**

It is necessary to state that it is likely the time given by the Gunns is incorrect. If they in fact left earlier than they said - at 10:15 a.m. to 10:20 a.m. - it would fit. There is however another question mark in relation to the Gunns - namely that the DPP told the Court they were "Tourists to Tasmania" when in fact they lived somewhere in North Hobart. The fact remains, **nobody living near to Seascope heard shots between 11:45 a.m. and 12:40 p.m.** It is also important to note while **Damian Bugg told this whopper to the Court**, Martin Bryant's third lawyer, John Avery, the man who allegedly persuaded him to plead guilty, sat back and did nothing to correct this **false statement** - or point out the true facts which give Bryant an ALIBI in respect of the Martin murders - and thereby also cast extreme doubt about what else went on at the historic site - namely that he acted alone.

Here we have not one but two pieces of critical evidence which give Martin Bryant an alibi. One, the timing of shots being heard much earlier, and the other a failure to disclose Bryant's whereabouts at that time - not being put to the Court. WHY? The Tasmanian DPP's office is legally and morally bound to explain exactly why the evidence of Douglas William McCutcheon was altered in such a manner as to remove any notion **Martin Bryant was in fact elsewhere** at the time murderous events were occurring at Seascope on the morning of Sunday, 28 April 1996. This is an indisputable case of **TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE** and **WITHHOLDING EVIDENCE** that are clearly related to each other - the circumstances of which combined indicates **a conspiracy by the DPP to pervert the course of justice** because that evidence would have established Martin Bryant to be innocent.

* **NB** The shots heard appear to be two different sets. Simmons was standing on the highway waiting for a car to pick him up and Seascope was in viewing distance a short distance way. He heard two muffled shots which he described as being like from a .22 rifle. It is believed they were actually high velocity rifle shots fired inside Seascope which were the shots that killed David Martin. This occurred before 11 a.m., more specifically **around 10:40 a.m.** These two shots were far too faint for McCutcheon, who lived 500 metres away, to hear. Simmons then got his ride and departed just before 11:00 a.m. After he left, there was a second batch of shots fired outside Seascope which it is believed the real gunman was test firing the two rifles to check their working order. These were the rifles used at Port Arthur Historic Site later that day. Those are the six to 12 rapid fire shots McCutcheon heard, and Simmons didn't hear because he had departed in the vehicle he had been waiting and watching for. Martin Bryant, the bunny for what was about to happen that day, was somewhere **between Midway Point and Forcett when all these shots were being fired.** As for Sally Martin, **she was alive that afternoon** long after all the shooting at the historic site, as well as on the highway had ended. Several statements prepared by the police confirm this fact. [see Allen, Hyland, Whittle statements] For the DPP and the judge to say Martin Bryant killed David and Sally Martin before he went to the historic site is incorrect concocted nonsense.

Andrew S. MacGregor
in *Port Arthur Cover-Up* (Ian McNiven)
loveforlife.co.au
18 February 2013
(amended; added emphasis)

without a warrant, late on the evening of 28th April. I have no reason to doubt the words of this witness. His allegation destroys Bugg's elaborate story used in court to establish Martin Bryant's departure time earlier that Sunday morning; namely, that the police led by inspector Ross Paine supposedly discovered a burglar alarm, set at 9:45 a.m. My informant told me no such alarm was set, for if it had been, the forced entry by police would have triggered the alarm and it would have awoken the neighbourhood! During the forced entry, police turned a blind eye to journalists who stole photographs of Martin that later were digitally altered and published on Tuesday the 30th April in *The Australian* bearing the now infamous, contemptuous headline, *FACE OF A KILLER*.

It reminds me of the tale of the arsenal allegedly stored inside Seascope, which was perpetuated right down to the wire and said to have been owned by the Martins. Even Cox the judge was taken in by this deception when he said this: "**Throughout the night he continued to discharge a number of weapons, his own arsenal augmented by weapons belonging to the Martins....**"¹²⁸

Neither the court, nor police ever bothered to establish the owner of this arsenal of firearms nor indeed who was responsible for their presence there either. The courts exhibit in Tasmania and indeed universally in Australia, an abiding fondness to prosecute anyone and everyone who breaches the various firearms acts. But they never did charge Martin Bryant, or Glenn Martin, the son of Sally and David Martin of Seascope, with any breach of law regarding these [alleged] illegally held firearms at either property – a subject also avoided by NCGC [National Coalition for Gun Control] The police also never bothered to establish the supplier of the alleged, "**one thousand four hundred and ninety one .308 calibre and two hundred and forty-six .223 calibre live rounds of ammunition...seized from Bryant's home.**"¹²⁹

I can but speculate that had the supplier been named, it could well have proved very embarrassing to Tasmania Police, rather than the accused and it took police 3 raids to recover it!

Interestingly, police are alleged to have told the media that Glenn Martin owned the reported "**arsenal of 43 guns stored in his parents' pretty cottage...**" a claim that he was understandably appalled by and quick to refute.¹³⁰ In the same report he adamantly states that there is no truth in reports that the guns used in the massacre may have belonged to him or were stored in his parents' home. Remarkably, **the media report remains the sole record of the number of firearms actually recovered from Seascope!** Police failed to establish that Martin Bryant purchased these firearms. In fact, Martin had been subject to a tight monetary control by Perpetual Trustees. **You cannot purchase 43 firearms with peanuts!** Anyway, how on earth would Martin have transported 46 [43+3] guns to Seascope that weekend, along with the 2,500 rounds of ammunition which professor Simon Chapman obligingly tells us he somehow knew the gunman had at his disposal inside Seascope before the ruins were even inspected by police!¹³¹

¹²⁸ William Cox. Comments on passing sentence in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 22 November 1996. It is exceedingly difficult to comprehend a supreme court judge uttered such ridiculous rot. There is **no evidence** proving Martin Bryant fired a single shot from any rifle or shotgun on either the 28th or the 29th of April 1996. This Cox, who was the chief judge of Tasmania, was either gulled by the cops, or was complicit in setting up the patsy. Mongrel Cox insisted on telling the world that Martin Bryant augmented his **never proved** alleged arsenal with a **never proved** alleged arsenal at Seascope cottage.

¹²⁹ Nick Perks. in *Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 1996: p. 190.

¹³⁰ Heather Kennedy. *Last contact with Martins years ago*; Sunday Herald Sun; 4 May 1996.

¹³¹ Simon Chapman. *Today*; *Liz Hay interview*; 29 April 1996: 07:57.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

You see, Chapman made this candid admission on Channel Nine's **Today** broadcast live across the nation – including Tasmania where the gunman supposedly had power to watch TV if he desired – at 7:57 a.m. on 29 April, **27 minutes¹³² before Martin was burnt out of Seascope!** Is professor Simon Chapman psychic also?

But consider, if the firearms average weight was say around 6lbs (2.7kg) that means Martin Bryant would have had to transport in **excess of 258lbs or 117kg** of firearms in his Volvo to Seascope, and what about the ammunition? For example a case of 880 rounds x .308W, weighs 56 lbs, while .223Rem by contrast a little lighter. Remember, an unnamed informant reportedly told police media liaison officer Geoff Easton there was: "shit-loads of ammo mate" stored inside Seascope. So who was Geoff Easton's informant with this first-hand knowledge of what was allegedly kept at Seascope? Did police ever bother to follow up the witness or the claims?

But really. Can you imagine the distinctive yellow Volvo, with a surf-board on its roof-rack, loaded above the windowsill-line of the passenger compartments front and back, with firearms, and thousands of rounds of ammunition aboard and with containers of petrol in the cabin making four stops along the way and this **arsenal** escaping the astonished gaze of at least someone?

But the Crown [State] alleges the FN-FAL and the Colt AR-15 Carbine were the only firearms used by the gunman at the following crime scenes:

1. Broad Arrow Café: Colt AR-15.
2. Bus/car park Broad Arrow Café: Colt AR-15, & FN-FAL.¹³³
3. Jetty Road: Colt AR-15.
4. Toll Booth: FN-FAL.¹³³
5. Port Arthur Service Station: FN-FAL.¹³³
6. Arthur Highway, at Seascope entrance: FN-FAL.¹³³

At the 7th crime scene – Seascope cottage – various unspecified firearms allegedly were discharged. Oddly we are not informed as to the calibre and/or type of most of these *various other firearms* and I'm caused to ask; the court denied those details – **why?** We are told only that they were "placed at least one firearm in each room." Neither police nor the DPP have given detailed information here, though Perks mentions in particular an "SKK semi-automatic rifle" and Gerard Dutton mentions among this arsenal of weaponry, a "12-gauge self-loading shotgun, a 30M1 Carbine," as well as a "7-62x39mm Norinco self-loading rifle."¹³⁴

An **SKK** carbine (not a rifle) is mentioned in various documents as being used at Seascope; it is an interesting firearm having a 30 shot detachable AK-47-type PM box magazine. The model is a variant of the SKS Type 56 Carbine of Chinese manufacture. The SKK being a variant of the original Samozaryadnyy Karabin Sisyemi Simonova or Russian **SKS**. And as you can see, the middle K in both acronymic titles stands for Carbine.

¹³² According to the chronology of events in the *Port Arthur seminar papers*; 1997: p. 6, Martin Bryant was burnt out of Seascope at 08:24. So as the author rightly notes, 27 minutes earlier this Chapman was on a television program in which the exact quantity of ammunition Martin Bryant was alleged to have with him, inside Seascope cottage, was broadcast to the Australian public. Of course Chapman did not know anything about what was inside Seascope. All he did was repeat what he was told or heard from some corrupt cop(s). This Chapman – a so-called professor – assisted with the spreading of the **false official narrative**.

¹³³ At each crime scene where the FN-FAL self-loading rifle was said by the DPP to have been used, it was in fact an AR-10 rifle, never recovered by police. **Both firearms used by the gunman departed with him from Seascope cottage.** (Beattie)

¹³⁴ *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 215. & Nick Perks. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 1996: p. 176.

Dutton's detailed description of the firearms allegedly used during the Port Arthur incident has been demolished by Stewart Beattie's superior analysis – it is obvious Beattie went looking for the truth, whereas Dutton went after setting up Martin Bryant.

As I have already stated, the DPP is quite adamant that the FN-FAL and the Colt AR-15 alone were used in the shooting murders and the woundings. But the 30cal firearm used at all crime scenes except Jetty Road (where the AR-15 SP-1 223 Rem was used) and Seascope was an AR-10 7.62 NATO rifle.

But we must be very aware also of the 7.62x39 calibre firearm that was [allegedly] deliberately aimed and fired at the police vehicle parked on the highway outside Seascope. What is also not made clear by the DPP is who fired those shots. It is my finding, that no proof exists in the DPP's case of who the shooter was, or even if it ever was *Jamie* a.k.a. Martin Bryant, and I will explain the veracity of this in detail in a later chapter.

So the prosecution's case rests upon the primary two weapons allegedly used in the commission of murders and attempted murders in the 7 crime scenes on the Tasman Peninsula, on the 28th of April 1996. The DPP's case is weak and was never proven beyond doubt.

The Crown introduced the Colt AR-15 .223 Rem into evidence in the *court document* at pp. 59/9 & 100/1-8, and the FN-FAL .308W at pp. 59/10 & 140/25-27, as being the two prime weapons used to cause the murders and injuries that weekend. I will show the deception of this claim as we progress. However, significant is the early mention by Damien Bugg of the Daewoo 12-gauge self-loading shotgun with its detachable magazine (*court document* p. 59/12), but again the prosecution fails to provide any details of the shotgun: **no** serial number, **no** movement history, and **no** proof of ownership.

Martin did acknowledge ownership of just three firearms: an AR-10 rifle (in for repair at Terry Hill's gunshop), a Colt AR-15 SP-1 Carbine (almost surely purchased at the Hobart Gun Show on 20 April, 1996), and the Daewoo shotgun. But the DPP's omissions I suspect are purposefully and consistently repeated, like for example in the case of the two sets of Smith & Wesson handcuffs that legally never existed. The reason for investigating police consistently omitting such information will become apparent as we progress in our study.

Now, with regard to the two sets of handcuffs, reputed to have been used in a most unusual way to manacle the hostage Glenn Pears, I can find no statement in the *court document* which relates directly to any photograph of these two handcuffs in place on the body, or indeed after having been removed from the remains. Why? Were they ever in fact recovered from the ruins of Seascope?

Police conducted an inappropriate interrogation of Martin Bryant in his isolation cell at Risdon Prison, **handcuffed and wearing leg-irons**. But he was also hobbled by the fact that even his legal counsel at the time, David Gunson [allegedly] sanctioned the police to conduct the interview **without him being present!** With dodgy [faulty] recording equipment inspectors R. Paine, J. Warren, detective sergeant L. Jones and detective constable S. Bolt are recorded as the inquisitors there on 4 July 1996. Paine raises the question of handcuffs for the first and last time with prisoner Martin Bryant when he asks:

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- Q. Ohh. When, the hostage, did you, did he just get in or did you handcuff him or anything like that?
- A. Umm, handcuffed him or anything, no. Ahh, what was that?
- Q. Well do you own any handcuffs?
- A. No, never, never owned handcuffs in my life.
- Q. Ohh right. ¹³⁵

Of this pair of handcuffs, the DPP **never** entered into evidence the two pairs of Smith & Wesson handcuffs and **never** entered into evidence any photographs of any type of handcuffs.

Another curious consideration is the fact that Mr. Perks claims (*court document* p.157/1-5), that near the tollbooth, the shooter transferred, "a number of items from the Volvo to the BMW," which included, the non existent "two sets of Smith & Wesson handcuffs." For Perks to make such a claim as *fact* he must indeed be psychic: there is **no statement from a witness and Martin Bryant stated clearly he never owned handcuffs**. No evidence existed to prove the two sets of cuffs were ever in the Volvo sedan that day. Forget about the handcuffs as THEY NEVER DID EXIST! If empirical evidence is not formally entered in evidence then that evidence for the purpose of the case DOES NOT EXIST. It is another smoke and mirrors trick!

Here I need also to point out a quite unique fact; in Sydney and on August 17 1991, 33-year-old Wade Frankum went to the Strathfield Plaza, where he killed 6 people and wounded another 17. Interestingly during the inquest the coroner, a Mr. Weller, mentioned Wade Frankum was at the time taking the controversial prescribed drug PROZAC. After exiting into the Plaza's carpark, Frankum reportedly *hijacked* a car - NSW Reg MTX-536 - driven by an off-duty female detective of the NSW police. Commander Wicks of the NSW Police Service was reported as claiming Frankum said to this driver, words to the effect, "I'm sorry," left the car, put the muzzle of the SKK under his chin and shot himself. Handcuffs were also recovered by police at the scene.

So similar to Port Arthur, the massacre at Strathfield had these elements present also:

1. The primary weapon was a self-loading military style firearm, already a primary target of *anti-gun* advocates;
2. Hijacking of a vehicle;
3. A knife as a weapon, with the knife being used first; and,
4. Handcuffs involved as evidential material.

Handcuffs have not been deployed by the perpetrator in any shooting incident anywhere in the world to my knowledge, other than in shooting massacres at Strathfield and Port Arthur in Australia. Please consider carefully the significance of this unique *modus operandi*. To any investigator worth her/his salt, such unique occurrences common in two crimes using the same type of weapons perpetrated by two independent killers and allegedly planned by them independently but occurring in a common country in a reasonably close time frame

¹³⁵ *Interrogation Transcript*; Risdon Prison, Hobart; 4 July 1996.

(say, under 5 years), points to an irrefutable common link. So, what is the common *link* in these two shootings? Of critical importance is the fact that in legal terms in the case of *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*, the **two sets of handcuffs never existed!** This fact is expanded upon in Chapter 23. But having in essence stated handcuffs were not used at Seascope only means that the real gunman and for that matter **Martin Bryant didn't use or possess handcuffs**; it certainly doesn't absolve the controller or those who ran the covert operation from the link they themselves have established in the allegations regarding the presence of handcuffs with the Strathfield massacre.

In the Frankum case, like Port Arthur, movement histories of firearms and handcuffs could have been proven through the trade's invoicing records at least; no such investigation was undertaken in either case. When fundamental police investigations are ignored in one case, it could be excused as an oversight. However, when it happens twice, one could be forgiven for suspecting these oversights were deliberate. It is not unreasonable therefore to conclude and I believe cannot be refuted by the gun-control networks, that here is demonstrated clearly the fact that extensive record keeping and registration by licensed dealers, of individual firearms, handcuffs and the like, at the various points from manufacturer to end user and on, is an abject failure. Now we move to a firearm officially labelled as almost irrelevant, although it fitted exactly the *gun control* crowd's targeted type of firearm.

DAEWOO SELF-LOADING 12-GAUGE SHOTGUN

During the interviews in July and when holding up a firearm to Bryant, inspector Paine said, "This is a Daewoo 12-gauge shotgun," which provoked the accused to respond: "...yeah I bought that one off umm, Hill..."¹³⁶ So here, Martin Bryant admits to owning a Daewoo shotgun for which he goes on to tell us he paid around \$3,000. Although yet again **police never confirmed** who supplied Martin Bryant with the Daewoo.

We are told Police recovered the Daewoo shotgun from the boot of a yellow Volvo sedan, registration CG-2835 abandoned by the gunman near the Port Arthur tollbooth, where he hijacked the BMW. On the Tasmania Police video and in the imprecise segment covering the Volvo, there we can see the Daewoo just inside the open boot in a most unnatural pose, with a magazine in battery and carry strap fitted. **Obviously someone had shifted the shotgun – surely it must have been police.** To suggest evidence has been tampered with is a most serious allegation, and is not an allegation I make indifferently.

Now Gerard Dutton holding up the Daewoo shotgun tells us the magazine is capable of holding 10 cartridges, but according to the *court documents*, when the gun was recovered the magazine contained just 9 cartridges. However, of importance here, is the fact **Dutton fails to inform us** whether the Daewoo was forensically examined to prove whether or not the firearm had recently been discharged.

¹³⁶ *Interrogation Transcript*; Risdon Prison, Hobart; 4 July 1996.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Secondly Dutton chooses not to provide any details at all of the ammunition loaded in the magazine as to the make, type of shell,¹³⁷ or shot size. Remember, with regard to the café segment, the time constraint and maximum 29 shot theory and lone-gunman scenario was central to the Crown's case. I believe these factors weighed more heavily upon the whole of the police investigation than many can imagine.¹³⁸

At page 91 of the EMA report, we are told that after coroner Ian Matterson at Taranna received the *all clear* at 19:30 hrs (7:30 p.m.). He proceeded to Port Arthur via the alternate route through Koonya to begin his duties of examining the crime scenes, commencing at around 20:05 hrs (8:05 p.m.) in the bus park beside the café. After examining 3 crime scenes he reached the Volvo where he explains, "Inside the open boot of the Volvo could be seen **firearms** and a small white gun shooting target that appeared to have been used. Within the passenger compartment were several petrol containers." I emphasise the fact that here the coroner used the plural, **firearms**; but keep in mind Matterson's indeterminate details as to the number of petrol containers and their position in the vehicle.¹³⁹

Gerard Dutton says: "Later examination of the Volvo revealed bullet damage, hundreds of spare cartridges, spare magazines and another container of petrol." Here Dutton alone informs us of a possible reason for the gunman abandoning the Volvo at the tollbooth; nowhere is this fact mentioned by the coroner nor can I find it detailed in the *court documents*; a press photograph is the only confirmation I can find of the Volvo having "bullet damage." But Dutton's statements are not definitive as to type of magazines, details of ammunition and location of evidential items and the situation continues with him stating: "Also in the Volvo's boot was a 12-gauge Daewoo self-loading shotgun fitted with a ten round box magazine. The shotgun was not fired during the Port Arthur incident....": but had it recently been discharged?

Perks tells us that the gunman "left behind in the Volvo...items ...including the 12-gauge shotgun Daewoo semi-automatic shotgun ...fitted with a magazine containing nine cartridges." He further states that also left in the Volvo were: "...two magazines for the .308 FN rifle, one empty and one containing seventeen live rounds." If this was so, why were the two 30 calibre magazines never entered into evidence, even photographic evidence? Were the two 308 FN Rifle magazines in fact not metric pattern, and so they would be embarrassingly incompatible with the *throw-down* FN-FAL rifle?¹⁴⁰

Here several other dilemmas are exposed, which immediately beg the question: What firearm/s (other than the Daewoo shotgun) did Mr. Matterson see in the boot of the Volvo, which caused him to use the plural form – "firearms"?

To consider fully the implications surrounding the Daewoo shotgun, we must also consider very carefully witness statements and the following report. A delivery driver for a welding firm in Vancouver, Washington in the USA, 54-year-old Dennis Olsen was a visitor to

¹³⁷ Here, shell is a synonym for a shotgun cartridge (approx. 7cmL x 2cmD), which basically is filled with a measure of gunpowder/propellant, a separating wad, then shot/pellets (or one solid projectile) which are/is discharged from the gun when it is fired by squeezing the trigger.

¹³⁸ Tasmania Police *training video*.

¹³⁹ *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: pp. 90-95. There is no record of Martin Bryant purchasing petrol then filling any type of container(s) with that fuel. It seems that petrol was purchased on 28 April 1996 but it was pumped directly into the petrol tank of a Volvo. Whether the person who did this was Martin Bryant, and whether that Volvo belonged to Martin Bryant is **not certain**. The State made many assertions, but **proved none**. There is clear evidence that on this day, a male person, most probably the gunman, impersonated Martin Bryant. That person stopped at several small-business premises along the Arthur Highway. At these places, the person interacted there with staff to ensure they would later recall the client/man with long blond hair who was then quickly and falsely identified as Martin Bryant. The presence of containers, filled with fuel or empty, in a Volvo, has never been explained in a credible way. Asserting they were there because Martin Bryant put them there is **not** proof of anything.

¹⁴⁰ *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 90. & Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 209.

*Officials did not investigate the incident at Port Arthur, they did exactly what textbooks tell investigators **not to do** – they publicly announced who they wanted the perpetrator to be, then they fitted the evidence to railroad him.*

CHAIN OF CUSTODY/EVIDENCE/POSSESSION

■ “Even though a reliable chain of evidence may be established, physical **evidence may have been altered** prior to or during its collection and examination. Unless the integrity of the evidence can be readily established, and legitimate evidentiary influences accounted for, **the documentation of a chain of evidence, by itself, does not provide acceptable grounds upon which to build reliable forensic conclusions.**” (added emphasis)

W. Jerry Chisum, Brent E. Turvey
Criminal Profiling
2001: p. 102

■ “When a question arises as to the authenticity of an item offered as evidence or its possible alteration or contamination, the location and condition of the article from the time of its discovery must be proved. Proof of this ‘chain of custody’ demonstrates that: (a) The evidence offered is the same evidence found at the scene; (b) There has been no opportunity to replace or improperly alter the evidence; and (c) Any change in the condition of the evidence can be explained (e.g., destruction through laboratory analysis).” &

■ “Since photographs are potential evidence for trial, the chain of custody may need to be proved in order to rebut allegations of **tampering**. The investigator should therefore maintain the physical and legal integrity of all photo negatives.” (added emphasis)

Jerry L. Dowling
Criminal Investigation
1979: pp. 63, 73

■ “The concept of ‘chain of custody’ or ‘chain of evidence’ is important to understand. A court* will require proof that evidence collected during an investigation and the evidence ultimately submitted to the court are one and the same. To prove that the integrity of the physical evidence has been maintained, a chain of custody must be demonstrated. This chain shows who had contact with the evidence, at what times, under what conditions, and what changes, if any, were made to the evidence.” (* Obviously this does not apply to corrupt courts in Tasmania.)

Barry A. J. Fisher
Techniques of Crime Scene Investigation
2004: p. 10-11

■ “In criminal investigations, all relevant evidence collected must be clearly linked to the source from which it arises. The explanation from a piece of evidence to its source must be complete and unbroken. This is called the chain-of-evidence and it is of critical importance if criminal charges are to be laid.... Proper records should be kept of the transfer of all evidence each time it passes from one person or place to another, **as well as of all processing that is done to it.**” (added emphasis)

Robert N. Moles
A State Of Injustice
2004: p. 34
(cont.)

■ “A stringent legal requirement for forensic evidence is that each individual or entity having possession of an evidence item from the time it is collected until the time it is introduced into evidence at a court proceeding must be identified. This requirement is referred to as the ‘**chain of custody**’ or ‘**chain of possession**.’ The chain of custody begins at the time the item is collected and continues through until submission of the evidence at a court proceeding.... This requirement ensures that the condition of the evidence has remained unchanged from the time of its collection until its introduction in a court.” (original emphasis)

Robert R. Ogle

Crime Scene Investigation and Reconstruction
2004: pp. 214-215

■ “Evidence should be properly marked or labelled for identification as it is collected or as soon as practicable thereafter. The importance of this procedure becomes apparent when consideration is given to the fact that the investigator may be called to the witness stand many months after the commission of the offense to identify an object in evidence which he [or she] collected at the time of the offense. Indeed, defense counsel, may require that the complete chain of custody be established, in which case each person who handled the evidence may be called to identify the object. Obviously such an identification is most easily managed by means of marks or labels which have been placed on the evidence. An additional aid to identification is the investigator’s notebook in which should be recorded a description of the evidentiary object, the position where it was found, the place where it was collected or the person from whom it was received, the names of any witnesses, and any serial number which the object may bear, together with the case reference data.”

Charles E. O’Hara

Fundamentals of Criminal Investigation
1976: p. 82

■ “The prime directive for gathering evidence of poisoning at a death scene is to remember the proper ‘chain of custody.’ Nothing can break a case assumed to be solid more easily than the defense being able to prove reasonable possibility that evidence could have been **tampered with** before the trial.” (added emphasis)

John Trestrail

Criminal Poisoning
2000: p. 65

*Always keep in mind that regardless of what the authors quoted above and every other author in the world who writes on chain of custody/evidence/possession says, they are describing **theory not practice**. The truth is, every link of every chain requires the highest integrity of every person involved. This is demanding thing for some humans to do, particularly people such as State employees whose reputation or success in court may be dependent on a corrupt act or corrupt statement which covers up some adulteration, contamination, or exchange of evidence. Judges who do not insist on credible chains of custody for all evidence, conduct **kangaroo courts**.¹⁴¹ – ed.*

141 In the legal system of Australia – note it is not a system of justice – judges and evidence are just two of the parts out of control. The use of computers has put an end to what little control there was over evidence and its handling. Almost any type of documentary evidence can be moved in milli-seconds, can be manipulated, rewritten, distorted, etc. Some judges do not seem to care what happens. Others might care but they understand the job of tracking movements, then identify who had the opportunity, ability, and motive to mishandle evidence can be extremely difficult. All of this takes time, budgets, and experienced computer investigators which few legal systems have or will ever get. Add in the cops, the leading liars in the land, and evidence integrity is as holey as Swiss cheese.

the historic site that day with his 49-year-old wife Mary. No sworn statement from Olsen is among those obtained by FOI legislation from out of the DPP office.¹⁴² However, from an American source this media account has come to light. That Sunday afternoon, Olsen and his wife were reported as being in the queue at the servery in the Broad Arrow Café to buy sandwiches, when the gunman took a rifle from his large bag and opened fire on the people inside the café: "I thought something like a pressure cooker had exploded," Olsen said. 'It took a little while for everyone to realize that what was going [on] was death.' A blond gunman was coolly picking off tourists one at a time with a high-powered rifle. 'He shot at the head, one time deliberately at each victim. He wasn't spraying the room with bullets; he was picking out individuals and shooting them'.¹⁴³

Dennis Olsen explained that his wife Mary lay flat on her stomach, but not Dennis: 'I just couldn't lay down. I felt I had to get up to survive,' and so when he looked over the barrier, he heard a shot, ducked, and realized he was bleeding all over his face. Abandoning his wife to providence as she lay on the floor feigning death, Dennis fled through the back door and up the steep rock face behind the café and into the bush just beyond.

In the Wound Ballistics Review, Olsen is designated "P13" and his wounds are listed as: "...1 day in hospital. Lacerations to right side of head, left eye and left chest from secondary fragmentation."¹⁴⁴

However, on page 34 of the EMA seminar papers we find the following: "Treating ambulance personnel were quite convinced for some time that Bryant had used a shotgun in the broad Arrow Café due to the significant number of *peppering* they noted."¹⁴⁵ [*sic*] This reference is directed toward "P13" Dennis Olsen.

This requires a short explanation. Recall, in reference to administering first-aid to those survivors who suffered **gunshot wounds** whilst inside the Broad Arrow Café, there are a number of eyewitnesses, all of whom were either serving or former experienced ambulance officers whose observations and conclusions must be considered. The second point I would make is that as professionals they had over a considerable time on the job witnessed first hand, call-outs involving both rifle bullet wounds and **shotgun wounds** – there is a difference.

In 2002, I interviewed Mrs. Wendy Scurr, the information officer and PAHS' first aid officer. Mrs. Scurr was a founding chair of the Peninsula community's volunteer ambulance service, and served as a volunteer ambulance officer, being highly trained as a St. John Ambulance first aid officer. (Wendy triaged the victims in the Café that day and administered first aid.)

With shots ringing out from the tollbooth and Port Arthur as a backdrop, it was none other than Wendy who examined Dennis Olsen's wounds as they crouched in the bush near a fence line above and beyond the cliff to the rear of the Broad Arrow Café. Without hesitation Mrs. Scurr described Olsen's wounds to me, by stating:

¹⁴² Immediately we know something is not in order. Why did the office of the DPP not provide a copy of the *Witness Statement* to the person(s) who submitted an application under freedom-of-information legislation? There can be only one of two reasons: **i.** Dennis Olsen did not submit such a statement; or, **ii.** There is something in Olsen's statement that the State does not want the public to know. Olsen was one of many wounded at Broad Arrow Café. He was not that injured, so he would have been able to submit a statement soon after the incident. Something is not in order, and the investigations conducted by Beattie are most enlightening.

¹⁴³ *Survivor tells how victims covered as gunman aimed for their heads;* The Nando Times; 30 April 1996.

¹⁴⁴ G. Dutton, *et al.* *A review of the wounding effects of the Colt AR-15 and FN-FAL rifles used by Martin Bryant in the Port Arthur shooting incident April 26 [sic] 1996; Tasmania, Australia;* Wound Ballistics Review – vol. 3, no. 4; 1998: p. 42.

¹⁴⁵ Peter Morgan, Andrew O'Brien, Grant Lennox. *The Port Arthur tragedy – the ambulance perspective;* Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 34.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

"Mr. Olsen identified himself, and when I asked him to show me the rest of his wounds, he opened his shirt and pulled his singlet¹⁴⁶ aside. His numerous wounds were not irregular or jagged – all were small, round, raised and dark, with minimal bleeding. They didn't appear to be wounds made by bullets, or bullet fragments. In my opinion, **I was looking at wounds consistent with those made by shotgun pellets.** I'd say the shot size was about the same as farmers use."

The section of the EMA report mentioned above was compiled by Andrew O'Brien, AFC¹⁴⁷ on the Tasman Peninsula, and in less than convincing terms, he concludes by stating, Olsen's wounds, "...later turned out to be [caused by] bony fragments from other victims." Considering Olsen's line of departure and his injury being sustained when he popped up from behind the servery, I believe the secondary wounding by bone fragments cannot be sustained. Please note that the authorities were fettered in their determination of what occurred inside the Broad Arrow Café by 3 constraints:

1. The DPP's case of a lone gunman – the accused Martin Bryant using a .223 calibre firearm only;
2. The gift-shop door with its defective fire-escape latch that contributed directly to the death of 2 staff and 5 visitors – 7 persons in all – by denying them their only escape route away from the gunman's bullets, while he remained in the café; &
3. The DPP's ridiculous and nonsensical synopsis of the 29 shots in 90 seconds time limit the gunman remained in the café.

Were these some of the overriding influences that also caused the sergeant Dutton to offer the vague report regarding evidential material recovered from the Volvo's boot like the inconclusive Daewoo particulars?

Now while dealing with the tollbooth crime scene, let us consider several other important anomalies here – even shown to us by police. Ian Matterson tells us that as the coronial team walked through the crime scenes and came up the road from the café, just 50-60 metres inside the entrance to the historic site tollbooth, they: "...came across the body of an adult clutching one small child with the body of another young child nearby behind the trunk of a tree."¹⁴⁸ The coroner is referring here to the deceased Annette Mikac allegedly clutching the body of her youngest daughter Madeline, while the body of her eldest child Alanna was lying some distance away behind a tree trunk. The Police *training video* clearly shows the body of Mrs. Mikac a significant distance away from that of her youngest child Madeline. So is Matterson's recollection defective, or did someone **tamper with the position of the body or bodies before the crime scene photographer videoed the scene?**

On Jetty Road, the gunman changed from the AR-10 .308W, back to the .223Rem caliber firearm. The DPP names four of six witnesses to these 3 shootings: John & Caroline Boskovic; Peter & Pauline Grenfell. But curiously, he opens his synopsis of this segment by using the statement of a witness he refers to only as "Mr. Dutton."

¹⁴⁶ an undershirt

¹⁴⁷ Ambulance Field Commander

¹⁴⁸ *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 91.

149 One piece of physical evidence in the Port Arthur incident was a yellow Volvo allegedly driven by the gunman, and by Martin Bryant, and by at least one other person. It seems there was more than one of these vehicles. Adding to all the confusion, which it is not unreasonable to believe was a consequence intended by those who planned all the killings, was/were the surfboard(s) attached to roof racks on the Volvo(s). A surfboard is frequently mentioned as being a distinguishing feature about Bryant's Volvo. But, such a feature could quite easily have been **set up** on a similar vehicle. In the literature, there are reports about a surfboard (singular) and surfboards (plural). So was there one, or two, or more surfboards? The editor has not been able to find any official description of the surfboard* alleged to have been owned by Martin Bryant and alleged to have been attached to roof racks on his Volvo. In fact, there is no official proof of every sighting of every yellow Volvo at and near PAHS. There is nothing to confirm that they were all of the same yellow Volvo, and that it was the yellow Volvo owned by Martin Bryant. There are just many assertions that all the many sightings are 100 percent accurate, and 100 percent certain to be of the yellow Volvo owned by Bryant. Some of the sightings were of a vehicle being driven along the Arthur Highway, presumably at highway speed. Yet witnesses allege that they saw Bryant's Volvo, **not** a Volvo. Witnesses claim to have seen Martin Bryant behind the steering wheel, not a person they did not know with long blond hair. Then we have statements about a surfboard, no surfboard, a surfboard cover, no surfboard cover, *etc.* Several witnesses gave written statements of a Volvo with different registration plates. See Part 7. (* Surfboards are different and these differences can be pronounced – ankle-tie, colour, decoration, fins, length, shape, weight, width, *etc.* Then there is damage from usage, which combined with all the above **makes every board unique**. Just saying it was Martin Bryant's surfboard on his yellow Volvo is not a proper legal way to identify anything – that's the sort of things unthinking people say over the back fence.)

Now actually the DPP is referring here to the witness James David Dutton, and by *de facto* his wife Joanne Helen Dutton, whose statements **I have on file**. Bugg explains to the court that as Mr. Dutton moves from the threatening scene he, "looked over his shoulder," seeing Mrs. Mikac shot in the head once, then falling to the ground. This act causes Dutton to take his wife's hand and flee further from the scene during which time he says he heard a further two gunshots; *i.e.* three gunshots in all. The number of shots discharged on Jetty Road as claimed by James Dutton and put forward by Bugg cannot be sustained after further examination. So why did Bugg use the Dutton statement? For then in the next breath to contradict Dutton's recollections, stating that five shots were discharged here? Bugg's reasons I shall explain shortly.

James Dutton continues to explain that from the sanctuary of a tree further into the bush, "I looked up and could see the lady and the dress of the older girl and the younger girl lying on the ground." His words are suggestive of him being at a lower elevation than the Jetty Road. In fact the topography at the scene and witness statements dictate that Dutton was at a higher elevation than the roadway, and therefore above the crime scene. Although James and Joanne Dutton provided considerable material in their sworn statements before and after they entered the historic site, substantial parts of their statements and the words they use, upon careful examination simply **cannot be sustained as credible**.

Both of the Dutton's statements are imprecise. For example, James Dutton states that earlier, the couple in their hired vehicle were making a U-turn past the historic site entrance on the road to Nubeena, when he saw "...a yellow Volvo with the surfboard on top with one male driver. I noticed it because of the surfboards [**plural**] and the weather as well as a surfer driving a surfboard." A rather curious recollection you surely must agree.

I believe the DPP used James Dutton's statement early in his recount of the events on Jetty Road, in an attempt to legitimise Dutton's account of sighting Martin Bryant driving his distinctive yellow Volvo sedan with a surfboard [**singular**] on the roof rack earlier that day near Port Arthur.¹⁴⁹ My investigation leads me to conclude their statements are imprecise.

The DPP's synopsis of Martin Bryant's movements throughout the entire day is weak, speculative, and inaccurate. If subjected to cross-examination I'm firmly of the opinion the prosecution's case could **easily have been destroyed**. It can be said it was nothing more than a smoke and mirrors case. So Bugg used the Duttons' statements in an attempt to bolster the Crown's weak case and conjecture up a belief that Bryant entered the historic site, shortly after 13:00 hours that Sunday, and at the same time corroborate the approximate times provided by Roger Lerner. For after Martin's brief visit to Lerner's property on Palmer's Lookout Road, the Duttons would have us believe Martin Bryant "drove past the Duttons heading towards Port Arthur 'entrance'." The key word here is "entrance" and it is a misleading influence upon the reader.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

But as the Duttons were the only witnesses who saw [allegedly] Martin Bryant driving the Volvo south between Palmer's Lookout Road turnoff and the Port Arthur Historic Site entrance, the DPP, clutching at straws, by trying to legitimise the worth of James and Joanne Dutton as witnesses and so used their statement in his *court document*. But the Duttons' account is destroyed by another quite thorough witness, in Jai Nichols.

It is a very enlightening fact; the straightforward statement from Jai Nichols¹⁵⁰ was never used by the prosecutor Damien Bugg, in stating his case against the accused. Jai Nichols was *dropped off* at the Port Arthur Store by his "pop...at about 12 midday," that Sunday, intending that he "hitch hike a ride to Hobart...." While walking north up the Arthur Highway towards the Fox and Hounds Hotel, "for two or three minutes," an oncoming yellow Volvo with a surf-board on top went passed travelling south, towards Nubeena. After purchasing a soft drink from the Fox and Hounds, Nichols continued walking and obviously when about adjacent to the gate-way south of the entrance to Seascap (the next-door neighbours property), the same yellow Volvo driven by a male with "sort of bleachy blonde hair" overtook him travelling north, and as it passed he saw the vehicle's brake-lights go on as the car slowed and turned into the Seascap cottage driveway.

Bryant was at the wheel both times, and now he was arriving at Seascap cottage **for the first time that Sunday**; a considerable period of time after 12 midday, and if not Martin Bryant, then who? This means that Martin Bryant did not turn into the historic site's toll-booth after visiting Roger Larnar as the Dutton's statement infers. Like a number of other visitors on the peninsula that weekend, were the Duttons simply acting out a role? Another author on the subject has also chosen to ignore entirely the statement by Nichols, and so his work is badly flawed in regard to this segment I believe.

Mr. Bugg used smoke and mirrors to warp the times so as to accommodate his synopsis of the timeline of Martin Bryant's estimated time of arrival at Seascap, and we shall examine that in detail in a later chapter. Before we continue with the story we should return to the café for a moment. There is much controversy about what items the blond-haired gunman carried to and from the Broad Arrow Café that Sunday, understandable when one considers all of the facts. After the gunman left the café, Vietnam veteran eyewitness John Godfrey said that he saw the gunman "...at the rear of his vehicle, he put a black bag into the boot he appeared to be calm relaxed and in no hurry."¹⁵¹ The exactness of these details is confirmed visually by the Balasko video. So how did the shooter turn what was described by a number of eyewitnesses as a **blue sportsbag** into a **black sportsbag**? He simply used the oldest conjuring trick in the book; there was one bag inside of another bag. But it may turn out a little different than even you the reader may be thinking.

The predominantly blue Prince sportsbag was thought by most of the witnesses to be THE bag, the only bag. I myself first wrote that the blue and white Prince bag was the outer bag: **I was wrong**.

¹⁵⁰ Jai Craig Nichols. *Witness Statement*; 8 May 1996.

¹⁵¹ John Godfrey. *Witness Statement*; 7 June 1996.

see following page

¹⁵² Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: 135 pp.

BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ

YET another mystery vehicle figures heavily in the massacre at and near Port Arthur: **a strange black van, with blacked-out windows**. In the video shown on national television by A Current Affair and with anchorman Ray Martin at the helm, amateur video footage (possibly the Turner tapes), captured from somewhere near the bridge over the mouth of the small stream that runs by the penitentiary to enter Mason cove, is quite revealing.

Several clips of the segment where two *rookie* policewomen are interviewed show a red and white Squirrel rescue service chopper on the grass stationary but with its rotors turning. Each clip shows a different but concurrent visit by Squirrel helicopters to the oval. As the first clip launches, the narrative infers we are seeing the first Squirrel helicopter arrival.

BLACK VAN



The Emergency Management Australia report¹⁵² shows the first helicopter was tasked at 13:59 hrs, while Tasmania Police assistant commissioner Luppo Prins puts the first Squirrel helicopter arrival there at 2:56 p.m.; the EMA papers tells us it departed at 2:30 p.m. So if Prins' time is correct, then with a flight time of just 14 minutes to Port Arthur, it took 42 minutes to get the first chopper airborne. But in the next of the two clips, we see another helicopter, this time parked much closer to the fence, and car park. Prins tells us that the subsequent arrivals of helicopters occurred at 3:07 p.m., 3:55 p.m., with the last landing at 4:16 p.m. In the background of both amateur video clips, is captured a distinctive, commercial-type but quite out-of-place **black van**, with all its windows blacked out, parked there in the middle of the roadway, out front of the café.

We also have on file a still photo of the **black van** showing the second helicopter landing, which corroborates the first A Current Affair video clip. Other still photos demonstrate the mystery **black van** had not arrived when the first ambulance and paramedic vehicles first parked out front of the café. Interestingly, the **black van** captured on both clips parked in the same spot, just so happens to be configured similarly to those used by a commonwealth agency.

The A Current Affair's (Turner) video clips and the photograph we have confirm the approximate arrival time of the **black van**, but in themselves do not verify the mystery van's departure time. However, we do have on file an accurate running log record compiled by a historic-site staff member, which evidences some 161 vehicular movements logged as passing through the boundary of the historic site, between **(cont.)**

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

the hours of from 3:10 p.m. to just after 5:40 p.m. From these log-sheets, photographs and video tape, I can confidently say that the mystery **black van** arrived on site after 3:10 p.m., and departed after 5:40 p.m. In other words, the **black van** remained within the precincts of the historic site, parked for most of its stay there, right out front of the Broad Arrow Café, for a **minimum of 2.5 hours!**

The **black van** was parked maybe just a few yards away but close by the only distinctive fawn-coloured campervan that appears in many of the photographs and video tapes captured of the Broad Arrow Café that Sunday afternoon, parked adjacent to the oval's picket fence, just west of the small guardhouse. Now the **black van** account doesn't end there; we also have learned from an eyewitness who when driving north past Seascape cottage that Sunday afternoon, observed white smoke rising from a gold-coloured car, parked well to the back of the allotment at Seascape.

Reacting naturally he wanted to assist in putting out the fire, so he stopped his vehicle at the entrance of Seascape cottage, and ran down the steep driveway into the grounds. However hardly had the witness gained the narrow bridge in the driveway over the creek, when two heavily built males, whom by their authority and demeanour were taken **to be police**, confronted this witness. Without displaying any identification to him, the eyewitness was told bluntly: "**Clear out now!**" and then, "**Get the hell out of here – you're not needed,**" or words to that effect.

A little perplexed, and before he turned to retreat, the eyewitness observed just beyond the farthest male, **a black, people-mover-type van with all of its windows blacked out**, parked on the pavers near the cottage. This incident occurred in that very small window of time, between when the BMW was set alight, and constables Garry Whittle and Paul Hyland arrived on the scene at the estimated time of 2:58 p.m.

One of the persons this witness saw in the grounds of Seascape undoubtedly would have been the *Fat Controller* – who went by the name of *Rick* or *Mick*. When all of this little intrigue is considered, it prompts me to ask: How many persons arrived and departed in this Commonwealth registered and operated **black van**? What role were the occupants tasked to do with regard to the massacre? The **black van** beat every cop to the Café and could hardly be termed reactionary in the true sense of the term.

Surely those in authority would not suggest we accept Martin Bryant had such influences that he also engaged a Commonwealth employee to act on his behalf? Who drove the **black van** onto the historic site and what activities was the driver involved in there at the Broad Arrow Café? Did the **black van's** presence there have anything to do with the cadavers of two deceased agents inside the Broad Arrow Café? And oh, by the way, because of the thoroughness of a Port Arthur Historic Site staff member, we have the **black van's** Commonwealth registration number!

Stewart K. Beattie

A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur

2006: pp. 199-200

(amended; added emphasis)

NOTE More disturbing details about a mysterious **black van** (the same one it seems) appear in an update (What Constable Hyland Saw) to the DVD book *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur* by Andrew S. MacGregor; 2001-4: p. 951: "[O]ne of the local lads that had left a footy match early and had driven into the Port Arthur village. He saw the shot up Toyota Corolla, containing the dead Zoe Hall, and was distressed at the fact that her body had not even been covered as a sign of respect to the dead. He was still angry as he drove on towards Taranna when he spotted smoke, and saw a burning motorcar on the Seascape property. [c.2:15 p.m.] He stopped his car and went towards Seascape to assist in putting the fire out, but as he approached the driveway to Seascape he saw a **black van** with two men near it. One of the men, whom the local lad took to be a **policeman**, told him to move on as everything was under control and he was not needed there." (added emphasis)

Many of those who were adamant that he entered with this same "blue" or "blue and white" sportsbag may very well have entered or re-entered the café after the shooting had ceased and, seeing there a predominantly blue bag on one of the dining tables, they were left with what they believed to be an irrefutable truth, though this bag was left there to be conveniently found by police. So how could they be wrong?

Well after considering this question for a considerable time, finally the penny tumbled. First and foremost Petra Willmott in her *Witness Statement* says that she accompanied her boyfriend shopping. In Fitzgeralds [store] she "thinks," Martin bought a bag, an "orange and blue/green sportsbag," which she never saw again. But in anyone's language, Martin's purchase in Petra's estimation wasn't "blue and white," unless Petra was/is colour-blind.

A significant number of witnesses mention a blond-haired male entering the café with a "sportsbag" or a "duffle bag" and of these witnesses a few make particular mention that it appeared "heavy." However, many of the witnesses describe the sportsbag in various colours, but most lean towards the "blue and white bag" discarded by the gunman on a table inside the café.

Ian Kingston, while an unreliable witness on so many details, is adamant in his first statement when he says: "I stopped a vehicle, a yellow Volvo sedan with surfboards [plural] on top of it.... He had a black bag on the back seat. It was an overnight type of bag...." When the driver parked contrary to Kingston's instructions down by the water's edge, he continued observing the driver when he: "...saw the male get out of the car,... he pulled out his black bag, closed the door and he started walking towards the Broad Arrow Restaurant."¹⁵³

The proprietor of the Sorell supermarket – where [allegedly] Martin purchased a bottle of **tomato sauce** – recollected the bag Martin carried to the peninsula that morning was a "large" sports type "bag."¹⁵⁴ The recovered bag with its items of evidence, a piece of rope, a jumper and a knife, was itemized as "exhibit P2" photograph #52, but the table number upon which the bag was resting when recovered by police remains vague, although the position of the table is obvious there on the police *training video* tape footage.

But ask yourself, why would anyone committing a serious crime leave his bag loaded with evidence behind, while taking yet another bag with him to his vehicle to escape? It stands out as quite illogical, unless the offender was intent on successfully deceiving someone with a stack of misleading evidential material. But what is misleading about these items?

In fact either deliberately or by inept investigation, police and so the court were denied the truth yet again. You see witness Rebecca McKenna stated: "He [gunman] was not wearing gloves...he placed his video camera and bag on the floor and began to eat his lunch. I noticed that he had a can of Solo and a plastic Schweppes cup on the table."¹⁵⁵

¹⁵³ Ian Gregory Kingston. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

¹⁵⁴ Spiros Diamantis. *Witness Statement*; 17 June 1996.

¹⁵⁵ Rebecca Kate McKenna. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

But realistically, how could police be so incompetent? Don't forget, James Balasko captured the gunman placing his black duffle type bag into the boot of a yellow Volvo. This is corroborated by two witnesses incidentally. And Terry Sloane said in his statement ¹⁵⁶ that before the shooting began, a male fitting the gunman's description "bashed" into his left shoulder while Terry was seated. Then as he later walked back into the dining area, the same male "brushed passed," his left side, carrying what he described as a "duffle-shaped bag which was quite long and had two handles in the centre." Now Mr. Sloane had every reason to take notice of the bag, as its carrier seemed intent on forcing him [Sloane] to *notice* both bag and the male carrying it. This second encounter happened just before the shooting began.

Now we know that he most definitely departed the café carrying a large black bag which he put into the boot of the yellow Volvo. It becomes quite clear the gunman was intent of creating a deception with the bag and left behind a different bag than he arrived and departed with, to maximize the people's confusion.

So I now understand that the black "duffle-type" bag had to be the outer bag. It must have been longer than the 74 cm bag left behind, and the longer black duffle-type bag had to be long enough to accommodate the 986 mm AR-15 **rifle** and the 1015 mm AR-10 rifle. Both were used inside the café. This most reliable witness that has confirmed the weapon was an AR-15 SP-1 rifle, is unwavering in his recollection. His subsequent examination of police photographs of the Colt AR-15 SP-1 Carbine – recovered from the periphery of the Seascope ashes – confirms that it was most definitely **not** the firearm he saw used by the gunman there in the Broad Arrow Café.

Some witnesses no doubt entered the café after the shooting ended, and saw the blue and white bag on the table; hence their statements. Dominant natured witnesses instilled by peer pressure the image of the blue and white Prince sportsbag as being *the only one*. No wonder some witnesses were quite confused by this deception. The shooter left the large blue Prince sportsbag – "Exhibit P2" with its contents of rope, knife and jumper – but strangely or not so strangely, **missing from prosecution exhibits** was the large, black video camera. It was never marked as an exhibit.

Newspaper reports of 4th and 5th of May 1996, announced that the "leading Hobart criminal barrister" Lt. Col. Gunson has been "briefed for the defence of Bryant...." One article said Mr. Gunson raised as his very first issue of disquiet: "...conflicting reports from eyewitnesses about whether the Port Arthur gunman had a video camera at the site. No camera has been recovered,"¹⁵⁷ the report stated. It seems already, just 7 days after the shootings, some police at least were doing a panic with this critical evidence simply having disappeared from the property room! As I mentioned the video camera is not listed as a court exhibit.

The Tasmania Police *training video*, contains considerable footage (that was provided to the prime TV and The Weekend Australian

¹⁵⁶ Terry James Sloan. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

¹⁵⁷ Chip Le Grand. *Top detective to head taskforce investigation*; The Australian; 4 May 1996.

incidentally), and on the table towards the north-eastern corner of the dining room, along with other items of interest there sits the blue and white *substitute* sportsbag. Commissioner Moroney of the NSW Police Service didn't even answer my correspondence dated 7 September 2004 with regard to the video *overboard affair* in which I detailed 13 serious charges of police misconduct. While his assistant director of NSW Police Service's forensic service group, acting inspector, commander Carlene York simply "declined" to investigate the matter further citing 3 unsatisfactory reasons for her decision.¹⁵⁸

If that wasn't a direct enough cover-up, I received a second letter from David Chie the customer service manager for the ombudsman! Both extraordinary responses when you consider I wrote to neither bureaucrats! I must say that this is really no surprise though to this author.

In the police *training video* clip, with the substitute blue Prince sportsbag, is easily recognized just a metre away from the gunman's first victim, William Ng. As the cameraman pans from left to right, beside and to the west of the bag can be clearly seen the brown tray the gunman carried his lunch on, firstly to the tables on the outdoor balcony as witnessed by Mick Sargent, and Melbourne visitors Michael Beekman and Rebecca McKenna. After eating his lunch he took the outer heavy duffle type sportsbag, along with the large video camera, and juggles the tray with his lunch remnants on it, back into the dining area to the table, the details of which the DPP, for reasons only known to himself, chooses not to identify by number. There he removes the Colt AR-15 rifle and commenced his killing. Before he leaves the dining room, he takes the blue and white Prince bag, "Exhibit P2," with its contents within, out of the black bag and as they say the rest is history.

But in the *training video*, on the brown-coloured foodtray, clearly can be seen a plate with a crumpled cordial cup, and importantly beside those items sits an opened, yellow-labelled aluminium can of "Solo" softdrink. As the camera continues to pan right, there comes into frame a **large, black, video camera**, with its integral, external, microphone quite visible. No less than four eyewitnesses mention the blond-headed gunman carrying this large video camera over his shoulder into the café. Even the DPP mentions the video camera of the gunman on several occasions in the *court documents*. How could the prosecution be so blatantly deceptive and expect us all not to notice this deception?

So what occurred between the crime scene investigators, forensic police, and the police property room officers? For the large, black, video camera seems to have rematerialized – in the mind of detective inspector Paine at least – when on 4 July 1996 he interrogates Martin Bryant (without his lawyer David Gunson being present), and suggests to Martin Bryant that he'd left the camera not on the table, but inside the Prince sportsbag where it was recovered by police. Here, Bryant continues to deny ever having been to the historic site that day. **So what really did become of the gunman's video camera and what does all this mean?**

¹⁵⁸ This is a classic way cover-ups are maintained. The most reasonable and detailed requests can be submitted, but the State cannot take any action because this will expose the cover-up. If everything was in order and there was nothing negative, then the State could and should attend to such requests. But when States resist they confirm their own involvement, be it direct or indirect, with a negative reality. Never forget that the only thing you have to remember about these matters is what journalist Isidor/Izzy Stone told us: "**Governments lie.**" (see Myra MacPherson. *All Governments Lie!: The life and times of a rebel journalist I.F. Stone*; 2006.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

When sergeant Gerard Dutton addressed a gathering of some 329 delegates from 20 countries as a guest of the Association of Firearm and Tool Mark Examiners in America, a medical doctor asked him, was there any empirical evidence recovered from inside the Broad Arrow Café, which linked Martin Bryant to the murders; there, in America, he answered "No."¹⁵⁹

So did Dutton provide a corroborative answer on Australian soil? Well at Brisbane's Nathan Campus of Griffith University and on the evening of the 21 November 2002, a meeting sponsored by the Australian and New Zealand Forensic Science Society Inc., was held. This same organization sponsored a well-attended meeting in Hobart in June 2000 which also awarded Dutton considerable public distinction. But in Brisbane, and when question-time arose, Ian McNiven from the Sunshine Coast, through the MC asked Gerard Dutton the first question, which was basically the same as the American doctor had posed. For his trouble McNiven was threatened with arrest, removed from the meeting, and Dutton chose to leave the question unanswered, and question-time ceased forthwith! A scheduled video tape of the meeting, promised to be available later, like the camera, has conveniently – gone missing.¹⁶⁰

It is now my firm belief, Tasmania Police and their counterparts from New South Wales forensic crime scene examiners collected no empirical evidence from inside the Broad Arrow Café, linking Martin Bryant to the shooting murders of 20 persons there.

The video footage of the Tasmania Police *training video* – for police eyes only – part of which was captured inside the Broad Arrow Café with a ceiling fan still in motion, shows all cadavers, except two, where they fell. But it also **exposes a great fraud** perpetrated by officials, Channel Nine Television, and person or persons unknown.

This tape also confirms the existence of empirical evidence sitting quietly there on a café table the likes of which would excite even the most hardened investigator and so why was this evidence, never mentioned in the *court documents*? Surrounded by chaos, there beside the gunman's blue Prince sportsbag sits the brown tray on which stands the open, yellow, aluminium "Solo" drink can, lunch wrapper and plate that had been handled by the Port Arthur gunman! It would surely have retained finger, thumb, and palm prints, DNA from saliva, sweat, possibly even hair samples, and as a bonus beside the tray sits the large, black, video camera the gunman carried over his shoulder. But to me, it became very clear why this piece of evidence at least went missing. I believe the gunman was trained in weapons handling, but he made a huge forensic blunder. Let me explain.

Unaware of the significance of what Michael Sargent witnessed,¹⁶¹ it is now your turn to grasp the importance of his account. He said: "The big blue bag was in this male person's right hand, and the video camera which was not in a case, was in his left hand. He was holding the video camera in a way which suggested that he had just

¹⁵⁹ The editor has not been able to locate the original source of this. Gerard Dutton did attend a seminar held by said group (Association of Firearm and Toolmark Examiners) at Vancouver in Canada, in May 2004. This negative statement attributed to Dutton has been on the Internet for some time, years it seems. This does not prove the statement is correct, but Dutton has had quite some time to refute it – **if it is incorrect**. (The editor will continue his attempts to identify the person who asked Dutton the original question.) Because there is no evidence of any kind confirming Martin Bryant was responsible for the shooting inside the Broad Arrow Café, or anywhere else on the 28 & 29 April at or near Port Arthur, the negative statement "No" seems to be **the only truthful reply**.

¹⁶⁰ Ellen Winnett. *Crime under the microscope*; The Saturday Mercury; 17 June 2000.

¹⁶¹ Michael Sargent. *Witness Statement*; 29 May 1996.

NO EVIDENCE

Connecting Bryant to Weapons & Ammunition

THE day after the massacre, The Examiner [newspaper; Launceston, Tasmania] reported that police had [allegedly] found a .223 mm Armalite M-16 at Port Arthur. Nothing has been heard since about this weapon that was found that day inside the PAHS. Then, on 1 May 1996, the West Australian told the public that the two weapons used had been a 5.56 mm Armalite AR-15 and a Chinese-made SKS .762 mm assault rifle. It is interesting that it took only two days for the Armalite M16 – a prohibited import – to **disappear from the public record**, to be replaced by a weapon which could be legally bought and sold in Australia.

From this point onwards, the SKS became the weapon most frequently referred to in the media as the weapon *Bryant* had used. Then, finally, the SKS was dropped altogether and its place in narratives of the massacre was taken by the Belgian FN-FAL. To me, these intriguing shifts look like shifts from the real murder weapons to weapons that could be connected to Bryant, if only because, like him, they also emerged from the Seascope inferno. In any case, **there is no evidence that Bryant procured either of the weapons to which the massacre has officially been attributed.**

No one has even been proven to have sold the weapons to Bryant, and no theory exists that would explain how he came by them if he did not buy them from gun dealers. A similar mystery surrounds the ammunition used at Port Arthur.... If Hill – or anyone else – sold Bryant the ammunition that was recovered from the crime scene, then Tasmania Police ought to have been able to prove it. The fact that they have **never traced the origin of the ammunition** (or, at least, have never revealed its origin to the public) surely means that it cannot be connected to Bryant. It is, after all, extremely hard to believe that Bryant, with an IQ so low that it would put him in the bottom one or two per cent of the population (as established by psychiatrist Ian Joblin in June 1996), could have managed his purchases of guns, ammunition and everything else involved in the case so successfully that the **police have utterly failed to establish the origin of so much as a single item.** It is far easier to believe that the police simply do not want us to learn who procured these deadly items and how.

Narratives of the Port Arthur massacre also contain mention of other items which allegedly belonged to Martin Bryant. These items consist of a video camera and a yellow Volvo left at the PAHS tollgate, together with items found inside it: a full 25-litre drum of petrol, a 10-litre drum of petrol containing seven litres, a grey video camera bag, lengths of sash cord rope, two pairs of handcuffs and three packets of Little Lucifer fire starters.

Not one iota of proof has ever been provided to prove that Martin Bryant owned any of these items (not even the Volvo, which could have been an identical model to Bryant's, rather than Bryant's unique yellow vehicle). What's more, **no one is on record as having admitted to selling Bryant any of these items.** Although Bryant could easily have purchased Little Lucifer fire starters inconspicuously, it is unlikely that he could have bought large drums of petrol or two pairs of handcuffs without attracting attention.

Carl Wernerhoff

Weapons and Ammunition used at Port Arthur
in The Port Arthur Massacre: Was Martin Bryant Framed?

loveforlife.com.au

May 2006

(amended; added emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

been using it, the strap was around his wrist and his fingers were on top of the camera." You see, the gunman should not have removed the video camera from its grey carry-bag. The camera would certainly have been **contaminated with his fingerprints** as well as his DNA.

Unhelpful evidence in any criminal case has a habit of disappearing from the property room of the police, or even at the crime scene itself. In the café, if all such evidence pointed conclusively in a direction other than toward Martin Bryant, I would defy any of those involved in the investigation and prosecution of Martin Bryant to deny that all such exhibits had to fade quickly from everyone's memory and especially the court system. This subject will be revisited later and when I deal with the burning of the BMW, you may just recognise a familiar pattern emerging here.

Now to the fraud exposed here. You see, the Nine Network's flagship, the daily evening show **A Current Affair**, with special reporter and experienced anchorman Ray Martin at the helm, aired a documentary entitled, *Port Arthur the inside story*. In a segment of that documentary Ray Martin explains the gunman "...left the café at one thirty-six. He'd been inside less than two minutes, yet he'd killed twenty people...." and at the same time the camera zooms towards the blue Prince sportsbag perched on a Broad Arrow Café dining table overhanging its edge. But, **all of this video clip is a fraud and a deceit.**

If I could show you a clip from the Tasmania Police *training video* and you could see the true internal condition of the Broad Arrow Café, you will realise immediately the Nine Network's special-effects people have been a party to a fraud here at least. Now the Nine Network had to be complicit with this fraud. Or, are they even more skilled in the supernatural than Roland Browne, the spokesperson of the National Coalition for Gun Control? Did they foreknow the Port Arthur massacre would happen and that the gunman had a fetish for blue Prince sportsbags?

Is it believable that, denied entry to the café, they settled for a mock-up, and yes, using digital editing, they *pasted* a photo of a blue sportsbag onto a photo of a dining room table taken in the café? But I cannot explain when, how, or who had the great foresight to take the original pristine photo of a pristine Broad Arrow Café dining room table **before the fact.**

A dining room with a thing not out of place, save this one table; even with a video camera (the same one?), sitting on a chair fortuitously pulled out from the table in the RH [right hand] foreground of frame? But, in place of the witnessed "Solo" soft drink cordial can, are several stainless steel milkshake containers, and various other sundry items, none of which are mentioned in eyewitness statements. Of course, The Nine Network's producer would have been entirely unaware of what exactly the gunman had on his tray, as he didn't have the advantage of reading the witness statements at that early time. I challenge Ray Martin and any of the directors of

Evidence was manipulated not examined, and highly significant items disappeared – if it was/is all so obvious that Martin Bryant was the gunman, why are officials so afraid of a public inquiry.

162 At the Port Arthur Historic Site, the road from the entrance tollbooth to the jetty/wharf area, and bus/car parking area is known as Jetty Road.

163 This is a very important observation. Use of his left hand by the gunman to do this, as detailed by Bugg, confirms that he (the gunman) shot the firearms from his right side. Whereas, Martin Bryant fired from **the left side**. This has been officially ignored because it destroys the official narrative. Officials do not want you to ask questions, or to express your concerns: they want you to blindly believe Martin Bryant was the gunman; and, they want you to ignore this highly significant fact of handedness which confirms Martin Bryant was not the gunman.

164 Damian Bugg. in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 1996: p. 152.

165 These shocking images are extremely significant in the process of convincing viewers that Martin Bryant was the gunman. Viewers are numbed, are appalled, are incensed, and this overrides all their objective reasoning. **Hate and vengeance** are aroused and a great desire to see punishment meted out overwhelms most people. So when they are told officially that Martin Bryant killed those poor little girls, the fact is not doubted or questioned – *it was him*. To suggest otherwise, or to write something the contrary as the editor has done here, can easily be interpreted as being wrong and cruel toward the family of the victims.* For many people (most?), it is beyond their ability to question the official narrative, to reconsider all the facts **objectively**, one, by one. Hate and vengeance are supremely strong human emotions not easily restrained. (* Reader, the killing of those two girls and their loving mother at PAHS was preceded by the building of a **22-body refrigerated mortuary vehicle** and the readying of **special embalming-related equipment** for the funeral directors Nelson Brothers in Footscray, Victoria. Martin Bryant had nothing to do with that vehicle or equipment. Those little girls and their mother, and every other victim (murdered or wounded) at and near Port Arthur were shot with official approval.)

the Nine Network, to explain to the public satisfactorily, just exactly how this segment of their inside story to this horrid massacre was assembled. It puts a whole new meaning on the title, *Port Arthur inside story*, doesn't it. I can assure the reader, their explanation would be most interesting. But, don't hold your breath!

Let us progress up the Jetty Road.^{**162**} And I should state clearly here, that while the authorities, politicians, media and National Coalition for Gun Control exploited the emotional and traumatic impact of this segment of the awful massacre to its entirety, that is farthest from my intention here. However, these details **must** necessarily be re-told here for a very important reason, which shortly will become evident to the reader.

From the *court documents* and the Wound Ballistic Review, we are informed that the gunman brought the Volvo to a halt beside Mrs. Nanette Mikac. Then, according to DPP Damian Bugg, the gunman: "...placed his left^{**163**} hand on Mrs. Mikac's shoulder and people were close enough to hear him tell her to get down on her knees on three occasions, whereupon the gunman shot and killed her with one shot to the head." We are told that "almost immediately," the gunman discharged two shots at the youngest child Madeline, the first from intermediate distance causing a non-fatal wound entering from the rear of her right shoulder exiting to the front of the same shoulder. The second shot was a distant shot which struck the child in the chest area, "travelling from back to front [and] slightly downwards, damaging her spine, before exiting the lower back." Neither of these bullets left recoverable fragments we are told.

Bugg continues to inform us the gunman then fired two more shots which missed their intended target, the elder sister Alannah, who by this time had sheltered behind a tree some 5.5 metres to the eastern side of the roadway. Bugg further informs us that the gunman, "...then moved to the tree and shot her at near contact point with the muzzle almost pressed against the right side of the child's neck." This tells us six shots from the AR-15 SP-1 .223 Rem rifle in total were fired at this third crime scene.

The DPP goes to some lengths to detail the nature of evidence to demonstrate to the court that the "powder marking" and a "patterned abraded injury" suffered by the second child were consistent with "the flash suppressor on the barrel of the gun having been pressed against the child's neck, prior to the firing of the gun." If this is so, and I have no reason to doubt Mr. Bugg in this instance, then the police *training video* exposes a very grave inconsistency with this version of events.

The statement by witness James Dutton, informs us that he heard just three gunshots here on the Jetty road. Yet a few lines away Mr. Bugg clearly states that in all 6 fired .223Rem cartridge cases were recovered by police at this scene; "...**five near the car on the roadside, and one near the body of the child Alannah behind a tree.**"^{**164**} Eight photographs (18-26) were exposed and entered as prosecution exhibits of this segment.^{**165**}

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

If the disparity in the claimed number of shots discharged here is not concerning enough, then consider the following: In the Tasmania Police *training video*, which must have been captured no later than 11:05 hours on Monday, 29 April (before the bodies were removed in preparation for the media people who toured this scene) and in the frames covering the Jetty Road segment, it clearly shows a body the narrator identifies as a "young woman" – Annette Mikac – prone on her right hand side, with the body's torso lying parallel to the alignment of the carriageway, her feet just off the sealed roadway. Bugg tells us that the body of Mrs. Mikac's youngest daughter Madeline "lay nearby." From the video, we can see the child lying on her back, with her left arm outstretched at right angles to her torso, and her right hand over her chest touching her left shoulder. Importantly, fallen leaves and grass are under the body, with no bitumen or gravel ballast beside the sealed carriageway visible in frame.

The next clip shows the body of her elder sister Alannah in frame, her body lying prone on her right side, with both arms forward of the body, extended upwards towards her head. The first frame of the next clip is a close-up of an area under the right arm, with an unidentified person's index and second finger of a white surgically gloved right hand in the top centre of the frame. The index finger is indicating what I can positively identify as a .223Rem spent case. As the video continues to roll a similarly gloved left hand lowers the deceased's right arm back to the position shown in the previous clip, to rest on top of the spent shell case.

From the pages of *The Mercury*, which at the time interviewed assistant commissioner Luppo Prins, we learn that the first ambulance arrived at the Port Arthur tollbooth at around 13:46 hours (1:46 p.m.), although mistakenly the report claims the ambulance originated from Dunalley; it came from Nubeena. The first ambulance was crewed by volunteer officers, Gary Alexander and Kaye Fox. This Nubeena ambulance crew could have been on the screen much earlier, but quite rightly, they adhered to the disaster plan protocols and waited for an all clear message from Peter Morgan in their communications room at ambulance HQ in Hobart relaying from the incident scene. This protocol was in place to ensure the safety of their officers when entering a dangerous incident site, as dead or injured or *ambos* cannot assist anyone. Meanwhile, other crews were proceeding; one ambulance from Taranna, the other from Dunalley.

Immediately upon receipt of Wendy Scurr's second telephone call to Peter Morgan, the Nubeena crew proceeded to the historic site. Upon reaching the tollbooth crime scene on their way down Jetty Road, the two ambulance officers broke their journey to check for vital signs and then covered the bodies of, "seven victims including the family of Walter Mikac." So it surely is fair to assume that all seven bodies remained covered and protected until the coroner and forensic police examined, and filmed the crime scene. If this is so, then Matterson's report above, the prosecutions case and the police *training video* of this segment present dissimilar accounts. I would suggest you may find it not such an easy task, to resolve these considerable anomalies.¹⁶⁶

166 Ian Munro, Garry Tippet. *The cruel legacy of Martin Bryant: The Sun-Herald*; 19 April 1997. In his article, Stewart Beattie presents the true reality in a logical and rigorous manner – true fact, after true fact. It certainly is not the reality desired by the corrupt State. As Beattie notes, there are anomalies, all of which have to be acknowledged, and there **lies the rub for most people**. To honestly acknowledge all the true facts, leads people away from the official narrative, which they want to cling to because it provides the answer to the whole Port Arthur incident. To abandon the official narrative necessitates that people admit, at least to themselves, **they were wrong**. But to admit our thinking and condemnatory words were wrong shakes our being. People twist, turn, and hang on to false beliefs so they do not have to relent and lose face: *he had long blond hair; they saw him there; he pleaded guilty; it's a conspiracy theory; etc., etc.* – all these phrases of denial have been and will be uttered: To keep the evidence from being examined in bright light; To protect the cover-up; and, To shield guilty officials who have **participated in mass murder** perpetrated as an act of **psycho-political terrorism** then blamed on a patsy (a *boy-man*) intellectually handicapped with an **IQ of 66**. But telling lies to resolve anomalies does not lead to the truth.

*Reason and
Reflection,
poor cousins
to Hate and
Vengeance.*

For example, Matterson said the mother was “clutching” her 3-year-old daughter Madeline, while Bugg presenting the Crown’s case does not sustain that position. The police *training video* shows the bodies of the mother and her three-year-old daughter Madeline separated by approximately two metres. What has occurred here? **Were the bodies moved and if so by whom?**

BENIGN BLUNDERS OR SINISTER SIGNS?

AS author Beattie rightly notes, the *training video* does not show any image of the mother “clutching” a daughter. The word clutching is from *Coroner’s responsibilities at Port Arthur*, a paper that Ian Matterson presented in Melbourne on 11-12 March 1997 – Port Arthur Seminar Papers. A benign blunder you might say, but Coroners are not paid to blunder. They have great responsibilities which might have been **beyond Matterson**. He also referred to: “a body seated behind the steering wheel of a **Ford Laser**.” No such body is mentioned elsewhere. Did Matterson blunder again? Or, was a body kept secret? Or, was a body moved? – **ed**.

What about the spent .223Rem shell case pointed out by the surgically-gloved hand in the police *training video*, lying there under the right arm of the elder daughter’s body? What I can state clearly here in relation to this particular spent shell casing is the following: the spent shell could not have come from the AR-15 rifle (or for that matter an AR-15 SP-1 carbine) which the gunman employed in these three murders. As the scenarios presented by the prosecution and reports by the coroner tell me, **this spent case could NOT have come to rest there under the victim’s arm other than by post discharge human intervention.**

Colt AR-15s have an ejection pattern that makes it impossible for a spent case to have landed there behind the tree under the deceased’s body, either at the time the single fatal round was fired at contact, or indeed when any of the other alleged 5 rounds were discharged there on Jetty Road during that incident. I’m forced to conclude that a person or persons unknown **deliberately placed this fired case under the deceased’s right arm**. Consider: How did police know to lift the arm to point out the fired case being there if they had no knowledge of it being there in the first instance?

The presence of the spent case there under the deceased’s arm and the fact that the DPP refers to that case as, “one near the body,” only highlights the deceit of this evidence. If police tampered with this evidence, then how much other evidence received similar treatment at the multiple crime scenes involved? I’m also stirred to note, that unlike bodies at the other outdoor crime scenes, none of the positions of the bodies and of the vehicles at the Jetty Road crime scene, the tollbooth crime scene, or the Port Arthur General Store driveway were marked out. Only the spent shell cases seemed to have been encircled with yellow marker. ■

(amended; added & original emphasis)

**ALLEGED FIREARMS
Seascape Cottage¹⁶⁷**

Andrew S. MacGregor

*This is not new evidence,
it is stuff that has been there
from day one.¹⁶⁸*

YOU would be excused if upon reading Mike Bingham's *authentic* account of the siege at Seascape cottage, you believed Tasmania Police faced a most dangerous and determined opponent. Alas it is but a fairy-tale concocted by a bunch of braggarts, like drovers of yesteryear around their campfire. Bingham though was not the only loud and empty tall-tale teller [see *SOME WORDS ON BOOKS*; Part 2] at that log fire. Here is another braggart:

"Burnt firearms were found in all areas of the ashes, including three on top of the remains of innerspring mattresses in what were formerly guest rooms. It was obvious that Bryant had placed at least one firearm in each room of the guesthouse for easy access. These included a 12-gauge self-loading shotgun, a .30M1 Carbine, a 7.62 x 39mm Norinco self-loading rifle and bold and lever action rifles. The firearms were so badly affected by heat that all moving parts had seized and only the steel remained. All the stocks had burnt and any alloy components had melted so that basically only the barrels and receivers remained."¹⁶⁹

So what weapons were located by Tasmania Police in and about the charred remains of Seascape cottage off the Arthur Highway on the Tasman Peninsula? Well for some descriptions, we will refer to the claims made by the sergeant Gerard Dutton:¹⁷⁰

(6) A .30M1 Carbine calibre Saginaw self loading rifle, serial number 1831263, with folding stock. (In extremely burnt condition, 1.1m north of the chimney.)¹⁷¹

(7) A 7.62 x 39mm calibre Norinco (SKK) self loading rifle, serial number 8814580, minus the magazine. (In extremely burnt condition, 5m from the western gutter alignment and 4.1m from the southern gutter alignment.)¹⁷²

(8) A .223 Rem. Calibre Colt self loading rifle, model AR-15, serial number SP128807, fitted with a 3x20 Colt telescopic sight and black nylon sling. (In burnt condition, .05m to the south of the southern gutter alignment and 6.3m from the western gutter alignment.)¹⁷³

¹⁶⁷ Original title: *The Weapons of Seascape Cottage*. Note the author of this article has no involvement with firearms or with any firearms group. MacGregor is a former senior constable with Victoria Police: 17 years service; National Service Medal 1985. He has investigated and written extensively on the Port Arthur case, and has also lecture widely on it in Australia.

¹⁶⁸ James Robinson. in *Police may face Bridgewater trial*; The Times; 22 February 1997. An article about three innocent men (Michael Hickey, Vincent Hickey, and James Robinson) who corrupt **cops set up** and had convicted of murder: "a forged confession which was instrumental in bringing the men to trial and sending them to jail for **18 years**." (added emphasis) Postscript: You should not be one bit surprised with the following which was in The Guardian, on 24 December 1998: "The Crown Prosecution Service has decided **no** charges will be brought against 10 police officers accused of **fabricating evidence** against...Michael Hickey, Vincent Hickey and Jim Robinson [who] were freed by the Court of Appeal last year after **18 years** in jail." Innocent Martin Bryant has now been **wrongly imprisoned since the end of April 1996**.

¹⁶⁹ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 215.

¹⁷⁰ Gerard Dutton. *Statutory Declaration* re: Martin BRYANT. 9 September 1996.

¹⁷¹⁻¹⁷³ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 6. added emphasis; original italics.

(9) A barrel and other assorted parts of a 12-gauge Franchi pump action repeating shotgun, serial number RFPO886. (*In extremely burnt condition, 4.8m from the southern gutter alignment and 5.7m from the western gutter alignment.*)¹⁷⁴

(12) A .22 calibre barrel (only) of unknown manufacture, nil serial number, with a silencer attached. (*In extremely burnt condition, 0.9m west from the south west corner of the chimney.*)¹⁷⁵

(13) A .303 Brit. Calibre Lee-Enfield bolt action repeating rifle, serial number 59L7948. (*In extremely burnt condition, 4.8m from the western gutter alignment and 3.4m from the southern gutter alignment.*)¹⁷⁶

(14) A .30-30 calibre Winchester lever action repeating rifle, serial number 5101463. (*In extremely burnt condition, on the remains of a coil spring mattress, 1.8m from the southern gutter alignment, and 3.7m from the eastern gutter alignment.*)¹⁷⁷

(15) A .22 calibre barrel (only) of unknown manufacture, nil serial number. (*In extremely burnt condition, on the remains of a coil spring mattress, 1.3m from the southern gutter alignment and 7.6m from the eastern gutter alignment.*)¹⁷⁸

(16) A .177 calibre Pioneer single shot air rifle, serial number 00310. (*In extremely burnt condition, on the remains of a coil spring mattress, 1.5m from the southern gutter alignment and 9.4m from the eastern gutter alignment.*)¹⁷⁹

(17) A .410 calibre unknown manufacture over/under shotgun, serial number unknown. (*In extremely burnt condition, 2.6m from the eastern gutter alignment and 5.3m from the southern gutter alignment.*)¹⁸⁰

(18) A .410 calibre Belgian manufactured double barrel shotgun, serial number unknown. (*In extremely burnt condition, 3.7m from both the northern and the eastern gutter alignment.*)¹⁸¹

Outside the confines of the burnt building were located:

(10) A 6.5 x 55mm calibre Mauser bolt action repeating rifle, serial number 48931 and one .303 Brit. Calibre cartridge. (*In good condition, on grass approximately 4.6m north from the northern gutter alignment and 7.1m from the building's north/east corner.*)¹⁸²

(11) Sixteen 7.62 x 39mm calibre cartridges. (*In good condition, from paving immediately to the west side of the burnt building in an area approximately 6m x 5m.*)¹⁸³

¹⁷⁴ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 6. added emphasis; original italics.

¹⁷⁵⁻¹⁷⁷ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 7. added emphasis; original italics.

¹⁷⁸ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: pp. 7-8. added emphasis; original italics.

¹⁷⁹⁻¹⁸¹ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 8. added emphasis; original italics.

^{182, 183} *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 6. added emphasis; original italics.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

On 3 May 1996, I received the following exhibits [where located not stated] **from Constable Standen of Ballistics Section:**

(86) A .308 Win. Calibre Fabrique Nationale (FN) self loading rifle, model FAL, S/No. G3434, fitted with a leather sling.¹⁸⁴

(87) A .22 calibre Voere bolt action repeating rifle, S/No. 842183, fitted with 4x40 Tasco telescopic sight and sling.¹⁸⁵

(88) A 3x – 9x Redfield telescopic sight.¹⁸⁶

32. Also on 3 May 1996, I received the following exhibit [where located not stated] **from Detective Keygan of Hobart CIB:**

(104) A patterned gun case containing a .223 cal. Australian Automatic Arms (AAA) self loading rifle, serial number SAR-020236, minus the magazine.¹⁸⁷

35. On the 8 May 1996, I received the following exhibits [where located not stated] **from Constable Standen of the Ballistics Section:**

(129) A 12-gauge Daewoo self loading shotgun S/No. F500 218, with a detachable box magazine containing nine 12-gauge cartridges.¹⁸⁸

(130) Two detachable box magazines; one empty, the other containing seventeen .308 calibre cartridges.¹⁸⁹

(131) One detachable box magazine containing twelve .223 Rem. Calibre cartridges.¹⁹⁰

(132) One .308 Win. Calibre fired cartridge case.¹⁹¹

Now the owners of Seascope cottage, David and Sally Martin owned two antique .410 shotguns, which had their firing pins removed to make them *safe*. David Martin also possessed a .22 rifle that was retained in the garage away from the *guest house*. Thus we can remove items 17, 18 and 87 from the list of firearms that the gunman inside Seascope cottage had for his use against Tasmania's finest, their Special Operations Group.

Let us think on the descriptive words of Mike Bingham as he tells us how the gunman flitted from room to room, firing an assortment of firearms, and then how sergeant Gerard Dutton tells us that the gunman prepared his defences by placing various firearms in different rooms. Let us first consider those weapons placed upon the guest-room beds; items, 14, 15 and 16; a .30-30 calibre Winchester lever action repeating rifle, a .22 calibre barrel (only), and a .177 calibre Pioneer single shot air rifle.

184-186 *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 14. added emphasis.

187 *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 15. added emphasis.

188-191 *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 18. added emphasis.

Can any person be so daft as to consider using a .177 air rifle against Tasmania's finest in a siege situation? Of what value is a .22 barrel going to be in any siege situation? And then we have the Winchester lever action. With the finding of one spent 30-30 cartridge inside Seascap there is evidence that at least this firearm was discharged during the siege, so that is one out of three firearms as presented by sergeant Dutton and expounded upon by author Mike Bingham in his book.

What is also relevant is, was this weapon loaded and did it contain cartridges within its magazine? Since this information is not mentioned, then the only choice we have is to believe that this firearm was not loaded at the time it was burnt.

In short, excluding the two antique .410 shotguns belonging to the Martins, there were eight firearms found burnt inside Seascap cottage, the air rifle, the two .22 barrels, the Winchester lever action, the old Lee-Enfield, the Franchi pump action shotgun, the SKK minus its magazine, and the M1 carbine.

Now the SKK does raise some questions, because when Martin Bryant was talking to the negotiator, sergeant Terry McCarthy, there was the sound of a SKK being discharged from another room. What this means is that there was either another SKK used at Seascap cottage during the siege, which left Seascap prior to the fire, or that the SKK found at Seascap was the only such weapon there, but its magazine got up and left the building prior to the fire.

Whatever way we look at it, there is the presence of 'Evolution' involved. Either way, the missing part grew legs and walked. Thus I find this part of Sergeant Gerard Dutton's statement rather telling: **(11) Sixteen 7.62 x 39mm calibre cartridges. (In good condition, from paving immediately to the west side of the burnt building in an area approximately 6m x 5m.)**¹⁹² In other words, it appears that some person emptied an SKK magazine by continuously working the SKK's bolt back and forth, and this is a specific military action called stripping the magazine.

We then come to the British Lee-Enfield .303 that fought in two world wars. There is no mention of a magazine for this particular rifle, nor is there any mention of any cartridges fired or unfired found inside the cottage, so again this rifle is again simply **window-dressing**. It is of no value in any siege situation. However when we consider this portion of sergeant Dutton's statement:

31. Also on 3 May 1996, I received from Constable Maxwell of the Scientific Bureau, Hobart, the following exhibits in plastic bags:

(91) Two .303 calibre cartridges, three 7.63 x 39mm calibre cartridges, one 7.62 x 39mm calibre fired cartridge case, one .30 calibre bullet (unfired). (Bag marked "2" labelled in part, "Ammo side of Seascap house.")¹⁹³

¹⁹² See note 183.

¹⁹³ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 14. added emphasis; original italics.

DEADLY DECEPTION OF CERTAINTY
Port Arthur Case – Uncertainties Unlimited

CERTAINTY can be deadly. A highly significant characteristic of human beings is the desire for certainty. This need impacts on the way we live, the way we think, and it is always – there we have one of its indicator words – pushing and maneuvering to be part of all decisions we make. Society pays much respect to big-name decision makers. We think it best if organizations have decision-makers at their helm, as we have little patience for those who are reflective by nature, or who are not prone to quick decision making. In fact, such *slow* people are frequently, and stupidly, derided.

So it is with the State and its systems, the legal system being one of them. In fact, we can say the legal system is one big process of attempts at certainty: guilty or innocent; non-compliance or compliance; obey or disobey; *etc.* So what are we to make of the Port Arthur case when many of its components are not known with certainty – are uncertain. In logic and law, no argument is sound if a foundational premise is not certain. It cannot be said, for example, that person X did this or that if at first the identity of person X is not 100 percent certain. In the case of Port Arthur however, this is exactly what has happened. The human need for certainty has led corrupt officials and the unthinking public to make decisive (and deadly) decisions founded on uncertainties.

Many official decisions in the case provide answers which were/are wanted for subjective (human not legal) reasons. People crave what they were given – an official narrative which explains everything. Spurious certainty is comforting. Whereas, the uncertainty raised by investigators and thinkers is condemned and shunned as being wrong because it is unsettling. But, **the Port Arthur case is riddled with uncertainties and decisive decisions made on them.** Here are just some of those uncertain elements:

■ **TWO CONSTABLES** Two constable (they say) went to Saltwater River (they say) to find drugs (they say) which turned out to be soap powder (they say). When asked who sent them on this wild Rinso chase the phone tip-off was lost (they say). But when the female partner of one of those cops received a phone call from one of the *Jamies*, notes were made (they say) of that conversation. But they won't say why *Jamie* wanted to speak with the cop.

■ **TWO GUNMEN** Investigators suggest the Port Arthur gunman was Benjamin Overbeeke. He drove the BMW to Seascapes where he met the cop Michael *Mick/Rick* Dyson inside. It seems they were the two gunmen there. But the set-up required Martin Bryant the patsy to be blamed. So officials identified him as the *lone-nut* gunman. To ensure the set-up worked, there was **no trial**.

■ **TWO-STOP ILES** Witnesses confirm constable Chris Iles of distant Sorrell unexpectedly stopped at the Port Arthur Kodak Shop. Then he drove his police vehicle to the Port Arthur General Store where he stopped. Then he drove away never to be seen or heard from again. There is no record of him ever being contacted or sent to the incident. His name is not in any official documents.

(cont.)

*One or two anomalies might be normal, but a whole series of them is a warning – something is **WRONG!***

194 This true fact is incontrovertible **evidence proves Martin Bryant was set up**. The only reason the gunman would depart the Broad Arrow Café with a sportsbag (witnesses saw him) and also leave a sportsbag in that café (visible on the *training video*) was to have people wrongly conclude that Bryant was the gunman. There were items **allegedly** belonging to Bryant in the café sportsbag and officials used that allegation against him.

195 That Martin Bryant would phone the female partner (Merran Craig) of that constable (Paul Hyland) at a local police station (Nubeena) and, according to her *Witness Statement* (8 May 1996) ask: “Do you know where your husband is?” makes no sense. There had to be a very serious reason for that call to have been made. Recall Hyland was one of the two constables who, allegedly, went on a *wild Rinso hunt* to Saltwater River.

196 “We can now show that Martin Bryant was not responsible for the murder of David Martin, and that the Martins were constrained at least at 10:40 a.m. when Martin Bryant was 58 kilometres away. So who did this?” Andrew S. MacGregor. *Speech*; Inverell; 2004.

197 Stewart K. Beattie. *A Gunsmith’s Notebook on Port Arthur*; 2006: p. 238.

198 The bodies of the two owners of Seascope were quickly found inside the cottage. If he was inside Seascope, the body of Glenn Pears would have been found around the same time. It was not. The circumstance around his arrival at the cottage in the rear of the BMW, the burning of that BMW, the siege, and the burning of Seascope strongly suggest Pears died in the BMW. Two pairs of handcuffs said to have been used to restrain him were never physically presented, or documented in the list of so-called evidence.

199 Those four in the BMW are believed to have been: Mary Rose Nixon; Russell James/*Jim* Pollard; Helene Salzmänn; and, Robert Salzmänn. The two who sat **inside the yellow Volvo** and spoke with the gunman were: Helene Salzmänn and Robert Salzmänn.

■ **TWO VOLVOS** There are *Witness Statements* describing different yellow Volvos. Registration plates are different – three were identified (see Part 7). No surfboard(s) on top is/are mentioned by some witnesses, one and two surfboards by others. Then there are descriptions of a second and a third yellow Volvo it seems, being driven at PAHS after the gunman departed in a yellow Volvo. How many Volvos and surfboards were there? Who owned them?

■ **TWO SPORTSBAGS** Different descriptions, different colours. The gunman went into the café with a bag, left a bag there, and then came out with a bag, which witnesses saw him place in the boot of a yellow Volvo – not Bryant’s with certainty.¹⁹⁴

■ **TWO JAMIES** Allegedly, one *Jamie* phoned (15:08) the partner of a local cop. How *Jamie* got the number officials never said.¹⁹⁵ (Did the gunman want to tell that constable: *I’m now at Seascope the shooting is done?*) Then another *Jamie* got on the phone and told the negotiator that he was preparing something to eat. For Rick? Or for Mick? Or for the two owners? But according to the complaisant judge William Cox, one of those two *Jamies* killed the owners before the shooting began at Broad Arrow Café.¹⁹⁶

■ **TWO NAKED-WOMAN SIGHTINGS** Documents reveal two cops recorded two sightings of a naked person at Seascope cottage. One cop said it was a woman. The other wasn’t sure – or didn’t want to say as this could not be part of any official narrative. But officials are so concerned about those sightings they ignored them and hoped they’d go away. But they haven’t, and they won’t.

■ **TWO ADMITTANCE TICKETS** If that yellow Volvo went into the site only once, how is it that, “Two Historic Site admittance tickets on the dash near the grey wallet”¹⁹⁷ were noted? This doesn’t reflect the certainty of the (concocted) official narrative.

■ **TWO PAIRS OF HANDCUFFS** There was so much talk about two pairs of handcuffs – why then were they not on the evidence list? Allegedly, they were used to restrain Glenn Pears inside the cottage with the other two hostages inside that cottage. But there are two stories about the end of Pears and those two pairs of never-seen handcuffs. They found the two bodies of the owners inside the cottage, but it took another two days for the shocking details to get out where the remains of Pears were found.¹⁹⁸

■ **TWO BMW STORIES** Now Martin Bryant (one of the *Jamies*) said he carjacked the gold-coloured BMW at Fortescue Bay. It is a strange story. But the gunman (the other *Jamie*?) is said to have carjacked the BMW at the PAHS tollgate. So we have two stories, and two people, and two places – so nothing is certain.

■ **TWO PEOPLE KNEW GUNMAN** The State does not want you to think about this uncertainty. The gunman stopped his yellow Volvo at the tollbooth, where four people waited in a gold-coloured BMW. Witnesses saw two people (Robert & Helene Salzmänn?) were seated **inside** the Volvo with the gunman – as if they knew him. Neither of those two knew Martin Bryant. Then the gunman shot all four of those people and carjacked their BMW.¹⁹⁹

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

■ **TWO SURFERS** Martin Bryant said he went to Roaring Beach on that Sunday (28th) morning. At that beach, he said he saw two surfers. But you won't find any details in the literature of the police searching for or identifying those two other surfers. Are we certain they were surfers? Or were they cops?

■ **TWO ADULTS AT FORTESCUE BAY** The gunman carjacked the BMW at the PAHS tollgate. But Martin Bryant says he did the same thing at Fortescue Bay. He also said there were two adults in that vehicle, plus a small child. Now, why would he say he carjacked that BMW when it was taken in front of witnesses at the tollgate? Bryant also spoke about those two adults, *Rick* and a university-educated woman with her child. There is no certainty in all of this.

■ **TWO PLEADINGS** Martin Bryant, who was doomed regardless of what he pleaded, said he was **not guilty** on 30 September 1996. But that was not acceptable to the State. So, the State made him plead a second time. On the 22 November 1996, a plea of guilty was submitted. It wasn't Bryant's plea, it was the plea of his lawyer **John Avery** who was supposed to be defending him. Now, it is not clear and certain why two pleas had to be submitted other than to set up Bryant. He said he was not guilty. Thus, there should have been a trial. But he was coerced into a complete reversal. Is it clear to you the Tasmanian legal system requires two pleadings? Or, was that just for setting up Martin?

■ **TWO WOMEN (AGENTS?) AT SEASCAPE** On the night of 27-28 April 1996, two women were guests at Seascapes cottage. They were Lynne Beavis and allegedly her sister Jean Andrews. Later, after an unusual article appeared in *The Mercury* newspaper,²⁰⁰ it was confirmed that **Beavis is not who she claimed she was.** (see *NAME INDEX*) Beavis presented an extremely detailed and long *Witness Statement*, but the editor has never been able to find a statement from her alleged sister. Lots of uncertainty with this pair, way too much to be making definitive decisions.

■ **TWO OLD SHOTGUNS** At Seascapes, the two owners owned two old shotguns (decorative items, firing pins removed), plus a small .22 rifle for use on feral cats. In a mysterious metamorphosis, they were turned into a long list of firearms or parts of firearms by Gerard Dutton. The uncertainty on this subject is very certain. Dutton conjured up a long list of alleged firearm evidence which proves nothing. There is lots of uncertainty around Dutton.

■ **TWO HIGHLY SUGGESTIVE STATEMENTS** When apprehended at Seascapes, Martin Bryant made several statements. Two are highly suggestive: *Don't shoot me I'm the hostage*²⁰¹; & *Petra, Petra did she get out of the fire?*²⁰² The uncertainties around these statements, and others, have never been clarified.

We could mention the two officially-lit fires at Seascapes, but that might be too much. With all this uncertainty, there is reasonable doubt about all significant elements of the Port Arthur incident.

To believe the official narrative is 100 percent truthful is a deadly deception. This deception has a big negative impact on how people think about the case and about Martin Bryant. – ed.

200 Christine Caulfield. *Big compo for Port Arthur massacre nurse.* *The Mercury*; 10 August 2004. See note Part 3. (It has been said that Wendy Scurr received similar compensation. Mrs. Scurr has informed the editor that she received no such payment.)

201 The editor has not been able to confirm the original source of this alleged statement. If it is accurate: it tells us how Martin Bryant saw himself; it confirms that he was not alone inside Seascapes; and, it makes sense of many facts which have been ignored in the official narrative, presumably because officials **cannot or will not** explain them to the public.

202 Malcolm James Scott. *Witness Statement*; no date: "I am a Constable in the Tasmania Police Force stationed at Launceston and attached to the Uniform Section. I am an operational member of the Special Operations Group." The statement by Martin Bryant confirms he did not have full comprehension of reality at Seascapes at the time it was burning. How long he did not have this comprehension prior to his exiting the cottage **is not known by anyone.** He spoke with concern about Petra Willmott his girlfriend. But to date, there is **no evidence** that she was there with him at Seascapes. We know he saw Petra last on Sunday morning. His statement recorded by the cop Scott was expressed about 24 hours after Martin last saw Petra. His disturbing statements, his confabulation, and his strange descriptions of his experiences, compel us not to exclude the possibility that his actions and memory were influenced by a **drug or drugs** and/or by **hypnosis.** There is no evidence confirming his exit from the burning cottage was impeded by a human blow or by parts of the cottage collapsing and rendering him unconscious. The injury he had was limited to burns, primarily on his back. For Martin Bryant, there was no physiological fact that would have allowed him to remain in a burning building with his back on fire. His 3rd-degree burns confirm he was face-down. He must have remained so in some inhibited state until the pain from the fire burning his back aroused him. It was then that he staggered outside. So what was done to Martin? By whom? And when?

You are in a siege situation against Tasmania's finest, and you suddenly decide that you wish to fire your old Lee Enfield. You then realise that you left those two cartridges outside of the cottage you are defending. Rightio, shout out *Barley* leave the room, exit the cottage down to the side wall, sort amongst the various ammunition there, pick up the required .303 ammunition, back into the cottage, back inside the room where you've left the trusty Lee-Enfield and the siege is back on. I don't really think so. Do you?

What we have is a weapon cached in one area inside Seascope cottage, with the required ammunition for that particular weapon cached in a totally different area, being outside Seascope cottage.

Then we have the Franchi shotgun described as: "**A barrel and other assorted parts of a 12-gauge Franchi pump action repeating shotgun.**" *Assorted parts of a shotgun do not a shotgun make.* Either this was a working firearm, which is not stated here, or it was a collection of parts, which would not operate as a working weapon. Now just what was it? On reading Dutton's actual words, the belief comes through that it was not a complete working firearm.

We will now consider the weapons found outside Seascope cottage.

One of the interesting stories that emanated from the local fire brigade was that when the firemen were putting out the fire at the cottage, one of the firemen came across a rifle lying on the grass. Being an ex-serviceman, he immediately recognised it as an FN-FAL. So let us look at the related sections of three statements, those of Constable Browning, Sergeant Harwood, and Sergeant Fogarty:

"About 8:40 a.m. I observed Special Operations Group members proceed towards the suspect via vehicle and restrain him. A search was conducted by Sergeant FOGARTY, Sergeant HARWOOD and myself from the bridge over the creek on the western side, around the cottage to the waterfront on the eastern side, including the boat shed. No weapons, ammunition or other relevant items were located by us."²⁰³

"I then moved forward with S/Constable BROWNING and conducted a sweeping search of the western side of the property. Approximately 30 metres from the burning cottage I directed another Tasmania Police SOG member to assist in our clearance operation. We then cleared around the northern side of the cottage and boat shed. I then established a perimeter around the cottage. Senior sergeant MORRISON, Sergeant HAYES and myself then viewed the immediate area around the cottage and located a number of firearms. An SLR was located on the roof of the eastern cottage. Another rifle was located inside this cottage on the ground floor. A further rifle was located on the grass to the north of the cottage."²⁰⁴

"I then left that position as they closed in on the person. After the search I returned to my vehicle and remained in that area."²⁰⁵

And this is what sergeant Dutton says in relation to this point:

²⁰³ Hedley George Browning. *Witness Statement*; no date.

²⁰⁴ Craig Harwood. *Witness Statement*; 9 August 1996.

²⁰⁵ Andrew Mark Fogarty. *Witness Statement*; no date.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

(10) A 6.5 x 55mm calibre Mauser bolt action repeating rifle, serial number 48931 and one .303 Brit. Calibre cartridge. (In good condition, on grass approximately 4.6m north from the northern gutter alignment and 7.1m from the building's north/east corner.)²⁰⁶

In the area searched by Browning, Harwood, and Fogarty, where Browning stated they found nothing, Harwood, Hayes and Morrison found what Dutton says was a Mauser rifle. After this little episode, the Mauser fades into oblivion. But there is now another conundrum.

Constable Browning states: "A search was conducted by Sergeant FOGARTY, Sergeant HARWOOD and myself from the bridge over the creek on the western side, around the cottage to the waterfront on the eastern side, including the boat shed. No weapons, ammunition or other relevant items were located by us."

Yet in this very area we get, according to Dutton: **(11) Sixteen 7.62 x 39mm calibre cartridges. (In good condition, from paving immediately to the west side of the burnt building in an area approximately 6m x 5m.)**²⁰⁷

In other words, either Tasmania's finest were blind, or this ammunition was placed in that position after the SOGs searched the area.

The next firearm to be located by the police SOGs at Seascope was: **(87) A .22 calibre Voere bolt action repeating rifle, S/No. 842183, fitted with 4x40 Tasco telescopic sight and sling.**²⁰⁸

Now this rifle was the property of David Martin and is explained in Donald Cameron Gunn's statement.²⁰⁹ There is no evidence of it ever being used during the siege at Seascope cottage as it remained within the garage.

The third firearm to be located by the police SOGs was the SLR: **(86) A .308 Win. Calibre Fabrique Nationale (FN) self loading rifle, model FAL, S/No. G3434, fitted with a leather sling.**²¹⁰

Now the problem with this firearm was that when witnesses saw the weapon being used at Port Arthur, the weapon was fitted with a telescopic sight, and when the FN-FAL was found by police in the gutter of the building, there was no sight attached. To introduce the supposed sight fitted to this .308 we then had Dutton state this:

On 3 May 1996, I received the following exhibits from Constable Standen of the Ballistics Section:

(86) A .308 Win. Calibre Fabrique Nationale (FN) self loading rifle, model FAL, S/No. G3434, fitted with a leather sling.²¹⁰

(88) A 3x – 9x Redfield telescopic sight.²¹¹

Sergeant Dutton then goes on to explain how this telescopic sight was attached to the FN-FAL:

²⁰⁶ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 6. added emphasis; original italics.

²⁰⁷ See note 183.

²⁰⁸ See note 185.

²⁰⁹ Donald Cameron Gunn. *Witness Statement*; 16 May 1996.

²¹⁰ See note 184.

²¹¹ See note 186.

A brown leather sling is fitted and the damaged bolt cover has three holes drilled in it to accept a telescopic sight mount. The Redford telescopic sight, 30(88) is attached to a metal mount drilled with three corresponding holes and it is consistent with having been formerly attached to the FN rifle.²¹²

This however compounds another problem. Had the Redfield telescopic sight been attached to the FN-FAL as described by Dutton, then we would expect that this telescopic sight would have been fixed to the firearm when it was damaged. We would also expect that the telescopic sight would have been torn off its mountings on the FN-FAL when this damage occurred. We would also expect that the missing parts of the FN-FAL as detailed by Dutton to have been within the area around where the telescopic sight was found. This did not occur. Those parts are still missing.

Furthermore we would expect that, since the area of damage to the FN-FAL was in the region where the telescopic sight was attached to that rifle, the telescopic sight would have suffered similar damage. There is no report of such damage to the telescopic sight.

Lastly, we would have expected for the telescopic sight, which was supposedly securely fixed to the dust cover of the FN-FAL, that the separation, supposedly by a severe force which caused so much damage to the FN-FAL, of the screws holding the telescopic mount to the dust cover would have torn through the dust cover creating larger holes and tears within the metal dust cover. No such damage is evident within a photograph of the FN-FAL as produced by sergeant Dutton.

Once this photograph is studied and the area of impact of the force that created that damage is seen on the dust cover of the FN-FAL, it becomes obvious that the damaged area of the dust cover is where the telescopic sight, had they been attached to the FN-FAL would have been and thus this damage would not have occurred to the dust cover. Furthermore, there is no sign of the three holes that Dutton states were drilled into the dust cover to attach the Redfield sight. Sergeant Dutton's statement in regard to the FN-FAL is not factual.

There is now only one remaining firearm to consider, the Colt AR-15.

(8) A .223 Rem. Calibre Colt self loading rifle, model AR-15, serial number SP128807, fitted with a 3x20 Colt telescopic sight and black nylon sling. (In burnt condition, .05m to the south of the southern gutter alignment and 6.3m from the western gutter alignment.)²¹³

In his *Statutory Declaration*, Dutton tells us: **At 1:30pm, I attended the "Seascape" Guest House accommodation, situated on the Arthur Hwy several kilometres north of the PAHS. There was a large number of police and fire brigade personnel present and activity was centred around the burnt remains of the main building which was still smouldering.²¹⁴**

²¹² *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 24. added emphasis; original italics.

²¹³ See note 173.

²¹⁴ *Statutory Declaration*; 1996: p. 5. added emphasis.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Dutton also states the following: Examination of the ashes of the burnt building was unable to begin until mid-afternoon after the roofing material was removed and sufficient water had been sprayed over the coals.

Now a house fire produces a great amount of heat, and the destructive power of that heat can be seen with all the firearms that had been totally destroyed inside the Seascope cottage. Now had this particular weapon been within half a metre of the fire as stated by Dutton, then this weapon would have suffered a similar fate to the weapons inside Seascope cottage.



*Credibility and consistency are just two of the things which you will **not find** in Dutton’s description of his alleged evidence.*

In other words, the AR-15 to have suffered only minimal damage as the nylon sling melting and metal parts of the sight to show heat discolouration, means that the AR-15 must have been lying in a heated situation for a far less period than the six or seven hours that Dutton suggests. Again the sergeant’s photograph of the AR-15 as it was “first uncovered in the ashes” shows further discrepancies as there is debris under the AR-15, it **would have been impossible for that debris to have been under the AR-15.**

Now since Martin Bryant had been arrested by SOGs during the fire at Seascope cottage, and was thus unable to place this particular firearm in the position where it was found and then photographed by Dutton, then **who was responsible for placing this particular weapon in that position?** Furthermore, just where did this particular weapon come from, as it did not undergo the ravages of the house fire, nor was it observed by the Tasmania Police SOGs during their search for weapons after the apprehension of Martin Bryant at 08:35 hours?

Just where did this AR-15 rifle come from? Not from inside Seascope cottage, as the damage tells us that, and not from outside Seascope cottage as the Tasmania police SOGs tell us that. **Where did this weapon come from?**

The only possible answer is that the AR-15 serial number SP128807 **was placed in the position where it was supposedly found by Dutton.** He had to have had possession of the AR-15 and it could only have been him who placed the AR-15 rifle where it was later photographed on the periphery of Seascope cottage.

The attending firemen could not have placed the AR-15 where it was found. They were under constant police supervision. A Tasmania Police SOG could not have placed the AR-15 where it was found because then the SOGs would have found this particular firearm, and described it in detail, as is normal police practise. Furthermore, had a SOG placed the AR-15 within the periphery of Seascap cottage it would have been done whilst the ashes were still hot, and again the AR-15 would have been destroyed by the heat.

Also, the SOGs would have left the site after completing their duties in securing the site and handing it over to detective sergeant Kemp of Bridgewater when he arrived with his crew.

Martin Bryant did not place, and could not have placed, the AR-15 there as he had no opportunity to disperse any firearms outside Seascap cottage after the cottage burnt down. And even if he had, that particular weapon would have been totally destroyed by heat. I will reiterate: **The only person in a position to place the AR-15 where it was found, as the length of time that the weapon would have remained in that position would have been minimal – this is demonstrated by the heat damage to the AR-15 – would have to be sergeant Gerard Dutton.**

There are two final weapons mentioned by Dutton: The Daewoo shotgun recovered in the boot of the Volvo at the tollbooth at the Port Arthur Historic site; and, the AAA semi automatic found by police in the second search of Martin Bryant's house in Clare Street, New Town. The fact that neither of these two weapons were taken by Martin Bryant to be used in the siege at Seascap cottage in itself must raise a plethora of unanswered questions. There should also be questions in regard to the media being informed that there had been in excess of forty²¹⁵ firearms recovered from Seascap cottage, when in fact Dutton's statement simply refers to a total of 14 firearms, three of which belonged to the owners²¹⁶ of Seascap and many of these firearms appeared to be in an inoperable condition.

The conclusion of this dissemination of sergeant Dutton's *Statutory Declaration* with regard to the crime scene at the Seascap cottage totally **destroys any credibility of the Tasmania Police scenario.** Weapons used and fired against Tasmania's finest included an air rifle and two .22 barrels, firearms without magazines and with ammunition found only outside the building, not inside where it could have been used. Furthermore, Dutton gave no evidence of any of these firearms being accompanied by unfired cartridges within any of the accompanying magazines of these weapons.

What we have at this particular part of the Port Arthur massacre is a scene designed primarily for the removal of the right for any person to own firearms in Australia. This is the only explanation for the **total lies and deceit** foisted upon an unsuspecting public by members of the Tasmania Police and the complicit media. ■

(amended; added & original emphasis; added & original italics)

²¹⁵ The number 43 appears in the case literature.

²¹⁶ When it became patently ridiculous that Martin Bryant did not acquire, conceal, transport, cache, then use all those weapons which officials claimed he did – **with no hard evidence** – the source for all the alleged weapons and ammunition was shifted onto the two owners of Seascap cottage, victims David & Sally Martin. Based on this analytical examination by the author MacGregor, the ballistics-related *Statutory Declaration* prepared by Gerard Dutton is a deceptive document.

JFK AND PORT ARTHUR

Terry Schulze

email to editor; 3 October 2012

*Of course, if I wanted to find out
what happened at Port Arthur,
I would just read the report from the inquiry
into Port Arthur – except there isn't one,
not even a coroner's report.²¹⁷*

JUST a few years ago, I listened for the first time to the tape of the gunshots in Dealey Plaza²¹⁸ on the day²¹⁹ that President Kennedy was assassinated. It was, shall we say, an epiphany – a moment in time when the perception of my world shifted. You see I had bought the establishment line about those gunshots, that is: *anyone could get 4 shots off in 8.31 seconds*. Indeed, the Warren Commission had three FBI agents do just that. No problem, you had all day for the first shot, then get off the remaining 3 shots in 8.31 seconds, an average of one shot every 2.77 seconds.

The argument of 8.31 seconds to get off all 4 shots was all smoke and mirrors; it was directing everyone's attention away from the real question. That question became obvious when I finally got access to the tape of the gunshots. You see, the last 2 shots are only **.82 seconds apart!**

It is physically impossible to recover from the recoil of a rifle, move your hand from the trigger, lift the bolt, pull the bolt back, push the bolt forward, close the bolt and then get your finger back on the trigger to snap off a second shot in **.82 of a second**. It just can't be done, forget about aiming, you just can't mechanically chamber a round like that in such a short period of time.

What the gunshots on that tape told me was that there had to have been a **second shooter**. If you have two people, that is enough for a conspiracy. Once I had that key bit of information, then the whole bogus Warren Commission with the former chief justice presiding was put in doubt. Obviously, there wasn't just a conspiracy to assassinate Kennedy; there was also a conspiracy to hide the truth of the assassination. So what has this to do with the Port Arthur Massacre? Well, have you ever heard the tape?

Retired gunsmith Stewart Beattie has put together a book called *A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur*.²²⁰ To say **it is devastating to the official line on the massacre** is an understatement. It exposes the fraud surrounding both the massacre and the cover-up that followed. I will offer some tidbits from that book, but if you want some real ammunition, get a copy with pictures and all.

217 Terry Schulze, retired barrister. It is hard to believe, but it is absolutely true as Schulze states. (The *Doyle Report* of June 1997 focuses on management, staffing, tourism, etc. matters related to the Port Arthur Historic Property. It does not address the crimes committed at and near Port Arthur.) There is **no** official report of any kind on the entire Port Arthur case. Some attention was given to an inoperative emergency door at the Broad Arrow Café – seven people died near it because they were unable to get out. But that attention only came after **repeated requests** were made. The State stalled to try and stop people from suing the government, which was responsible for the café. Eventually, an improper investigation was undertaken. Damian Bugg the DPP deliberately **tampered with the evidence** (doorlock). This so-called investigation related to that inoperative door is a cruel insult to all those who had their partners, family members, and friends killed near that door all because it would not open as was required. (see *THAT BLOODY DOOR* Insert in Part 8).

218 Planned and actual place of the assassination of John F. Kennedy in Dallas, Texas.

219 22 November 1963

220 At 400 pages, Beattie's book on the Port Arthur case is an outstanding contribution to the literature on the Port Arthur case.

221 Chapter 22, 6th edition.

222 See following page in the book you are now reading.

223 The alleged assassin of John F. Kennedy. Like most of these set up killings, Oswald was soon silenced – he was murdered less than 48 hours after Kennedy’s death. Injuries to his face confirm his statement that he was beaten by a cop prior his death. Extensive investigations confirm that Oswald was an innocent patsy.

224 In the jargon of these planned killings, a handler is a/the person who manipulates a patsy through steps he is expected to take.* Patsies are never made fully aware of the complete plan, which often results in their death. The evidence strongly suggests that Martin Bryant was meant to die inside Seascope cottage. But that part of the plan by those who arranged the psychopolitical incident at Port Arthur was prevented from happening when Martin managed to get himself out of the burning building. The evidence suggests that he was drugged, as his back – not his hands and face – was well on fire (3rd-degree burns) confirming he had been laying face down unaware of the fire he was in until he was stirred by the pain. His documented verbal remarks when he was apprehended seem nonsensical. And for those who believe Martin Bryant could have explained everything to the cops, note the following: **i.** We do not know what exactly Martin Bryant told the police. All we know is what officials want the public to know; **ii.** Martin Bryant could have revealed many things to officials, but if those things did not fit into the official narrative they would have been suppressed; **iii.** We do not know what drugs were given to Martin Bryant before, during, and after the Port Arthur incident; and, **iv.** The first person to speak seriously with Martin Bryant it seems was a highly questionable psychiatrist (Ian Sale; see Part 8), not an investigator from Tasmania Police. (* See the Insert *STATEMENTS BY PETRA WILLMOTT*. She describes a man called **Tiger**, who might have been a handler manipulating Martin. Very suggestively, this **Tiger** seems to have been completely ignored by all officials. **Why?**)

In Chapter 15,²²¹ Mr. Beattie addresses this specific gunshot at Seascope cottage on the **A Current Affair** video shown on TV. If you listen to the tape you hear Bryant saying: “I’ve got twenty to seven ‘cause of I’m making up some sandwiches ...WHUMP!...these people got, um salad and some steak here...”

That WHUMP! is clearly a gunshot. I’ve been around firearms all my life, spent some time in the service and Viet Nam and I have been to quite a few indoor shooting ranges. That is the signature of a gunshot in or around a structure, no doubt about it. Mr. Beattie confirms that with the report from an independent expert’s report from **independent audiometry technologist**. You can read the analysis and view the waveform comparisons in the book.

So, big question, if Bryant is on the telephone, **who is doing the shooting?** Do you get it? There are two people; if you have two people then you have enough for a conspiracy. Further on in Beattie’s book is a listing of the various “coughs” on the tape (that is what the police called the gunshots).²²² The transcript indicates that there were over 20 such “coughs,” but it is how the gunshots are mentioned in the transcript that may illustrate the frustration of those involved with the investigation.

THE PATSY

Another tape to listen to and compare with the Kennedy assassination is the tape where Bryant asked McCarthy about what happened at Port Arthur. The negotiator mentions that there had been some shooting at Port Arthur and was wondering if Bryant knew anything about it. Bryant, in a voice that echoes from the past with Lee Harvey Oswald,²²³ then asked: “**Was there anyone hurt?**” This is supposed to be from a person who had just shot over 30 people at the Broad Arrow Café, killed a mother and two daughters at point blank range, then killed four more and dragged some of their bodies out of a BMW. It has the ring of innocence of Oswald’s voice when he was asked by a reporter “Did you shoot the President?” Whereupon Oswald replied: “I didn’t shoot anybody, no sir. I’m just a patsy.”

THE FIREARMS

Mr. Beattie in his notebook also spends considerable time explaining the firearm evidence. It is clear from Chapter 13 that the .308 FN-FAL was not Martin Bryant’s. He had an AR-10 in .308 calibre. Unfortunately for Bryant’s handlers, silly Martin took the AR-10 to Terry Hill the gundealer 34 days before the massacre. **The gun was still there on the day of the massacre.** You have to remember that the target firearms of the gun-ban legislation dating back to the 1980’s were all self-loading firearms, not just the military rifles, but also .22s and shotguns. Well, Bryant owned a .22 self-loader (the .223 AR-15), a .308 AR-10 and a Daewoo shotgun configured like an AR-15 (allegedly not used in the massacre, just left in the boot of a yellow Volvo at the tollgate along with Bryant’s passport!).

I expect what happened was, his handlers²²⁴ didn’t find out about the AR-10 being with the gun dealer until quite late in the game, so they were forced to substitute in the FN-FAL at the last minute.

PERVERTING JUSTICE

DURING the alleged siege of Seascapes cottage by the Special Operations Group of Tasmania Police – the siege that never was – the police claim they did not fire a shot for fear of harming the alleged hostages. However, many shots were fired from the Seascapes premises (cottage and adjacent building) and an estimated number of 250 appears in the literature. Inexplicably, the gunman, who had earlier displayed lethal accuracy at the Port Arthur Historic Site, displayed complete inaccuracy at Seascapes. According to the official narrative, every shot fired at Seascapes was discharged by Martin Bryant who, officials insist without a shred of proof, was the gunman.

During phone conversations between a *Jamie* and the police negotiator, conversations which were audio-recorded, distinct gunfire was detected by an investigator. This sound was described with the word **cough** on the official transcript. The recordings were examined by an “independent audiometry professional.” Using the appropriate equipment, sound wave patterns were produced then analysed. It was confirmed that the documented **cough** was a “high frequency” sound akin to a gunshot. It seems that 22 gunshots from Seascapes were audio-recorded and deceptively described with the word **cough** on the official transcript.

No.	Page No. Court Doc.	How Worded	Where in Dialogue	Attributed to Speaker
01	03	cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
02	08	cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
03	12	cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
04	15	COUGH	singularly	Terry McCarthy
05	27	COUGH	singularly	Terry McCarthy
06	37	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
07	43	cough	end of sentence	Terry McCarthy
08	43	cough	second word	Terry McCarthy
09	43	cough	eighth word	Terry McCarthy
10	43	Cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
11	45	Cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
12	47	cough	fifteenth word	Terry McCarthy
13	47	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
14	48	Cough	second word	Terry McCarthy
15	48	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
16	48	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
17	49	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
18	50	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
19	51	Cough	first word	Terry McCarthy
20	54	cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
21	56	cough	singularly	Terry McCarthy
22	57	Cough	114th word	Terry McCarthy

Stewart Beattie has stated: “I believe here we have an independent expert’s evaluation which confirms that the ‘cough’ is indeed a gunshot, and I contend this gunshot or ‘control sound’ was produced by the Colt AR-15 .223Rem Rifle, or like calibre.” This confirms Martin Bryant was not alone at Seascapes, and it also confirms that another person was discharging a firearm at Seascapes as the recordings of the gunshots reveal a distance from Bryant who was conversing on the telephone with Terry McCarthy.

NOTE All the above is extracted from the Bangs & “Coughs” chapter (22) of Stewart K. Beattie. *A Gunsmith’s Notebook on Port Arthur*; 2006 – ed.

As Bryant said continuously, "No, I've never seen that one before. Never. That's not one of mine". He admits ownership of the AR-15, but not the FN-FAL. In fact he denies ever having seen the rifle before, yet he was supposed to have used it during the massacre! After **repeated denials by Bryant**, the police interrogator states: "Now you say you've never seen that 308 before, but, you in fact own a 308." Bryant answers "Yeah, definitely...inaudible...AR-10." The prosecution also did their job well by slight of hand at the sentencing so that the public never cottoned on that the rifle was not Bryant's. I have visions of 1963 and a police officer holding aloft an old Carcano military rifle with a loose scope as the alleged murder weapon of Kennedy.

225 This is an extremely important part of the incident. Recall that police negotiator Terry McCarthy was so taken aback by this that he felt compelled to report that he thought Martin Bryant was not conversing normally or spontaneously, but was acting – he was **acting out a role**. To prevent any ballistic tests being conducted on rifles believed to have been used in the incident, the planners had two options: **i.** Have the rifles removed from Seascope cottage (which would have been easy to do, but difficult to explain credibly); or, **ii.** Have the rifles damaged so no rifling tests would be possible. When Martin said matter-of-factly, as Terry Schulze notes, that "**They'll all be destroyed,**" he was acting out his role and conveying a message to the negotiator. But there was no need to destroy the firearms if Martin was departing Seascope cottage without them. (There was talk of a helicopter taking him to Hobart.) If Martin Bryant was the *lone-nut* gunman and he was leaving the weapons in the cottage, there was no point in destroying them. But there was a big official need because Bryant was **not** the gunman, and the firearms used during the incident were **not** his. If the firearms that were used were not destroyed, Bryant's innocence would have been proved for all to see. Again, it made no sense for Martin Bryant to destroy his own firearms if he was the gunman and he was **not** taking them with him. But it makes a lot of sense to the other people who were in/at Seascope cottage if they were **not** Martin's firearms and if Martin was **not** the lone gunman.

OFFICIAL KILLING COMPONENTS

JFK and the Port Arthur incident fits the standard pattern for official killings. Though the nature and methods differ in all such cases, five major components are recognizable: **Purpose; Plan; Killing; Official Narrative; Cover-up.** These components are sequential and manners of execution vary. Though each official killing is different in practice, all are founded on gaining power to exert control. – **ed.**

DESTRUCTION OF THE FIREARMS

During the discussions he had with the negotiator, Bryant makes comments about destroying the firearms before he leaves Seascope. The negotiator asks this: "can I take it that you won't have any firearms with you then?" Whereupon Bryant states so matter-of-factly, "That's correct....they'll all be destroyed." Negotiator: "You're gonna destroy the firearms?" Bryant: "Yes, break them up."**225**

Now here is where it gets interesting. Mr. Beattie goes through the blown up AR-15 in great detail. Using his experience and various pictures, it is clear that the AR-15 was blown up by the use of a "hot" round. That is, a round that was put together with very fast burning pistol or shotgun powder, not the medium burning powder usually used in the .223. So where did silly Martin learn to do this? Where did he do this? When did he plan this?

More importantly, why did the police take a different tack to this issue, they say that it was an accident (an accident that Bryant was able to predict!). Beattie goes through the police forensic evidence in depth and **demolishes it**. The police reports go to great length to allege that it was a bad batch of ammunition that blew up the gun. Unfortunately, the company (Norinco) that made the ammunition doesn't make ammunition by batches, only by years. Also no other distributor or gunsmith that he contacted ever heard of such faulty ammunition.

SECURITY

There is a scene in the movie **JFK** where Donald Sutherland, playing the chief of the President's security, tells Garrison (Kevin Costner) that he had been sent out of the country to Antarctica during

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

the time of the President's assassination. It is a dramatic scene in the movie that gives evidence of the extent of the conspiracy. No such "chief" at Port Arthur, but the *modus operandi* was the same.

The only two police on the Tasman Peninsula, constables Hyland and Whittle, were directed by an anonymous bogus drug tip that left them at the farthest point on the peninsula at the time of the massacre. Also the senior management staff of the Port Arthur site was **sent away that morning** to an obscure management meeting on the mainland. It was the first of its kind and strangely it was scheduled on a weekend during the busy time for the site.²²⁶ If there is ever a movie about the Port Arthur massacre, perhaps Donald Sutherland's son, Kiefer, could play one of the cops that were sent on a wild goose chase.

OTHER ISSUES

The book is full of other interesting tidbits, like police statements that confirm multiple persons at Seascap. The FN-FAL being found in the gutter of the porch next door to Seascap (with a picture from the 24 March 2001 edition of New Idea showing the gun still in place!). The "further rifle....located on the grass to the north of the cottage," located there by the cop Craig Harwood. Not to mention the autopsy report regarding Mrs. Sally Martin: "The autopsy revealed...a number of small fragments of lead shrapnel...located in and around the left shoulder area and chest cavity"; "...although injury caused by exploding ammunition during the fire could not be ruled out as the cause of this" – what bunkum, can't happen! Reminds me of the *magic bullet* in the Kennedy assassination.²²⁷

WITNESS

Of all the witnesses that saw the shooter, **only one knew Martin Bryant from before**. That was Jim Laycock, the former owner of the Broad Arrow Café. He not only knew Bryant, but also where he used to sit in the café and what he used to drink and the conversations he used to have with his daughter. So what did Laycock say about his identification of the shooter?: "**I did not recognize the male [shooter] as Martin Bryant.**"²²⁸

Wouldn't it be interesting to hear that evidence **in court!** Imagine the only person who knew Bryant from before the massacre saying that he didn't recognize the shooter as Martin Bryant. Of course, we will never get to hear that evidence, not only because the government will never have an inquiry, but more importantly because Mr. Laycock is now deceased. Reminds me of so many of the key witnesses around the Kennedy assassination *ending up deceased*, perhaps this is just one more of those **unusual similarities** between the Port Arthur Massacre and the JFK assassination. ■

(amended; added emphasis)

²²⁶ See *MY DAY* Insert by Robyn Cooper in Part 4.

²²⁷ In a ridiculous attempt to explain away the (planned) killing of Kennedy, and the wounding of the Texas governor John Connolly who was with him, officials spoke about a bullet which exited and re-entered both Kennedy and Connolly, causing **seven wounds in total**. This *magic-bullet theory*, also called the *single-bullet theory*, has long been disproved. The official narrative said Kennedy was shot from behind by Oswald, but untouched film footage shows him being thrown backward in the limousine as a bullet enters his head from the front.

²²⁸ James Clement Laycock. *Witness Statement*; 10 May 1996. Recall that Laycock was the only witness who **personally knew Martin Bryant**, and he had known Martin for many years. No other witness in the Port Arthur incident did. Three other witnesses who looked into the face of the gunman also said he was not Martin Bryant: **i.** Wendy Scurr who worked at PAHS looked at the gunman as she entered the Broad Arrow Café to buy her lunch, after which she departed then the shooting commenced; **ii.** Graham Derek Collyer who was inside that café where he looked directly into the face of the gunman before being shot and seriously wounded; & **iii.** John Godfrey who said the following in his *Witness Statement* (7 June 1996) about the gunman: "In my opinion the picture I saw in the newspapers was not the same person."

ENDING

MURDER cases can have tedious trials. The highs when some piece of evidence confirms a significant legal point, the lows when evidence fails to confirm what was sought from it. These cases can go on for weeks and months as the evidence is presented and argued, and examined and cross-examined, until the last tad of significance, or insignificance, is teased from it. The system is not perfect, but it is the system that exists. And above everything, is the requirement of proving something beyond a reasonable doubt. To use that phrase of the late US lawyer Johnnie Cochran, the phrase he spoke to a jury again and again: *If it doesn't fit, you must acquit.*

But the legal system is something all together different in Tasmania. There, made-up lists of evidence can take on the trappings of truth even when none of that evidence was ever weighed on the scales of justice. There, people can concoct stories related to alleged offences and feed them to the media. This is the commission of two offences, but officials (includes politicians) in Tasmania who should act on such things seem indifferent to matters of **sub judice**.

In the Port Arthur case, the whole legal system forfeited its integrity to a subjective concern of the public. A murder of one person would rightly grind its way through the court. But unbelievably, 35 murders shut everything down. **There was no trial.** Not even for one charge of murder, which was all that was necessary. Unproved evidence and assertions were bandied about as if they were significant and decisive – when the truth is they were neither.

And a most abhorrent action arose from out of the legal community whose members all stood up as one, crying out in deafening silence. Then there were the judges. They quietly and so noticeably went to chamber, closed their doors, and ignored the gutting of everything the public thought that real courts were all about: **Truth** and **Justice**. They let that “pathetic social misfit” squirm on his burns while they did crosswords perhaps and had sychophantic officials set up Martin, then caged him in Risdon – 11 letters across: N.O.N.F.E.A.S.A.N.C.E.

None of the evidence in the Port Arthur case, evidence compiled by officials paid for with taxpayers' money, proves anything. If it could, it would still stand today. But it doesn't. So it will never see the light of day in a sound court. That's why it went to the kangaroo court of William Cox. He billed himself as Justice. Think about that. An adult calling himself Justice sent a *boy-man* (11 years old; 66 IQ) off to prison for the term of his natural life. That's real justice in Tasmania. We can say Australia, as there never was a peep or a nay from any lawyers on the mainland. Or from the judiciary there. Or the media. Or from anyone really. Not even the Church.

As for Johnnie Cochran, his words don't suit Tasmania. None of the official evidence fitted a guilty verdict. So they skipped the trial and convicted him anyway: *it doesn't fit, but we won't acquit.* Regardless, hard evidence, detected and exposed by decent moral investigators who believe all people are innocent until proven guilty, confirms beyond all reasonable doubt that **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!** ■

THE WITNESSES

7



**BIG
WORM
BOOKS**

CONCERN

Scores of eyewitnesses gave written statements believing their significant evidence would be used in a trial – but the State discarded their statements as it was responsible for all the killing and wounding.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS	379
■ INTRODUCTION	381
■ IGNORED FACTS	Noble 383
EYEWITNESS MISIDENTIFICATION	
PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE	Image
RUNNER & BOOT	Images
ARTHUR H'WAY SEASCAPE TURN-OFF	Images
FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT	
YELLOW VOLVO ALLEGED STOPS	
THE ZAHORCAK STATEMENT	
MIND MANIPULATION BY STATE	
PORT ARTHUR SHOOTER?	Image
VOLVOS, A VOLKSWAGEN, A BLUE....	
OFFICIALS DECEIVING AUSTRALIANS	
MAJOR CONCERNS, REASONABLE....	
■ ENDING	498

COUNTS

Images 6, Inserts 24, Notes 104, Pages 122

FORETHOUGHTS

■ “Not surprisingly, witnesses are very important to a criminal investigation. Unfortunately, eyewitness accounts are notoriously unreliable. Police officers become accustomed to the shock and frustration of hearing a dozen eyewitnesses to a crime give a dozen different accounts of the incident. Because it is subject to so much distortion, the coloring of perception, the shading of emotion, the imperfection of memory, eyewitness testimony is not slam-dunk courtroom evidence. It is evidence, but it must be corroborated by other, more objective evidence. Most importantly, all eyewitness evidence must be obtained independently, **so the recollection of one witness does not influence that of another.**”¹ (added emphasis)

Alan Axelrod, Guy Antinozzi

The Complete Idiot’s Guide to Criminal Investigation
2003: p. 262

■ “[Damien Bugg the director of public prosecutions] spoke to me for over two hours. I finally said to him, I was there, you weren’t. Don’t tell me what I saw and what I didn’t see. I was not prepared to **tell lies for him.**”² (added emphasis)

eyewitness

in *Deceit & Terrorism – Port Arthur*
2001-4: p. 17

■ “Witnesses who have conferred with each other may change their stories, not from a desire to mislead the police, but from a very basic factor in human behavior. One or more persons in a group may force their dominant personality on the group, and the other witnesses will compromise their stories so as not to disagree or offend the stronger personalities, or to seem ‘stupid’ by having seen something no one else saw.”³

Vernon J. Geberth

Practical Homicide Investigation
1996: p. 84

■ It is difficult to believe how far the imagination of emotional, though highly intellectual, persons will carry them.... To be convinced of this fact, it is only necessary to note how easily emotional persons can be made to relate occurrences which they have **never seen nor heard**, and that without any recourse to suggestion. In spite of their earnest desire to stick to the exact truth, on the first opportunity they strike off to the right or left, and at last can no longer distinguish between what they have really seen and what they have only imagined. With such persons the Investigating Officer cannot be too careful or reserved, especially if he himself be of an imaginative turn.⁴ (translation; added emphasis)

Hans Gross

in *Criminal Investigation*
1924: p. 61.

■ “The fact that [eyewitness] testimony is not always reliable does not mean that it is always wrong. The criminalist must be aware, however, that an honest identification given by an intelligent, perceptive, and upright citizen might be entirely mistaken.... [**cont.**]

¹ During the afternoon and evening of 28 April 1996, witnesses from the Port Arthur Historic Site were herded together at a number of locations, some were bussed to places of accommodation, and all of them had unrestricted opportunities to discuss the incident with corrupting input provided by officials.

² Corrupting the words of witnesses is what lawyers do – prosecution and defence. Their professional role is to win, and contrary to what the public thinks, truth and justice are secondary. There is no reason to believe this eyewitness was not the tip of the iceberg. Evidence strongly suggests witnesses were manipulated to present information desired by the State. Another example of this involves **Terry Hill** who the corrupt lawyer John Avery tried to intimidate, in writing (see Insert *TWO-PAGE LETTER OF INTIMIDATION* in Part 1), to lie and say he had sold firearms to Martin Bryant. (see words of Hans Sherrer at *FORETHOUGHTS* at Part 9)

³ Most people are (overly) sensitive to what other people think of them. That a revelation might lead to a person being identified as stupid or silly, will discourage most people from revealing what they really saw if it is different from what other people saw. Francis Bacon said the “feeling of the ignorant crowd” is a stumbling-block in the way of grasping truth. (see words of Bacon in *FORETHOUGHTS* at Part 2)

⁴ This statement by Gross (rhymes with Ross) was first published in his *Handbuch für Untersuchungsrichter, Polizeibeamte, Gendarmen usw.* (part of his *System Der Kriminalistik*) which was published in **1893**.

[cont.] Many psychological experiments have verified that people are very suggestible, and that their memory of an event can actually be subtly altered so that it agrees with someone else's verbal description without their being aware of the process."

Michael Kurland

How to Solve a Murder

1995: p. 131

■ "[T]he rather flimsy curtain that sometimes separates memory and imagination."

Elizabeth F. Loftus

in Handbook of Criminal Investigation

2007: p. 81

■ "I am not aware of just how many of the *Photographic Identification Boards* there were, but at least one witness described it for me. There were numerous police mug shot photos of various males, all in **black and white**. However the only photograph of Martin Bryant was a **coloured photograph**, so that it immediately stood out as different. If you refer to Linda White's statement in regard to the board she viewed she even states that Martin Bryant is wearing the same clothing that he was wearing when he shot her, which was totally incorrect and demonstrates that Linda White has confused the newspaper photograph of Martin Bryant and the person who she fleetingly saw before he shot her. But even more, we now get to know exactly where the ID photo of Martin Bryant came from. The photographs left on his kitchen table [30 Clare St, New Town], that he later stated were **stolen from him**."⁵ (added emphasis)

Andrew S. MacGregor

email to editor

6 March 2013

⁵ This has been noted within the *Witness Statements*. Witnesses who saw a blond-haired person described this person as wearing clothing the same or similar as appeared in the stolen image of Martin Bryant which appeared on the front pages of newspapers around Australia. Those descriptions did not correspond with the descriptions of clothing worn by the gunman which most witnesses gave. As Gross states (see previous page), the imagination of some witnesses leads them to make statements about things they did not see or cannot recall.

⁶ The way officials treated and described Martin Bryant told the public that the gunman had been apprehended. Thus, it should be no surprise to anyone that memories were probably distorted. Stories were told and swapped. What might have been accurate was lost in a sea of swirling assertions, blame, claims, dubious recollections, *etc.* all discoloured with hatred for Martin Bryant.

■ "There is little that can be done to differentiate true memories from those that have been suggestively planted."⁶

Tim Newburn, Tom Williamson, Alan Wright

Handbook of Criminal Investigation

2007: p. 81

■ "[O]fficers using what they already know/suspect about the case and as a result shaping their questioning around the 'key' topic areas; they may also frame the written statement itself in accordance with the investigative hypotheses."

Stephen P. Savage, Becky Milne

in Handbook of Criminal Investigation

2007: p. 617

■ "Scores of other witnesses can't understand why the media reports differ greatly from what they saw and heard. The eyewitnesses can't understand why their testimony recorded by police was not used. Even the police can see that the bulk of evidence points to others."

Lloyd T. Vance, Steve Johnson

The truth about Port Arthur

scribd.com

9 December 2012

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

EVERY statement from a witness reveals something about some particular situation or incident, and something about that witness her/himself. The whole matter of guilt or innocence can, in some trials, be resolved based on statements made by witnesses. But two highly relevant things need to be kept top-of-mind when working with *Witness Statements* – the matters of credibility and accuracy.⁷

Some texts on crime investigation describe different types of witnesses based on adherence to social mores, personality characteristics, social responsibility, etc. But there is no certainty, based on scientific research, that there is a direct relationship between a type of person and the accuracy of any statement he/she makes. Nearly 80 years ago, the criminologist Harry Söderman (Stockholm, Sweden) and police inspector/educator John O'Connell (New York, USA) said: "Unfortunately, modern witness psychology does not yet offer means of directly testing the credibility of testimony. It lacks precision and method...."⁸ Things have not improved much since then.

There are so many variables which influence what any person senses, retains, and recalls. (It is a fact that something can occur right in front of a person and he/she can have no recollection of it.) Each incident witnessed is unique and most probably, for most witnesses, has never in any form been witnessed before. Things like attitude, fear, gender, presence of children, proximity to incident, use of a weapon, etc. can all influence what a witness senses, retains, and later recalls. All the many components of an incident and their sequence and relationships are **beyond any scientific formula** which can be applied to determine statement credibility.

What can be overlooked in the process of obtaining statements is the involvement of an official (usually a cop) during the preparation of written statements. Police bring their own beliefs, biases, and bastardizing techniques when they are involved with collecting or transcribing statements. And the amount of time between the incident and the making of a statement is also a significant variable. Logically, the shorter the time it is more likely witness recollection will be more thorough. But contradicting this are those witnesses who experience severe trauma during an incident and who might have a richer recollection after some time has passed. A recollection might be described in greater detail a week/month/year after the incident. (Investigators must be cautious as such so-called later recollections can be concocted, or piped into a receptive ear by another person with sinister or negative intent.)

So when it comes to *Witness Statements*, nothing is certain, different witnesses can and usually do give different recollections, and they can place differing degrees of emphasis on different parts of any incident. What ultimately ends up in written statements is the outcome of objective and subjective facts and needs which have intermingled in the mind of a witness. The recording of the final statement is influenced by environmental circumstances in which the witness finds her/himself in and, by the way any official, if one is present and/or involved, participates in the preparation process.

⁷ CREDIBILITY: Did the identified witness actually sense what he/she alleges? What needs to be assessed is whether the witness could and truly did sense what is alleged, or is the witness telling a false and thus deceptive story. Note that although a recollection might not be possible, a witness who falsely claims to recollect it might do so without any malicious intention; ACCURACY: Has the identified witness described accurately what he/she alleges was sensed? Eyewitnesses can and do sense things, but it is an accurate (honest) description that investigators need. A good example of credibility and accuracy in the Port Arthur case is that of the eyewitnesses who were at the penitentiary during the shooting. From that location it is quite credible that eyewitnesses could see people moving around near the café and parking area. But there is no accuracy associated with allegations that witnesses saw Martin Bryant shooting there. That was what they most probably were told later, but it was not what they sensed (saw and heard) from the penitentiary. It is **not** physically possible to identify facial features of any person with certainty given the **distance**.

⁸ *Modern Criminal Investigation*; 1935: p. 13.

⁹ Some of the witnesses actually declared their willingness to appear in court. Here are a few examples: "I am prepared to give evidence in court if needed" (McElwee, 28 April); "I have no objections to attending court and giving evidence" (McKenna, 28 April); "I am content for this statement to be used in any legal proceedings and to give evidence in Court" (Parker, 2 May); *etc.* But through its (in)actions, the State told these witnesses to get stuffed then ignored their statements, which they had carefully prepared after a traumatic experience believing they were doing the right thing. And they did do the right thing. It is the State that has done the **wrong thing**. And why did the State do this, if, as its officials claimed, there was a watertight case against Martin Bryant. People were told it was to spare the family and friends of victims. But an examination of the evidence, particularly the *Witness Statements*, shows the real reason is the case against Martin Bryant does not hold water – **he is innocent**, and facts in the *Witness Statements* which the State ignored **confirm his innocence**.

¹⁰ A waste bin or some other place where unwanted (incriminating, too hard, troubling, unwanted, *etc.*, *etc.*) documents and papers are put then forgotten. Think about it. Thirty-five people murdered, and 23 others wounded – but **the State did not** want one witness to speak one word in a sound court during a trial with members of the jury all listening attentively. The State goes on and on with its narrative about evil Martin Bryant being guilty, but there could be no trial. No. To this day, there is still no hard evidence proving guilt – just **State corruption**.

¹¹ One cop who reported this fact and who gave the best description of the woman is Paul Barry Hyland. He describes a naked woman with **black** hair. Based on an image in the book *Born or Bred?* (see Part 2) **Sally Martin had grey hair**. So who was that naked woman who had black hair? It seems it was not Petra Willmott. It seems it might have been Mary Rose Nixon, Helene Salzmann, or....

¹² See Insert *MY DAY* in Part 4.

In this part of the book, the *Witness Statements* are addressed. Not one of them was ever presented to a jury during a trial. In good faith, and believing in the laws of the land, and having said they were prepared to attend a trial,⁹ witnesses provided their carefully worded statements to the State. But the State **threw them into File 13**.¹⁰ Hundreds of pages from witnesses who were right there that day at Port Arthur. Right at the historic site. Right inside that bloody Broad Arrow Café.

Of course the State did not want any of the witnesses to say one word during a trial about their experiences related to an officially premeditated, planned, and perpetrated **mass murder**. The State could not allow it because there is so much hard evidence disproving the official narrative. A trial would see innocent Martin Bryant returned to his hum-drum life. (And after Martin walks, the corrupt State and all its associated official criminals will themselves be put on trial.)

When reading the extracts from the *Witness Statements* and the editor's comments, it is important not to read them then filter the facts through the official narrative. Yes, compare the content of the statements with the content of that narrative. But do not keep referring back to any story as if it holds the final word on all the facts.

Of course there are description differences amongst the statements – several eyewitnesses seeing the same object or component of the incident can and do provide descriptions which differ. This is normal. What is abnormal, immoral, and unproved nonsense is the many assertions made by the State as if they are proved truths. Despicable DPP Damian Bugg says in an official document that Bryant killed Sally Martin at Seascope cottage around midday on 28 April 1996. But he never proved it and eyewitnesses saw a woman alive at Seascope later in the afternoon. That woman was seen running across the yard **naked and screaming**.¹¹ Innocent Martin Bryant was blamed for killing Sally Martin and her husband David Martin, and Glenn Pears, when there is **not one iota of hard evidence** to prove any of this. In fact, eyewitness statements provide exculpatory evidence.

Another thing to bear in mind is that the State not only refused to present the *Witness Statements* submitted in good faith to a jury, the State also manipulated witnesses and curtailed what they wanted to say. Wendy Scurr went to help inside the Broad Arrow Café after the gunman drove away. She saw things there that the State does not want you to know about. So the State refused to take any related details from her. **This is totally unacceptable**. Once officials start manipulating the evidence and shutting out witnesses, then the rule of law ceases to exist. When so-called justice is the outcome of State control over the evidence, then there is no justice at all.

Witness Robyn Cooper states: "I am very disillusioned with the present system which is denying survivors of this tragedy the opportunity of presenting their testimony in the cause of truth and justice."¹² All witnesses of the Port Arthur incident have been stopped from giving testimony. Because, the State quakes knowing that a proper jury trial will **reveal the official narrative is a corrupt lie**. – ed.

IGNORED FACTS
Statements of the Witnesses
Keith Allan Noble

*Facts do not cease to exist
because they are ignored.*¹³

STATEMENTS made by witnesses* are an extremely important part of most cases. Thus, they **must never be ignored**. They can be very revealing, but can also be very deceptive which is why care must be taken over credibility and accuracy. Advertent and inadvertent errors can occur during their preparation.¹⁴ (* see *DEFINITIONS*)

Statements are series of facts strung together verbally to describe what a witness saw and/or believes, or what a witness thinks he/she saw and/or believes, in relation to a description or incident real or perceived. So there are real or perceived facts which are described verbally, orally or in writing, which are susceptible to errors unintentional and intentional. Given this, we should not be surprised deception can occur. There is also another variable which comes into play. It is the interpretation of meaning, for each of the facts, by the person hearing or reading the statement. Every person who hears or reads a statement gives the meaning he/she believes is appropriate to every fact mentioned. Optimally, the statement giver uses precise words to describe each fact, there is/are no error/s, either unintentional or intentional, and the receiver gives the same meaning to each word as was intended by the statement giver.

The matter or error/s is of course significant as statements which are given hurriedly, or which are given with imprecise words, leave a receiver wondering what was really seen or what is believed. Such statements might arise from benign actions, but can also arise from sinister actions by the statement giver or the person preparing the statement – a police official, for example. Just one word omitted or added can have a deceptive impact on the meaning a statement conveys. Errors in statements can be introduced by simple carelessness, but can also arise when the statement giver is under duress or suffering from trauma. Imprecise words can be used and a witness in a stressed condition might not even realize it, or care to make a/the necessary correction/s.

Following is a list of some concerns of the editor accompanied by his comments for statements given by **over 100 witnesses** in relation to the mass murder. (All emphasis is added.) Note that not all statements given by witnesses appear here. That there are differences between statements is normal. Like everything else in this book, the most important thing whilst reading it is **not** to interpret the meaning of any fact using the corrupt official narrative as the standard.

¹³ Aldous Huxley. *Proper Studies*; 1929.

¹⁴ Statements are frequently dictated by the witness to some official, usually a cop. This is not the best way to record what a witness sensed and believes. In the Port Arthur case, visitors and employees who became witnesses on Sunday 28 April 1996 ending up handwriting their statements late into the night, some early on Monday morning. Those handwritten statements were then given to police who arranged for them to be typed on standard witness statement forms. The possibility for errors existed and no doubt errors did occur during the preparation of these statements, and the transcription of them. But before this process even commenced, the recollections of witnesses were contaminated during an assembly in which officials insisted witnesses participate. An assembly in which witnesses were forced to meet as a group then speak about (contaminate their recollections of) their own experiences. In his book *Practical Homicide Investigation* (1996: p. 84), legendary Vernon J. Geberth (worked on 8000 homicides) tells investigators this: “[I]t is important to keep the witnesses separated from one another. Witnesses who have conferred with each other may change their stories, not from a desire to mislead the police [this is certainly possible], but from a very basic factor in human behavior. One or more persons in a group may force their dominant personality on the group, and the other **witnesses will compromise their stories** so as not to disagree or offend the stronger personalities, or to seem ‘stupid’ by **having seen something no one else saw.**” (original & added emphasis) This is exactly what happened in the Port Arthur case. Geberth documented something that has been known for a long time. Senior cops in Tasmania would have been aware of it. But they ignored it. Thus, the statements submitted by witnesses were probably compromised.

15 It is not unusual for eyewitnesses to believe their observations are beyond being questioned. They can become quite disturbed if what they say they sensed (feeling, hearing, intuiting, seeing, smelling, touching), is questioned or even discussed. The truth, however, is that being an eyewitness does not mean what any person recollects is always 100 percent correct. Every person is capable of mis-sensing misunderstanding, misinterpreting, *etc.* what was experienced. Based on data (86 cases) provided by the Innocence Project of Cardozo School of Law in New York, and reported as *The coming paradigm shift in forensic identification science*, in the serial Science; 5 August 2005, errors of eyewitnesses were factors in **71 percent** of the wrongful conviction cases considered: “erroneous **eye-witness identifications** are the most common contributing factor to wrongful convictions.” The truth is well-meaning but wrong eyewitnesses sent **innocent people** to prison and, in some parts of the United States, off to be executed (State murder). It happened because what those eyewitnesses say they saw was wrong, and was proved to be wrong using DNA analyses. And be assured that eyewitnesses are no different in the United States to eyewitnesses within Australia **or Tasmania**. It is understandable that eyewitnesses can feel slighted if what they relate they did sense is queried. They were there. So to them, what they sensed is real and right and not open to dispute or question. But eyewitnesses must be enlightened with the truth, which has been scientifically-proved. People can **and do** make mistakes when sensing something, when implanting what was sensed in their memories, and later when that something is recalled from their memories. This multi-stage process is susceptible to **subjective** and to **objective** influences. It is troubling to note that in the same mentioned report, **police misconduct** was a contributing factor in wrongful convictions in **44 percent** of the studied cases, and that **prosecutorial misconduct** was a contributing factor in **28 percent** of those cases. Don’t ever doubt cops, prosecutors, and other State officials can be very **devious and dishonest**. They must never be naively trusted.

EYEWITNESS MISIDENTIFICATION ¹⁵

EYEWITNESS misidentification is the **single greatest cause** of wrongful convictions nationwide [USA], playing a role in nearly 75 percent of convictions overturned through DNA testing.

While eyewitness testimony can be persuasive evidence before a judge or jury, 30 years of strong social science research has proven that eyewitness identification is often unreliable.

Research shows that the human mind is not like a tape recorder; we neither record events exactly as we see them, nor recall them like a tape that has been rewound. Instead, witness memory is like any other evidence at a crime scene; it must be preserved carefully and retrieved methodically, or it can be **contaminated**.

Witnesses substantially changed their description of a perpetrator (including key information such as height, weight and presence of facial hair) after they learned more about a particular suspect.

Estimator variables are those that cannot be controlled by the criminal justice system. They include simple factors like the lighting when the crime took place or **the distance from which the witness saw the perpetrator**.

Estimator variables also include more complex factors, including race (identifications have proven to be less accurate when witnesses are identifying perpetrators of a different race), the **presence of a weapon** during a crime and the degree of **stress or trauma a witness experienced while seeing the perpetrator**.

System variables are those that the criminal justice system can and should control. They include all of the ways that law enforcement agencies retrieve and record witness memory, such as lineups, photo arrays, and other identification procedures.

System variables that substantially impact the accuracy of identifications include the type of lineup used, the selection of *fillers* (or members of a lineup or photo array who are not the suspect), blind administration, instructions to witnesses before identification procedures, administration of lineups or photo arrays, and communication with witnesses after they make an identification.

As far back as the late 1800s, experts have known that eyewitness identification is all-too-susceptible to error. When Yale law professor Edwin Borchard studied 65 wrongful convictions for his pioneering 1932 book, *Convicting the Innocent*, he found eyewitness misidentification was the leading cause of wrongful convictions. Since then, **hundreds of scientific studies** have affirmed that eyewitness identification is often inaccurate.

Innocence Project
Eyewitness misidentification
innocenceproject.org
4 February 2013
(amended; added emphasis)

NOTE The vision defect of colour-blindness has degrees of severity. About 7 percent of males and 0.4 percent of females have this defect. It can influence identification whenever the colours of objects are involved. – **ed.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **ALLEN**, Patrick James (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "At about 6pm I heard the sound of a high pitched yelling and screaming coming from the direction of Seascape."

COMMENT: Reviewers of this statement surmise the screaming and yelling was **from a female**. This is supported by the cops Hyland and Whittle. That woman was not Petra Willmott and was not Sally Martin who had grey not black hair. So who was it? The DPP knew about this unidentified black-haired woman, but Bugg just ignored this fact.¹⁶

WITNESS: **BAKER**, Maree Helen

DATE: 10 May 1996 (**12 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: Says she phoned Seascape at "3:50 pm" and spoke with an unknown male. She says he angrily told her: "I told you not to call until after five o'clock, don't call again, good-bye." There is no mention in Baker's statement that she spoke with this male at any time previously. Note another witness (Craig) says she conversed with an unknown male earlier at "3:08 p.m."

COMMENT: Was it the same male in both telephone conversations? Whoever he was, he might have thought Craig was phoning him again at Seascape when it was actually Baker.

WITNESS: **BALASKO**, James

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I saw the gunman walk over to a yellow car, possibly a Volvo." & "I'm not really sure what he was wearing. [H]e was really cool and calm. There was no hysteria about him at all. He did everything in a very together way." & "I would recognize him again."

COMMENT: Stating he saw the gunman walk calmly to a yellow car is credible. But adding "possibly a Volvo" suggests he was encouraged to add the vehicle make. (Note the statement was given one day after the shooting. There would have been a lot of talk about a **yellow Volvo**.) It is not believable Martin Bryant was the gunman. That he could kill 24 people and injure 23 others then remain cool and calm is all out of character. Such characteristics are those of a **professional hitman**, not those of an *11-year-old boy*. Balasko says he would recognize him again but, even though the gunman was "cool and calm," he (Balasko) could not say what clothes the gunman had worn. That he would recognize the gunman again is not credible.

Now comes the knock-out. Balasko never mentioned that he made a video at Port Arthur. If he had videoed what he saw, it is reasonable to believe he would have told the cops there and then. But immediately after the shooting at and near the Broad Arrow Café, Balasko **never said one word** about having recorded a video. But on 1 August 1996 – **95 days** after the PAHS incident – this American *witness* James Balasko with his partner Cynthia Zahorcak¹⁷ turned up at a New Jersey police station and there gave a nine-page statement related to a video of the incident. A video that Balasko alleges he made over three months previously at Port Arthur in Tasmania on 28 April 1996. His video has **no credibility**. (Nor does James Balasko.) It has been proved to be deceptively corrupt, but this did not stop the State from using it to set up Martin Bryant.¹⁸

¹⁶ Bugg states this in *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996: "between 11:45 and 12:40, Martin Bryant shot and killed Mr. & Mrs. Martin." There was and is **no proof** of this and it was never presented and assessed by a jury during a trial. At 18:00 (6 p.m.) that Sunday, cops at Seascape reported a naked, black-haired woman running and screaming in the yard there. So who was this woman and why was she behaving in the manner described by the police? Bugg offered no evidence to confirm Bryant killed Mr. or Mrs. Martin, or any other man, woman, or child there, or at any other place in Tasmania.

¹⁷ See *THE ZAHORCAK STATEMENT* Insert following.

¹⁸ despatch.cth.com.au/Misc/martinbryant/MartinBryant3.html; *The Port Arthur Massacre: Was Martin*

WITNESS: **BALL**, Glen Gordon (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "At about 8:20 am I noticed a naked male with blonde shoulder-length hair walk from the building.... He had his hands on top of his head. He then knelt down" & "BRYANT was taken into custody by Constable HAWKINS and Constable SCOTT."

COMMENT: But other police gave other inconsistent descriptions. For example, Browning says: "I observed and reported the suspect to **stagger** and drop to his knees several times."

WITNESS: **BARNETT**, Gregory Keith

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "While at the Kodak Shop, I looked up towards the tollbooth area. I could see three (3) bodies lying on the roadway.¹⁹ **I could not see any vehicles at all.**"

COMMENT: What is all this about? The following is what the owner-operator (James/Jim Laycock) of that Kodak Shop states about that tollbooth area: "I could see a red car leaving the site, a fawnish colored car which I now know to be the gold BMW Sedan and behind this vehicle a yellow car which had something on the roof." With Laycock was his son-in-law Yannis Kateros and this is what he said: "After my father in-law Jim spoke to the police I heard another four to five shots fired. We both went to the front car park area of the shop where I had a clear view of the tollbooth area. I saw a gold coloured sedan, which I later found to be a BMW stationary near the tollbooth. The vehicle was facing towards me.... [Amended text handwritten between paragraphs as follows: 'Also saw yellow car facing in same direction as other car but to right of it as I look at it.']" Yet, the witness Barnett drove slowly by the turnoff to the historic site and said that he did "not see any vehicles at all."

Here was a point of extreme interest for numerous witnesses, but Barnett never saw the Volvo which is mentioned in the statements of Laycock and Kateros. Was it really there and Barnett just did not see it? And who handwrote the amendment onto the statement bearing the name Yannis Kateros?

This uncertainty is made even more troubling by what is in the statements of other witnesses. The PAHS employee at the tollbooth Aileen Kingston reports seeing a yellow Volvo being parked on Jetty Road some distance (80-100 metres) from the tollbooth, but makes no mention of the gold-coloured BMW, or of the red Commodore²⁰ which then would have been **parked right outside the tollbooth in the entrance lane blocking incoming traffic.** And the witness Doug Horne says this: "I recall coming down the road and there was a pink house, someone told me it was 'Sea Scape.' There was a **brown or yellow BMW or Vol[v]o parked outside....** As we got close to the beige or yellow car I observed a male person standing in front of the vehicle. He had fair hair and I think a check shirt on. I think my mate said 'he's got a gun'."

So we have the witness Kingston **not seeing** a smart BMW parked just outside her tollbooth. We have the witness Horne describing a vehicle parked outside Seascape, a vehicle he said was either a BMW or a Volvo. We have witnesses Laycock and Kateros describing a yellow car at the tollbooth. But the witness **(cont.)**


¹⁹ Did this witness just fail to see the fourth body? Was there really a fourth dead body there? Officially, the fourth body was that of Mary Rose Nixon. But in none of the statements studied by this editor has any witness described a body at the tollbooth clothed in a purple leisure suit, which allegedly is what Mrs. Nixon wore when she left her home that Sunday morning. (see Nixon statement) An image in Part 8 that seems to show a body clothed in a purple leisure suit is of questionable credibility.

²⁰ The red Commodore which the two Buckleys state they parked right behind the gold-coloured BMW at the tollbooth, the red Commodore they abandoned when then ran off and were taken to the service station in the vehicle driven by Keith Edward. (see Edward statement)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Barnett never saw any vehicle as he drove by the tollbooth. It is very easy to say some witness was wrong. It is very easy to say someone made a mistake. And it is only too open for know-it-alls to tell us what it all means. Inevitably, what happens is that most people and those officials involved pick a combination of facts and/or sequence of events which they believe are best. But they really do not know what is the truth. And whatever does not fit their explanation is usually discarded, or ignored, even laughed at. Of course the benefit of all doubts should go to the accused, but in the Port Arthur case, all the doubts were interpreted in favour of the State.

WITNESS: **BEAVIS**, Lynne Suzanne (ASIO?)
DATE: 30 May 1996 (**32 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: "...thin build and medium to long blonde hair...being a light white colour." & "I know this road to be the exit road." & "...saw a yellow coloured Volvo sedan drive out of the top car-park and head towards the toll-gate. This vehicle had a surfboard on the roof. I recognized the driver as being the same person who had been standing on the verandah with the gun."²¹



PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE
*THIS image was taken c.10 metres from the front of Broad Arrow Café looking across to the penitentiary from where Lynne Beavis says she identified the gunman. It was totally **IMPOSSIBLE** for this person to recognize facial features, or length of hair, or clothing types, or makes of vehicles, etc. at this distance. – ed.*

COMMENT: Investigators believe that at the time of the Port Arthur incident, BEAVIS (see *NAME INDEX*) was working in some intelligence (*sic*; it's not intelligent to be part of a **mass murder**) capacity for the Australian government. Her *Witness Statement* is a good piece of English prose. It goes on for pages and pages – all copybook with few errors. Beavis had **32 days** to get the official narrative right, and she did. The richness of the detail in her many pages smacks of lots of rewrites and official input. Long, blond, light white hair is what she said she saw. That fits the narrative. But what did witness BALASKO see?: "dirty blonde hair." How did BEAVIS know an obscure road was an exit road? Are we to believe intuition? Just like, it seems, recognizing the driver as the gunman on the verandah. It had to be a guess. Given her location, which she describes, she was **more than 150 metres away** from that verandah and that Volvo. Thus, she could never have seen the facial features she describes. She actually was asked to identify an image and of course she identified Martin Bryant, even though **she could never have seen anyone distinctly at that distance**. BEAVIS does not reveal the distance in her statement. Her words suggest she was close to the gunman: "My immediate thoughts were that kids were standing on the bluff at the rear of the cafeteria and throwing pine cones onto the roof of it." But she was over **150 metres away**.²²

²¹ Some creative witnessing by this Lynne Suzanne Beavis. She is the witness who it seems received a **secret** six-figure compensation payout from her *employer* for what she experienced at Port Arthur. But Beavis it seems was not working for or with the Commonwealth Bank. Nor was anyone she accompanied at the Port Arthur Historic Site working for or with the Commonwealth Bank that Sunday 28 April. But even if Beavis worked for "Audiometrics" or for the "Commonwealth Bank" there was no obligation to compensate Beavis for what she did voluntarily on her own time. It seems that this Beavis was a government agent (spook) on duty at Port Arthur and was understandably traumatized. It seems her employer was ASIO, and it paid the secret compensation – **with taxpayers' money** of course. (see Christine Caulfield. *Big compo for Port Arthur Massacre nurse*; The Mercury; 10 August 2004)

²² Andrew Mark Brooks states the following in his *Witness Statement*: "Sometime between 1:20 pm and 1:30 pm we were sitting on a small wall near the penitentiary. This is **150-200 metres away** from the coffee shop." (added emphasis) What did the witness Lynne Beavis say about that stone wall?: "Firstly we went to an area on the far left of the penitentiary where we took some photographs. After this we moved through the penitentiary and front of the wall.... We then hid around the corner of the wall and tried to keep our eye on as to what was happening." Well this Beavis must have super-human sight (and super-human hearing). She described the blond-haired gunman for the cops, estimated his height down to a couple of inches, and she said she recognized the driver of a yellow-coloured Volvo sedan as being the same person who she saw with the gun on the verandah of the café – and she saw all of this at a distance exceeding **150 metres** according to Brooks. It seems this Beavis was pleased to point out Martin Bryant on the photoboard which cops showed her **over a month later**. (This editor was told Jean Andrews, the travelling partner of Beavis, did not provide a *Witness Statement*. If this is true, we must ask – **Why?**)

WITNESS: **BEEKMAN**, Michael Dean
DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)
CONCERNS: "He was wearing a **ski type jacket, blue, orange and a few other colours** on it. He had **light coloured trousers** on and was definitely wearing **grey/blue Nike sandshoes**. He had a really big video camera on his shoulder and was carrying a really big bag."

COMMENT: Note the other clothing and footwear descriptions given by the other witnesses – the differences are marked. (So marked, it is not unreasonable to think there were two look-alike gunmen.) There is no proof Martin Bryant wore grey/blue Nike sandshoes that day or the next, or that he even owned such footwear.²³

WITNESS: **BROOM**, Gerald/Gary
DATE: 2 May 1996 (**4 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: "I saw a male person holding a gun. He was tall, blonde straggly-hair, possibly wearing blue jeans and a jacket. He was holding a rifle which had a magazine and he was wearing a sling." & "Before all this happened I thought I may have seen this man sitting at a table." & "I'm not positive if it was the same man."

DATE: 15 May 1996 (**17 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: "I have seen a number of photographs of the man responsible for the shooting at Port Arthur in newspapers." & "I can say that the man in photograph No. 5 is the man I saw at Port Arthur shooting in the restaurant."

COMMENT: Note that Broom was wounded during the incident and had to be treated at the Royal Hobart Hospital. It is reasonable to conclude he held negative feelings toward the gunman. In his first statement, he says he recalls something that no other witness saw: "he was wearing a sling." And, Broom admitted he could not be certain about the identity of: "this man sitting at a table." To his credit, Broom also said: "I'm not positive if it was the same man."

Then in his second statement given nearly two weeks later, this witness says the following: "I have seen a number of photographs of the man." But then after seeing things no other witness ever recalled on the gunman, and after not being certain about the identity and having admitted seeing illegal images in newspapers, it's BINGO! Broom says clearly that the gunman was the man in photograph No. 5.

Many witnesses were like this. Not certain of the gunman's identity immediately after the incident. But **weeks later so very certain** it was Martin Bryant in the image stolen from his home. And most, but not all, said they had seen images of Martin in the media but that had not affected their recall. But the truth is any image of a similar-looking person broadcast into their brains could have had an impact on their recall. And as the communication experts tell us, the insidious impact of such contaminants on human memory is always there. Do not forget this witness was wounded in the incident. It is human nature to strike back in any conceivable way. And Mr. Broom and his wife (Maree Therese) gave **similar statements**. Both claiming they were not in any way affected by images they had seen in the media. There is a big credibility gap with this statement.

²³ At least two other witnesses have said the gunman was wearing a soft type of footwear commonly referred to as **runners, trainers, or sandshoes**. But it gets complicated when two facts are raised: **i**. The alleged gunman was said to have been wearing **lace-up boots** before the shooting on that Sunday (see Kessarios); and, **ii**. The alleged gunman was said to be wearing **Blundstone-type* boots** during the incident, at the tollbooth specifically. (see Rabe) So how could this be? If there was only one gunman, it means he must have put on three different types of footwear and one of those times must have been inside the yellow Volvo, between the parking lot and the tollbooth. Why? To create uncertainty perhaps. Or, were there two people the subject of these different footwear sightings? (* Quality boot made by Tasmanian company Blundstone which did not make runners/sandshoes/sneakers in and prior to 1996. see below)

Nike Runner (c.1996)



Blundstone Boot (Classic)



OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **BROWNING**, Hedley George (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "I saw movement through the upper level windows on the northern side. It was a person crawling from east to west in **dark clothing**." & "I observed the **thick white smoke** emanating from within an upstairs room." & "I also heard **three very loud explosions** from within the cottage." & "About 8:00am, I heard several shots which sounded like a **hand-gun**." & "About 8:25am, I observed and reported a person moving away from the south west corner of the cottage. This person was wearing **dark clothing**, had shoulder-length blonde hair, was **flat-chested**, and **holding their hands forward**. This person was unarmed at the time. I observed that this person's clothing was on fire in the back region." & "About a minute later, I observed a naked male person, believed to be the suspect, **stagger from the vicinity** of where I had lost sight of the burning person previously. I observed and reported the suspect to **stagger** and drop to his knees several times as he made his way towards the poplar trees on the southern side. He had what appeared to be burns on his back."

COMMENT: Note the reference to dark clothing. There is no record that Martin Bryant went to Roaring Beach wearing dark clothing on Sunday 28th. The gunman at PAHS was not described as wearing dark clothing (see Beekman). **Dark clothing is what SOG members wear**. Thick white smoke is given off by activated incendiary devices containing phosphorus, and police assault thugs, like SOG, use such devices. **No handgun was found** after extensive searching of Seascapes by the police, and no handgun is on the long list prepared by Gerard Dutton. This means **that handgun was taken away by the killer** (believed to be Benjamin Overbeeke), or by the cop in the cottage (believed to be Michael *Mick/Rick* Dyson).

Read the entries for Ball and Harwood. The difference confirms how statements are worded not based solely on memory but also on what people hear in discussions. Ball has Martin Bryant walking from Seascapes with his hands on his head, whereas Browning has Bryant staggering, holding his hands forward, then dropped to his knees. And, if Browning heard three **very loud explosions**, why is it that no other cop reported hearing them, as there were dozens of cops near Seascapes? What were those explosions?²⁴

WITNESS: **BUCKLEY**, Debra Jane

DATE: 28 April 1996 (derived from "today" in statement;
no date or commencement time given)

CONCERNS: "We were travelling in an Avis rent-a-car which was a **red Commodore** sedan. On arrival at the Port Arthur complex we stopped at the toll gate and paid our admittance. We then drove down Jetty Road²⁵ toward the carpark.... I saw approximately thirty people running and jogging across the road...toward the grassed area which is between Jetty Road and Church Street. I heard someone yell out...'Don't go down there, there's someone with a gun.'... My husband then reversed our car (**cont.**)

²⁴ People are quick to explain these three loud explosions away as being ammunition explosions. But there is no proof of this. There certainly is no proof Martin Bryant obtained (where from?) and transported the massive quantity of ammunition to Seascapes which officials say he did. This is an unproved assertion. What this witness says he heard – note he is a cop, and the word of a cop is never to be trusted – might be more imaginary than real. Another possibility is that these explosions did occur and they were caused by incendiary devices fired into Seascapes by a SOG member (Fogarty?) outside, or detonated within the cottage by a SOG member (Dyson?) inside. Browning might not have known such devices were used. Another possibility is discharging **hot-rounds** (see *SUBJECT INDEX*) in the firearms to destroy them so ballistic tests **could not be conducted** on them.

²⁵ Debra Jane Buckley knew a lot about the historic site for a tourist from New Zealand. She even knew the name of the streets. Just as the suspicious (ASIO?) witness Lynne Suzanne Beavis did.

*Words expressed
with conviction
are not
necessarily true.*

and turned to travel back toward the toll gate. I noticed a gold coloured BMW which was directly ahead of us also reversing and turning to head back in the same direction. **We followed the BMW back to the toll gate and stopped behind it. My husband and I then got out of our car.** We went to the building at the gate. I heard the female staff member [Aileen Kingston?] tell my husband that the police had been called and that she believed there was someone down the road with a gun. I had a short conversation with an occupant from the BMW. This person was of **dark complexion** and perhaps of **Greek extraction**. Whilst talking with this person for some reason I turned around and saw a person approximately **30 metres** down the road in the direction from where we had just come. I noticed that this person had shoulder length blonde hair, and my initial impression [was] that it was a woman. I noticed that this person had a gun with along barrel, and was pointing it into the bush which was off to my left, as I faced this person. This person was holding the gun at shoulder height as if ready to fire. I then began running with my husband in the opposite direction. We initially were **running down the road** but then decided to take some cover by running in the tree line. I don't specifically remember hearing and shots being fired. We then flagged down a car leaving the toll gate and we travelled in the rear of this vehicle to the shop before the toll gate itself.... As we came out of the bush I saw **two bodies laying on the road near the toll gate.** I thought that these people had been shot. There was **no movement or noise** coming from these people.... We then went to the Port Arthur Motor Inn."

COMMENT: One of the most suggestive statements from witnesses. Debra Jane Buckley states that she and her husband got out of their rented vehicle and spoke with people at the tollbooth. But after that, she makes no mention of their "**red Commodore** sedan." It disappears from her statement, and from the statement of her husband Thomas Mark Buckley. No other witness says anything about such a red vehicle parked at the tollbooth.

Debra Jane Buckley describes what could have been the gunman **30 metres from her** but she does not mention the vehicle (yellow Volvo) which it is said was right beside him on Jetty Road. She does not say one word about the woman and her children who died on/near that road. She says nothing about the rifle shots which many witnesses said they heard. Debra Jane Buckley claims there was no life in the dead bodies at the tollbooth, that is how close she was. But she said there were only two bodies there. If she was that close, why did she not see four bodies which were not in a confusing pile but which were separate but close to each other?

Mrs. Buckley went back to the tollbooth. But, in her statement, she does not describe any vehicle being there. NONE! But we have been led to believe by her and Mr. Buckley that they abandoned their rented **red Commodore** there. No other witness describes seeing a red vehicle at the tollbooth after the **(cont.)**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

shooting there. So it must have been driven away, during the time when the Buckleys left and returned. Driven away by whom? And where to?

So who was the one with a "**dark complexion** and perhaps of **Greek extraction**" who Mrs. Buckley spoke with? The official narrative says there were four adult people travelling in that BMW: Mary Rose Nixon; Jim Pollard; and, Helene & Robert Salzmänn. They are all listed as dying at the tollbooth. So if this is true, which of the four did Mrs. Buckley speak with? Did Mary Rose Nixon have a dark complexion? Pollard it seems was from England, but was then retired and living in NSW at Brunswick Heads. Helene Salzmänn was a native of Switzerland but lived at Ocean Shores, NSW. This leaves Robert Salzmänn who strangely Mr. Nixon did **not** name or mention in his statement. So when and how did Robert Salzmänn appear on the scene? And, did he have a dark complexion – or just a dark past?

After all his reading on the case, this editor is troubled by what really happened near and at that tollbooth on the afternoon of 28 April 1996. Statements by witnesses confirm that what went on is not what is in the official narrative. Statements of some eyewitnesses are not corroborated by other eyewitness statements. A blue vehicle was seen at the tollbooth by Rabe, and Prout says he saw a green vehicle. Yet a yellow Volvo is said to have been left there. A red sedan was parked there, then it seems to have **disappeared**. Two vehicles were said to have been parked immediately outside the tollbooth, yet the person who worked there did not say one thing about them in her statement. It all smells corrupt. It is unacceptable and stupid to quickly dismiss these highly significant matters by saying people forget or make mistakes.

How could this Debra Jane Buckley **not have seen** poor Mrs. Mikac and at least one of her two daughters when Buckley was only 30 metres from them? How could Debra Jane Buckley **not have heard** the many shots that killed the three Mikacs that afternoon? How could Debra Jane Buckley have seen only two dead bodies at the tollbooth, when we have been told there were four bodies there? How could Debra Jane Buckley fail to identify the sex of the two bodies she claims she saw? She never even made an attempt to identify the sex, just left us guessing. If you are so close to a dead body to be able to say there was "**no movement or noise**" the sex of the victim would in most cases be discernible from clothing, footwear, and/or the hair. Recall, it was broad daylight in the mid-afternoon.

WITNESS: **BUCKLEY**, Thomas Mark

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "At about 2 pm on this day we arrived at the Toll Gate We paid the entry fee to the female attendant (Aileen Kingston?), and then commenced to drive forward. We were driving a Red Commodore Sedan Rent-a-Car No DK 2661.²⁶ We drove forward about 100 mts, when I saw a large group of people running across to my right, into a grassy area. There were about 100 mts away from us. Just after this, I saw an **elderly gentleman**²⁷ on the road in front of us. We were **following a gold BMW sedan**, and we were both yelled at by this gentleman, saying (cont.)

26 In his statement, Buckley says "we" spent time at the shop near the tollbooth at the historic site entrance. He also states: "we spoke to the Fire Brigade and subsequently attended at the Motor Inn." How he and Mrs. Buckley travelled that c.1 kilometre distance is not revealed. Walked? It meant going by the tollbooth, and their rented **red Commodore** – if it was still parked at the tollbooth. So it seems this Buckley handwrote his statement at the Motor Inn. And in it, he entered the registration number of that red vehicle: "Reg No DK 2661." So either Buckley had his Avis rental agreement in his pocket, or he has/had an excellent memory. Later that Sunday evening, the Buckleys were driven from Port Arthur to Hobart. In his *Witness Statement* (30 May 1996), witness Tony Chan says the following: "We left the area at about 12:30 a.m. after midnight with the New Zealand couple and drove back to Hobart. We had to drive New Zealanders back to their hotel because they couldn't get their car." A true statement by Chan, but a lie from the Buckleys it seems. They couldn't get their car because it was not there to get. So who drove it away from the PAHS tollbooth that Sunday afternoon around the time of the killing there?

27 Who was this unnamed "elderly gentleman"? How did he get so far away from the Broad Arrow Café area so quickly? Which way was he walking? How did he learn that someone was shooting at the café in a dangerous manner? *Etc.* Note Buckleys in their **red Commodore** and the BMW ahead of them had driven through the tollbooth. As soon as the PAHS employee there (Aileen Kingston?) was told there was a gunman shooting at and near the café, she stopped cars entering the site. This suggests that when this employee let the BMW and the **red Commodore** pass by the tollbooth and drive into the historic site, she knew nothing about any shooting going on down at the site. But we are expected to believe some "elderly gentleman" on Jetty Road not too far from the tollbooth knew about the shooting before that employee. Now, how could he have known there was a dangerous shooter "down there" before the tollbooth employee was told by phone? So again, who was this "elderly gentleman"? Just a site visitor, or.....

'Don't go down there, someones down there firing shots' or words to the effect. We backed up and turned around into a back ramp and drove back up to the toll gate. Both the BMW and myself **parked near the toll gate**, and I went to the female attendant and asked if she knew what was happening. She said Police had been called, but knew no more. I then heard some kind of noise, so I then looked down the road. I then [saw] a yellow Volvo Sedan parked on the side of the road, facing us. This vehicle was not there when I had driven down here. I then saw what I thought was a female person standing on the drivers side of this vehicle. I could see this person holding a rifle, it may have had a scope on it. This person then lifted the rifle up to the shoulder, and pointed at another female, who was standing on the edge of the road, very close to the person. The person then shot the female who had been waving her arms about. The female then fell to the ground, whereas the person with the gun then pointed it at a child, who was a few feet on the top side of the female. The person then shot the child. The child also fell to the ground. I heard both of these shots. I was standing about 80-100 mts away, when this occurred. We both then **started running up the road**, towards the turn-off. At the tollgate, there was a white hatch vehicle which had driven up **behind us**. They stopped and we got into this vehicle. They then took us up to the service station, where we stopped I know the people in the car now as Keith and June EDWARD.... A while later we spoke to the Fire Brigade and subsequently **attended** at the Motor Inn. I can describe the person* with the gun as a person of about 6 foot tall, **blonde hair**, which **flowed down onto the chest**. The person was wearing a green Anorak. I was unsure whether it [the person] was a male or female."²⁸ (sic)

COMMENT: This statement from the declared husband of Debra Jane Buckley does not make hers any more credible. (And the statement given by the witness June Margaret Edward – not Edwards – contradicts what Mr. Buckley states.) There are omissions in the statements of Thomas Mark and Debra Jane Buckley which stop us from knowing all their actions and observations at and near the PAHS tollbooth.

After reading both statements in full, it is not unreasonable to conclude the **Buckleys were not together at the time**. Mr. Buckley says he was 80 to 100 metres from the shooting on Jetty Road, and he also said he heard shots being fired there. Whereas, his wife said she was only 30 metres away from the shooting, but she never said a word about hearing any shots, nor did she say she saw the woman or either of two young girls. Mrs. Buckley says she was closer, yet **she saw less and heard nothing**.

Then there is the disappearing "Red Commodore Sedan" vehicle. Mr. Buckley states it was a "Rent-a-Car, Reg No DK 2661." Now after being mixed up in a mass murder, and having seen some of the killing with your own eyes, and after running for your life, who would go into such details about a rented car? Buckley did. (cont.)

²⁸ This is a strange and suggestive wording. If the Edwards had driven up "behind" the Buckleys, it means the Edwards were exiting the site. But in her statement, June Margaret Edward (sic) says she and her husband (Keith) never went through the tollbooth and entered the historic site. So the Edwards could not have driven "behind" the Buckley vehicle which was parked on the site behind the gold-coloured BMW. Then we have a word that is highly suggestive: **attended**. Members of the public do not use this word when they describe going to or having been to any place. The words **attend, attend-ed, attending** are used by the police: "I received a radio message that required me to **attend** at the Port Arthur Historic Site." (Hyland); "I **attended** the entrance area to the Port Arthur Historic Site." (Whittle) The use of this cop word **attend** in a statement confirms either one of two things: **i.** Thomas Mark Buckley (could be a pseudonym) **is/was a cop**; or, **ii.** The statement allegedly prepared by this witness was **prepared by a cop**, not Buckley. Note also within the statement the word metres is abbreviated with "mts." This is not how that word is written by members of the general public. Who is this person called Buckley? And who did/does he work for? ASIO?

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

He and his wife both told us how they drove that red Commodore into the historic site, behind a gold-coloured BMW. Then they told us how they turned their red Commodore and drove back to the toll-booth, behind that gold-coloured BMW. Then the Buckleys told us how they stopped their red Commodore and parked it near the toll-booth, right behind that gold-coloured BMW. And finally, they told us they alighted from their red Commodore to go and speak with the site employee in the tollbooth. Well, Mr. Buckley spoke with that employee, while, it seems, Mrs. Buckley was having a conversation with a person (Why didn't she say a man or woman? If she was not there, she wouldn't know.), who she said "was of dark complexion and perhaps of Greek extraction." (This does not seem to match up with any of the people who, officials say, were in that gold-coloured BMW – perhaps it is a little bit like Robert Salzmann.)

Thereafter, that red Commodore just disappears. Not one witness, including both Buckleys said a word about it. Allegedly, the Buckleys were from New Zealand. According to Mrs. Buckley they were on "holiday." So when they both alighted from that vehicle at the tollbooth, did they take all their personal possessions (camera, keys, money, passports, purse, travel documents, etc.) with them? It's doubted, because they had parked right at the tollbooth. No one would steal them in those few minutes they were out of that red Commodore and standing nearby. But neither of them said one word about any concerns they had for their personal possessions and important documents. No. Not one word about the inconvenience, or about how they returned to Hobart from where it seems they'd come. (Did they really stay in Hobart on Saturday night? Where?)

They saw the gunman, they said. And instead of getting back into their red Commodore and speeding away, they just said to hell with all our personal things and the vehicle, we can outrun a gunman with a rifle. Do you see any sense in leaving all your needed possessions behind, leaving your vehicle behind, and running along the road? (He said "up the road." She said "down the road.") And later, when the gunman was gone, neither Buckley said one angry, confused, or worried word about all their personal possessions, and their rented red Commodore. But then, how could they have said that if their vehicle was no longer outside the tollbooth – right behind that gold-coloured BMW in which there was a "person of dark complexion and perhaps of Greek extraction." The lack of credibility here is large.

Then Mr. Buckley upends the whole official narrative. The official narrative which describes Martin Bryant as having long blond hair. The narrative which the media keeps going on and on about and supporting with images of Martin with long blond hair. In the two Cheek statements, both witnesses were at the tollbooth when the shooting occurred. They saw the gunman kill people there. And both these witnesses said the gunman had long hair **below his shoulders**. While the media and members of the public go on about how it was his hair that made the gunman distinctive – witnesses who saw the gunman up close with their own eyes said his blond hair was **below his shoulders**. Mr. Buckley too describes hair that was **below the gunman's shoulders**. It is more proof Bryant was not the gunman. Buckley says the gunman had: "**blonde hair, which flowed down onto the chest....** I was unsure whether it was a male or a female." Martin never ever wore his hair that long. **NEVER!**

*If you know
anything about the
two mysterious
Buckleys
please contact
this editor.*

WITNESS: **CARTER**, Anne Maree
DATE: 28 May 1996 (**30 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: "About 1:30 p.m. we were walking towards the Guard Tower. At this time I heard several dull thuds." & "I and the people who I was with, took cover behind a stone wall." & "I looked back towards the cafe and saw the male, who emerged from the cafe, getting into a yellow Volvo which had surfboards on it's roof." (*sic*)
COMMENT: This witness uses the word "thuds" to describe sounds which she later learnt originated inside the café. Whether the witness did or did not know the difference between the sounds of a shotgun being fired and an assault rifle being fired is not known. But "thuds" is a more accurate description of a shotgun being fired. The sound is dissimilar to the piercing crack/lash of a high-powered rifle being discharged. This is what the witness Andrew Mark Brooks said in his statement of 30 April 1996: "Sometime between 1:20 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. we were sitting on a small wall near the penitentiary. This is about 200m away from the coffee shop." So behind this wall an estimated **200 metres from the café** is where Carter was hiding. That she saw a vehicle, even a yellow vehicle, is credible. But there is no way she could have identified it as a Volvo. And seeing one, or two, or three surfboards is very much doubted.

WITNESS: **CHAN**, Tony
DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)
CONCERNS: "We were about thirty metres before the entrance to the historic sight, and I saw a man waving a rifle but I'm not sure if it was a rifle and with the driver's side door open on the Volvo, he was getting something from inside the car." & "There was a bronze BMW sedan stopped in the middle of the road, next to the Volvo, facing out of the park." & "The man had the rifle in his left hand and I believe and he just pulled the body [1] out with his right hand. I also saw two bodies [1 + 1] lying on the road." & "I also saw another body [1] in front of the driver's side door of the Volvo. I had heard about three or four gun shots just before we got to the entrance, and then when I saw the bodies I thought it was a play."

DATE: 30 May 1996 (**32 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: This witness gave his first statement to Tasmania Police in Tasmania (Port Arthur). He gave his second statement to Victoria Police (Melbourne). It is immediately obvious to the unaided eye that this second statement has been **corrupted**. There are differences in the leading (space between lines of text) in several paragraphs. Several paragraphs with unregistered (ragged-right) endings have been inserted between original paragraphs with registered (right & left) endings. The document has been corrupted by either Victoria Police, and/or Tasmania Police, and/or the office of the director of public prosecutions in Tasmania. (The same type of corruption is evident on the *Witness Statements* of Jason Graham Cole, Lois Elsie Horrocks, Christine Elizabeth Sullivan.²⁹)

²⁹ The Horrocks statement of 29 May 1996 and the Chan statement of 30 May 1996, were witnessed by S. Solomon, detective sergeant 21136, Victoria Police. Note the editor is not saying this cop corrupted these two statements. Given the way corrupt cops work, it would be highly unlikely he did. But someone has, and the name S. Solomon (but no signature) appears on both the statements identified here. On the Cole statement, the name of the cop has been **completely removed**, or was **never entered**. All that appears for identification is the place name of "Ballarat" and the number "22489."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: On 15 April 2013, Chan told this editor that he and his travelling companion had a good sighting of the tollbooth area. He also told the editor he had no recollection of a red Commodore parked near the tollbooth. Note this witness did not say anything about a surfboard in his first statement. But in the corrupt second statement it says: "I saw a yellow Volvo sedan.... It had something sitting on its roof on a roof rack." Did Chan really state this?

WITNESS: **CHEOK**, Freda/Frida

DATE: 15 July 1996 (**78 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "As we approached the tollbooth I saw that one of these cars was a gold coloured BMW in our lane, facing us and was blocking out [our] path [into PAHS]." & "I recall seeing a man and a woman seated in the front of the BMW." & "I saw two people in the front of the Volvo as we arrived." & "The blonde-haired person was half turned away from us and his **blonde hair was long, below his shoulders.**" & "He was in his early twenties ...and he was wearing a **long dark coloured coat** just above his knees." & "I noticed there was still a female sitting in the front left passenger seat of the Volvo." & "I then looked to my left and saw the blonde-haired male trying to drag a woman who was crouched down on the ground.... I presumed that she was the woman that I had seen in the front seat of the Volvo. I then saw the blonde-haired male shoot this woman." & "As we drove off I saw the other woman still sitting in the front of the BMW but I don't know what happened, Debra drove away." & "the BMW stopped on the wrong side of the road and was about in front of the smallish white car [Toyota] and the BMW would have blocked the white car from leaving." & "The blonde-haired male got out of the BMW and I saw he had a gun in his hand. I have a recollection of something else on his hip, it might have been another gun.³⁰ I know that he was definitely holding a gun in his hand." & "Debra then drove off and **I didn't see anything further.** The last thing I saw was the blonde-haired person approached the driver of the white station wagon but I **didn't see what happen to him.** Debra then drove for quite a while before stopping at her sister's place. We wanted to make sure we were well away from Port Arthur." & "I have since **seen photos of Martin Bryant on television and in the newspapers** and I am able to say that the man I saw shoot people at the tollgate is very **similar**³¹ to the man in those photos. The **hair on the man at the tollgate was longer and neater than the hair on the man in the photos.**"

COMMENT: Almost everything this witness stated is corroborated in her son's statement (see below) – he was with her at the PAHS tollbooth and at shops on the nearby highway. Both witnesses were only several metres away from the gunman and saw him side-on, thus their observations and related words about the length of his hair ("**below his shoulders**") are very credible. Martin Bryant (**cont.**)

30 It might also have been a small radio receiver-transmitter. Worn on his belt, a small receiver-transmitter plus a small earpiece (hidden by his long hair or wig) and a lapel microphone would have allowed back and forth communication between the gunman and a handler.

31 This educated witness did not rush to accuse Martin Bryant. She acknowledged having seen images of him on television and in newspapers. Clearly, the witness reflected on what she saw. The witness uses the word "similar" to make the point that the photos she was shown by the cops were not images of the person she observed at the tollbooth. And this witness qualifies her assessment with: "The hair on the man at the toll gate was **longer and neater** than the hair on the man in the photos." In the typical *she'll-be-right-no-worries-mate* manner of Australians, it seems that many witnesses were pleased to be able to say they saw (and identified) Martin Bryant as the gunman. When all they could rightly say is that they saw a blond-haired male and, later after being saturated with images of Martin Bryant in the media, the person they saw had a few "similar" characteristics. But witnesses went in for the kill. Here are words of the witness Peter Francis Stainthorpe (*Witness Statement*; 30 May 1996): "I did not see him close up from the view I had I could not identify him." This is straight forward and tells us the witness could **not** identify the male person he saw presumably because he **did not see the gunman's facial features up close.** Then the witness said: "I have seen the photograph of the person accused [Martin Bryant] in the media and I believe he is the same man I saw at the Volvo." So after **not seeing the face** of the person at the Volvo, and admitting it, the witness then goes ahead and says he believes it is Martin Bryant. Not "similar" as the witness Cheok carefully differentiated, but "he is the same man." This is just part of the problem associated with the identification of the gunman. Accusations – **not identifications** – made by many witnesses who were eager to blame and name a person who was "similar" in looks. It is believed this is exactly what the officials who set up Martin Bryant wanted to happen.

never had his hair that long. Note the difference in the description of the gunman's outer clothing compared with that given by witness Beekman. It is the editor's belief the statements of Freda Cheok, and of her son Nicholas (see following), have credibility because they did not know what had taken place at PAHS, and they were seated just a few metres from the gunman and his actions. Note that the statements of the mother and son do not align with the statement of Debra Rabe in whose vehicle they were passengers.

WITNESS: **CHEOK**, Nicholas Emmanuel

DATE: 14 July 1996 (**77 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "As we approached the tollbooth at the entrance to Pt. Arthur, I saw a BMW, which I think was a **white colour**, stopped on the road and it was in our lane facing us. On the left-hand side of the BMW I saw a yellow Volvo **station sedan** which was also facing us but was on the correct side of the road." (all vehicles were stationary) & "I saw a male person [Russell Pollard?] aged about 65, with whitish hair and wearing glasses, in the driver's seat of the BMW and a lady [Mary Rose Nixon?] in the front passenger's seat. She had dark brownish, shortish hair, and was about 52 years old. Both of these people were making worried gestures or hand signals as if to say stop and pointing for us to go back." & "Then I saw a man [Robert Salzmann?] get out of the rear seat, driver's side, of the Volvo station sedan and just stand on the road near where he got out of the car." & "I noticed a woman [Helene Salzmann?] about 45 years, in the front passenger seat of the Volvo." & "I then saw a male person [Benjamin Overbeeke?] get out of the driver's seat of the Volvo. He had long blonde hair which was **down below his shoulders**." & "He had jeans and a wind cheater on, dark coloured." & "He was talking to the man that had got out of the back seat of the Volvo." & "The driver got out of the Volvo and walked over to him...from their body language I could tell they were arguing." & "...the blonde-haired male...walked around the front of the Volvo, and he went to the left side of the Volvo to the rear." & "This older male was just staying standing in the same place as when he had got out of the Volvo." & "When the blonde-haired male walked back to the older man, that's when I saw that he was carrying a gun.... It was just a large gun to me." & "There was a bit more talking,³² about ten seconds, between the blonde haired male and the older man and then the blonde haired man lifted up the gun and pointed it at the chest of the older man...then I heard the blast...and the older man's chest just seemed to cave in and he fell to the ground." & "I then saw the driver of the BMW open his door and get out and he walked around the front of the BMW towards the back **in the general direction of the blonde-haired male and the older man who was lying on the ground**. A few words were spoken³² between him and (**cont.**)

32 In relation to these two points, the witness uses the words "talking," and "spoken." This witness and two others were seated in a vehicle only a few metres in front of the gold-coloured BMW. They saw two older men from that BMW, one at a time, talking with the gunman. They could see the gunman was being "spoken" to. Not one of these three witnesses said there was yelling or any wild threatening gesticulations going on. After the 1st man (Robert Salzmann?) was shot point-blank in the chest, the 2nd man (Russell Pollard?) from the BMW walked toward the gunman – whose most recent victim was still warm at his feet – and began to converse with him. Any normal person would have sensed danger and got out of there as fast as possible. But not this Russell Pollard(?). He got out from behind the steering wheel of that BMW and walked over to and spoke with the gunman – then he too was shot point-blank in the chest. In places within the case literature, the word **remonstrate*** is used to qualify the talking between the gunman and the two men from that BMW (Salzmann? & Pollard?). The gunman knows what was said to him, but until he is arrested the public will never find out. ASIO will not reveal anything related to those four murders at the PAHS tollbooth which have been **wrongly blamed on Martin Bryant** (* This word means: say or plead in protest, objection, reproof; make objections; argue against some actions.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

the blonde-haired male...and then the blonde-haired male raised the gun and shot the male who had just got out of the BMW.... When the blonde-haired male shot both men...I would say the gun was only inches away from the chest of the second man when he shot him and the gun was right up to the first man's chest when he shot him." & "I saw the blonde-haired male walk around the front of the Volvo and then open the front passenger door of that car. I could see him...reach into that car towards **the woman who was still sitting in the passenger seat** [of the Volvo]." & "At the same time as the blonde-haired male dragged this woman out of the car he shot her and very quickly after that another shot. At this time, the woman in the BMW was still sitting in the front passenger seat. I didn't see what happened to her because Debra [Rabe] had reversed [our vehicle] away from the area." & "I think I recall seeing the blonde-haired male walking past the front of the Volvo towards the BMW but I didn't see anything after that." & "We went a short way down the road and stopped at the deli on the left-hand side. Just before we got to the deli I could hear some more gunfire, those same cracking noises." & "Debra then drove to a service station on the right-hand side of the road." & "I saw the BMW come down the road from the direction of the tollgate with the same blonde-haired male driving." & "[T]he exact point that most people hopped into their cars was when the blonde-haired male got out of the BMW with the gun." & "I didn't see what happened after we drove out onto the main road.... Debra kept driving for about twenty-five minutes before she stopped." & "I have...seen photos of Martin Bryant on television and in the newspapers and I can positively say that the man I saw shoot the people at the tollbooth is the same man shown in those photos, but the hair on the man at the booth was **a bit longer** than is shown in the photos."

COMMENT: This too is an absolutely staggering *Witness Statement*. It confirms some or all of the four people in the BMW knew the gunman in the Volvo and that they had parked at the tollbooth waiting for him to arrive. Note the BMW was in the wrong lane facing out of PAHS. The gunman had a clear exit in the other lane. He did not have to stop or manoeuvre around the parked BMW. The gunman stopped, even though there was no physical object obstructing the exit path of the yellow Volvo.

It seems two of those people from the BMW then went and sat inside the Volvo. (Or was one or both of them already in that car when the gunman stopped at the tollbooth?) If they had not known him or known about him, they would never have done this. It seems Mrs. Salzmann sat on the front passenger seat right next to the gunman. No innocent woman would get into the front seat of a vehicle at a public tollbooth, with a strange man she did not know and had not met before. And it seems Mr. Salzmann sat in the rear on the driver's side. And without a doubt, they knew the man in the Volvo was a gunman.

*The
facts ignored in the
Port Arthur case
confirm a very
different story
than what is told
in the
official narrative.*

*Any witness
who states things
contrary to popular
belief is wrongly
subject to
condemnation.*

What was the subject of conversation inside the Volvo? The State wants you to believe the four in the BMW were just luckless visitors to PAHS – but, their actions say otherwise. Innocent people do not wait for a gunman who has just killed a woman and two children and who is still armed. A normal person is perturbed when someone comes toward them carrying a firearm, especially a person with whom there had been heated words. Then after the first man was shot, the driver of the BMW abandoned his passenger in that BMW, got out, then walked toward the gunman who had a dead body at his feet. It is all abnormal and highly suggestive behaviour.

Other highly significant points raised by the witness are: “He had long blonde hair which was **down below his shoulders.**” And the description of the clothing he gives differs from the description given by witness Beekman, for example, who said: “He was wearing a **ski type jacket, blue, orange and a few other colours** on it.” Martin Bryant never had long hair **down below his shoulders.** He normally wore his hair short, but strangely, for a few months before the incident, he let his hair grow longer. Images of him with his longer hair show it is **not** below his shoulders.

Those who knew Martin Bryant personally describe him as **simple, polite, and harmless.** To kill at pointblank range, to drag women from vehicles then shoot them to death not only requires physical strength, it necessitates great **psychological power.** The gunman demonstrated a coolness and the ability to murder which Martin does not have. On hearing about the shooting, childlike Martin asked: “**Was there anyone hurt?**” Evidence strongly suggests he was being his naive innocent self. There is no proof he shot the BMW-four at the PAHS tollbooth, or anyone else at or near Port Arthur.

WITNESS: **CHIN**, Alison Jane

DATE: 31 May 1996 (**33 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: “It was shortly after that somebody said that there was a man outside with a gun. I looked out one of the windows of the Penitentiary building and saw what appeared to be a woman in a green silky type material tracksuit top. She was standing at a point near the rear of the bus parking area between the back of the bus nearest us and the water. I saw a person who appeared to be young and had suffle [*sic*] type long blonde hair.... I then either heard one or two loud bangs and nearly at the same time saw the woman in the tracksuit top fall to the ground and I saw a couple of splashes in the water behind her.... There would have been about 20 people in the Penitentiary area at the time I was there. People were talking to each other and I heard someone say that they had seen the gunman drive off away from the bus area in a Yellow Volvo with a Surf board attached to the roof. I did not see this car at any time.... Myself and my mother then walked back down across open ground past the bus car park. I could see the body of the woman at the back of the bus.... Today I have been shown a Photoboard containing 30 photographs and which is numbered fifteen. I am not able to identify any person in this photoboard....”

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: Like Beavis, this witness wants you to believe she can see the details of clothing at a distance of **150 to 200 metres**. But this is not possible. This witness saw the details related to that dead woman in green after the witness went and looked at the dead body. Note how **conversations contaminate the recollections of others**. This witness did not see a yellow Volvo with a surfboard, but it is now in her memory regardless. To her credit, Chin did not succumb to identifying Martin Bryant on the corrupt photoboard. **Thank you.**

WITNESS: **COLE**, Jason Graham

DATE: 3 June 1996 (**36 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I was standing up and had a good view of the area.... I saw a male person who had long blonde hair and a long dark coloured over coat on. This person had a long barreled firearm and **was carrying a bag which was about two foot long.**"

COMMENT: This bag the witness says he saw is the bag the gunman took with him from the Broad Arrow Café. The bag left behind in the café, which appears in the police *training video*, was left there by the gunman to implicate Martin Bryant. Allegedly, it contained items belonging to Bryant but like everything else nothing was ever proved to be his. The leaving of that second bag in the café is undeniable proof that Martin Bryant was being set up.

This statement has the appearance of having been corrupted like those of Tony Chan, Lois Elsie Horrocks, and Christine Elizabeth Sullivan. At the end of this statement by Cole, the place "Ballarat" and [police?] number "22489" appear. But nothing else.³³

WITNESS: **COLLIER**, Flora Helen

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "We then slowly strolled over to the penitentiary along a pathway and over a little bridge. We had just entered the ruins and read the first information plate when I heard a very loud noise.... We both then went straight to the window and looked out.... I could hear what I now know to be rifle shots.... I did not see the person with the gun at all and only saw the car as it was leaving the car park and entering the exit road. The car was yellow in colour, and **I did not identify it as a make or notice a surf board.** I did notice it was a sedan."

COMMENT: This two-page statement is undated, unsigned, not witnessed, and bears no official letterhead, name, stamp, or anything to identify where it was prepared or presented.³⁴ It could have been prepared by anyone, anywhere, at any time. The comment about not identifying a surfboard on the vehicle, tells us that the witness was prompted to give an answer about a surfboard.

When the police ask witnesses questions, either open or closed, it prompts witnesses to reply with an answer which they believe the cop wants to hear. If a witness has heard anything about some item from other witnesses, here a surfboard, then the witness giving the statement is tempted to repeat what she/he has heard from the other witnesses. Flora Helen Collier must have heard about the surfboard on the gunman's yellow Volvo. But to her credit, this witness only stated what she honestly saw and nothing more.

³³ See *Witness Statement* (28 April 1996) of Tony Chan.

³⁴ Note that this witness, who it is believed lived/lives outside Tasmania, might have no knowledge of these flaws which could have been the outcome of her original statement being manipulated by corrupt cops or other officials.

WITNESS: **COLLIER**, Vincent James

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "We both got in a position to be able to see out through one of the windows. I could still hear this loud noise going although I did not think there was twenty shots fired in there.... I kept watching and about 2 minutes after the first shot was fired I saw a man with a gun on the roadway.... He was carrying the rifle at hip height with the barren [*sic*] pointing straight out. I cn [*sic*] not remember if he lifted the rifle up or not but I don't think so.... I think I then saw a lady wearing green slacks run down between the first and second bus and around the back of the first one.... The next time I saw the person with the gun getting into a yellow Volvo sedan with a light coloured surf board on top. I don't think it was white but **I think it had a fin at the rear of it....** the person with the gun had long blond hair and was average height and build. I can not remember anything about his clothing at all."

COMMENT: Like the statement (allegedly) from his wife Flora Helen Collier, this two-page statement is undated, it is unsigned, not witnessed, and bears no official letterhead, name, stamp, or anything to identify where it was prepared or presented. It could have been prepared by anyone, anywhere, at any time.

This witness did his best to make his statement correspond with the official narrative. He and his wife were looking out the same window of a building which is **150-200 metres** from where the shooting took place at the bus parking area – yet, Mr. Collier saw things his wife did not see or hear. He questioned the shots fired in the café, he stated a time that fits perfectly with the official 90 seconds, he saw the rifle fired from the hip – well, he thinks he did. He saw that lady who was wearing green, but strangely his wife did not. He saw that yellow sedan, and at 150-200 metres he just knew it was a Volvo with a surfboard on top. But his *silly* wife never saw those things either. And he also said he only thought that the surfboard had "a fin at the rear of it." But every surfboard has a fin or fins. Collier claims he saw all that and more, yet he could not say one word about what the gunman was wearing.³⁵

WITNESS: **COLLYER**, Graham Derek

DATE: 7 May 1996 (**9 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I notice him because of his overcoat I think it was green." & "He seemed somewhere about 20. He had long bedraggled hair about **3-5** [measurement missing here; on page 2 the witness uses the imperial word feet, thus it is reasonable to conclude the missing word is **inches**] **below the shoulder**. He looked like he might have had a lot of acne. A pitted face."

DATE: 8 May 1996 (**10 days** after Port Arthur incident)

CONCERNS: "...pull out an old SLR [self-loading rifle] from the bag. It seemed to be painted or something it seemed to be a very light colour." & "The coat was **lime green colour**." & "I still haven't seen anything in the media about the person who shot me."

³⁵ This statement has zero credibility. Note that the recollections of this witness are not corroborated in his wife's statement.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: The statement of this victim who was shot in the café is credible. His direct and close observation of the gunman confirms that the gunman was not Martin Bryant. Martin looked older than 20. Even when his hair was longer, **it was never 3-5 inches below his shoulders**. Martin has a **clear and smooth complexion**, certainly not a pitted face. Collyer's description of the SLR the gunman fired in the café disproves the claims of the alleged ballistics expert Gerard Dutton³⁶ of Tasmania Police. And Collyer's statement has additional credibility because he was not biased by media images.

WITNESS: **COOK**, Brigid Ann

DATE: 22 July 1996 (**85 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: None.

COMMENT: The fact this witness used the name BRYANT in her statement is unfortunate. There is no evidence that he shot anyone. Brigid Ann Cook received, this editor hopes, special recognition for warning as many people as she could of the imminent danger from the gunman. More people might have been shot if she had not acted as she did – bravely and immediately with great risk to herself.

Then after she herself was shot, she refused to falsely identify Martin Bryant as the gunman because, as she said: "I have read an article in the Time Magazine and have viewed a photograph of Martin BRYANT within this article so if I chose BRYANT in a photo-board, I would be very influenced by this article." While most of the Australian population was clammering to blame innocent Martin for everything, Brigid Ann Cook stood up after she was shot down, and said no – *this is immoral and I will not do it*. **Thank you Brigid.**³⁷

WITNESS: **COOPER**, Paul Anthony

DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I then started running toward the Model Prison, looking for more persons to get into cover. At this time I saw a yellow Volvo parked directly across from Clougha. I recognized this car as the one **the gunman had been in the boot of earlier**." & "I came across a number of ladies and asked if they had seen anyone in the Volvo as I believed the gunman must have been in the near vicinity. The ladies said it was their car and I realised that **there must have been two Volkos**, and I had mistakenly identified one for the gunmans." & "I saw a lot of bodies." & "It appeared that the people had tried to get out the [emergency] door, which must have been locked." & "I called Ian KINGSTON and asked what he wanted me to do.... He asked me to check the Toll Gate." & "**About 200m from the tollbooth I saw a lady lying on her back on the right side of the road**. She had a cloth over her face which indicated that someone had already attended to her. I noticed that a black handbag was next to her head." & "I continued to drive toward the tollbooth and believe I passed **another body on the left side of the road**. I could not tell if it was male or female as a cloth was covering this person's face also, indicating that the person was dead." & "I believe I counted **seven bodies** as I travelled (**cont.**)"

³⁶ Officially, it is suggested this cop is an expert on matters ballistic. But note that behind all those big assertions, it is only Dutton's words about Dutton's work. There are images of him holding up firearms and making serious sounding statements. Dutton held up a rifle and said this **IS** the rifle.... He did not say it will be proved in court that this is the rifle.... No. Dutton believes all he has to do is say it, and that makes it the truth – an assertion is all it takes to prove Martin Bryant was the gunman. But note nothing ballistics-related which Dutton has claimed in connection to shooting at and near Port Arthur has been proved in a trial. That he worked on the NSW case involving Ivan Milat confers no certainty to anything which this *Mr. Ballistic* has blurted out as if it was the gospel truth.

³⁷ Not only was this employee at the Broad Arrow Café a witness, she herself was shot and seriously injured. Yet, after all the suffering she went through then, and no doubt to this day, **she stated the truth**. She knew that the image of Martin Bryant she had seen in a news magazine (TIME: Australia; 13 May 1996) would influence any identification she made, so she made **no identification** on any of the police photoboards. Whereas some people seem to have been very eager to identify Martin Bryant as the gunman, Brigid Ann Cook stood by the truth.

*False memories
deceive people
including those
who have them.*

up the road, all of whose faces had been covered over.” & “There were **three bodies** together which **appeared to be men**. I believe they were alongside the tollbooth.” & “Some were in front of the booth also.” & “I saw the yellow Volvo with **two surfboards on the roof** and the driver’s door open.” & “I ran to the tollbooth and knocked. I asked if anyone was there because I was here to help. There was no response. It crossed my mind that one of the bodies outside may have been the tollbooth operator as all the lights were out and the door was locked.” & “I accompanied the policeman to the area where Nicole was and found a **black plastic disposable type item**. The police officer said that it would hold 30 rounds.” [magazine for shotgun or rifle?] & “Walter was then informed that the bodies of his wife and two children had been found at the tollbooth.”

COMMENT: One of the most disturbing statements of all those submitted by the witnesses. Cooper clearly saw and identified a second yellow Volvo at PAHS. He is firm in his belief that he saw the gunman doing something in the boot of that vehicle, but then expresses the thought that he had made a mistake. But did he? There are statements about a yellow Volvo (singular) and yellow Volvos (plural). There are statements about the gunman placing things inside the boot of a yellow Volvo after the shooting inside the café – for example, a sportsbag. There are statements about Volvos with and without a surfboard (singular) and surfboards (plural). And there are statements about a surfboard without a cover and with a cover. (Silver- and yellow-coloured covers are stated by witnesses.)

At the tollbooth, this witness clearly states he saw two surfboards on the yellow Volvo parked there. He said the driver’s door was open, but said nothing about the boot lid being up and a firearm (Daewoo shotgun) being inside that boot, which is what appears in the police *training video*. Nor does this witness say he saw a body of a male adult lying directly on the road right next to the yellow Volvo he said he saw. If this witness did see a yellow Volvo as he claims, then he should have seen the unobstructed body of that male which was lying in clear view on the bitumen roadway. But Cooper said nothing about that body. So was that body on the roadway when Cooper was there? Was Cooper really there?

Conversely, what this witness said he saw inside the café is credible. His reference to the emergency door and the bodies of those who could not get out because it was “locked” confirms what several other witnesses have stated. Up to seven people died because that door could not be opened, as it was designed to. Contrary to what officials evasively claim, up to seven people died because they could not get away from the gunman. Emergency doors are for emergencies, and a gunman – never confirmed as Martin Bryant by a jury – shooting inside the PAHS café was an emergency. (see *THAT BLOODY DOOR* at Part 8)

According to the *Port Arthur Deceased Persons File*, 20 people died inside the Broad Arrow Café. A further four victims were shot in the car/bus parking area, and a further four were shot at the tollbooth. In between, the only three deaths officially recorded are those of a mother and her two daughters. (the Mikacs)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The estimated distance between the three Mikac bodies and the tollbooth varies in the *Witness Statements*: 30 metres (Debra Jane Buckley); 80-100 metres (Thomas Mark Buckley); 50 metres (Pauline Grenfell): let's say an average of c.60 metres. This distance is significant for at least two reasons: *i.* It confirms that no person inside the tollbooth could clearly see the facial features of the gunman. Build yes, hair style and colour yes, gender yes. But definitely not facial features. So when PAHS employee Aileen Kingston says she saw the gunman shooting at the Mikacs, this might be correct. But at that distance, Kingston cannot say exactly who it was doing the shooting. (Before the gunman arrived at the tollbooth, Kingston understandably locked herself inside the internal toilet room, and did not see the gunman at a closer distance.); and, *ii.* It tells us that from the car/bus parking area to a point c.60 metres from the tollbooth (where the three Mikacs were said to have died), no other body was officially there. But this does not fit with what the witness Cooper has stated.

He says: "**About 200m from the tollbooth I saw a lady lying on her back on the right side of the road.** She had a cloth over her face which indicated that someone had already attended to her. I noticed that a black handbag was next to her head." So who was this lady? There was no dead child near this body, so it was not Mrs. Mikac. Then Cooper says: "I continued to drive toward the tollbooth and believe **I passed another body on the left side of the road.** I could not tell if it was male or female as a cloth was covering this person's face also, indicating that the person was dead." Another body, and again Cooper was unable to say if it was female or male. Again there is no mention of a dead child near that body, so it seems as if it was not Mrs. Mikac. So **who was this dead person?** The only official deaths between the car/buspark and tollbooth were those of Mrs. Mikac and her two daughters. But this is not what the PAHS employee Cooper describes. He has told us about **bodies that officially do not exist.** Has this witness lied? Or did Cooper come across something that has been kept secret from the public?

In the police *training video*, there is an image of three bodies close together on and just off the roadway. Where exactly is not discernible. But viewers of that video are led to believe they are three of the four bodies at the tollbooth. The video suggests this, but does not confirm it. Cooper said he saw three bodies together which he said seemed **to be men.** Well, one of the bodies in the *training video*, the one in the middle of the roadway is dressed in a purple leisure suit. It looks decidedly female. So again, did Cooper really go to the tollbooth? Or, did someone start moving bodies after he drove back down Jetty Road to the car/bus parking area?

Recall that all the shooting had just taken place. Cooper said: "I called Ian KINGSTON and asked what he wanted me to do as I was free. He asked me to check the Toll Gate." So Cooper drove up there attentively. It would have taken him 2-3 minutes, certainly no more than five. After he arrived, this is what he said he did: "I ran to the tollbooth and knocked. I asked if anyone was there because I was here to help. There was no response.... [T]he lights were out and the door was locked." So where was Aileen Kingston, the PAHS employee who had locked herself in the toilet room?

Many things happened at the PAHS tollbooth which have been kept secret from the public – for example, four people waited for the gunman so two of them could speak confidentially with him while sitting inside the vehicle he drove there.

*The
red Commodore
is equally
significant as the
yellow Volvo
in the
Port Arthur case
– perhaps
even more so.*

In her *Witness Statement*, Aileen Kingston says this: "I stayed in the toilet for about 15-20 minutes waiting for someone to come. I then heard a persons voice outside and bashing on the door." But it wasn't Paul Cooper according to Kingston who stated: "I recognized the voice as belonging to Athol Bloomfield. I left the booth with Athol and I remember seeing four bodies outside the tollbooth as well as the yellow Volvo." But Kingston says nothing about the **red Commodore** which Buckleys left just outside her tollbooth. Neither did Paul Cooper say he saw that **red Commodore**.

"I drove to the site with Athol and I recall seeing a womans [*sic*] body and a young child's [*sic*] body on the road where I had previously seen the car and the male person before." So, the witness Paul Cooper drove up Jetty Road and did not, it seems, see the body of Mrs. Mikac and definitely not the body of one of her two daughters. Kingston says she saw them, but not Cooper. And he said he saw a dead woman with a black handbag near her head, but Kingston never said a word about seeing that body or the handbag.

And it gets even more bizarre, because neither of these two witnesses said anything about who covered the faces of the dead bodies. Who went along (up or down?) Jetty Road and covered the faces of the dead? And what did they use as covers? Were they improvised covers, or prepared-in-advance covers? And which dead bodies because clearly the two accounts from these two witnesses (Cooper & Kingston) do not even come close to being similar. No one who was really there would drive along that road and notice a black handbag but **completely overlook the dead body of a child** lying dead next to its dead mother. What does all this mean?

Might the person or persons who covered the faces of the dead have done a little bit of rearranging? What are we to understand by Cooper's words about the Mikac bodies, which it seems he never saw? This is what he said about Walter Mikac: "Walter was then informed that the bodies of his wife and two children had been found at the tollbooth." But this witness Cooper tells us he had already been to that tollbooth and he had not seen any Mikac bodies.

Cooper spoke with Ian Kingston who asked Cooper to check the tollbooth. Very understandable. But then Cooper states: "I got into my green Holden Gemini and drove to the tollbooth." What reason was there for this witness, who seems to have **not witnessed** quite a few things, to tell us that he drove up Jetty Road – with death all around him – in his **green Holden Gemini**. Cooper is either a *car-freak*, or he had a very good reason to impress upon us that it was him in the **green Holden Gemini**. We must ask, **Why?** This editor believes an innocent person would say "I got in my car," or "I drove to the tollbooth," or words similar. To give the colour, make, and model of his vehicle, after a horrific mass murder is highly suggestive. Either this witness did not want to be mistaken for some other person, or have the actions of another person attributed to him. It was important for Cooper to identify himself with his vehicle so he would not be misidentified as some other person – **who did what?**

In his statement, Colin Frederick Prout says what he saw at the tollbooth: "I recall a 3 Series BMW parked on the roadway & I recall a vehicle with its doors [plural] open, I think the colour of the vehicle was **green**." Prout did not recall seeing a yellow Volvo or a red Commodore at the tollbooth. A **green** vehicle sticks in his mind.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **COOPER**, Robyn

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "At 11:00 a.m. that day, (10) Managers and Supervisors, left the Site on their way to a conference at Swansea.³⁸ This was the first time in my 20 years, that I am aware of, where all the Senior Management had been involved in a conference/training session **away** from the Port Arthur Historic Site which required an overnight stay, Sunday through to Monday." & "At a phonebox on the side of the road, I learnt that my niece and cousin had been **murdered** in the Broad Arrow Café." & "The three cars carrying Managers and Supervisors continued to Taranna where several police had set up a police barricade across the road. It was now 3:40 p.m. We were directed by police via Nubeena to Port Arthur and arrived at approximately **4:00 p.m.**" & "I could not at this stage identify any Police Officers controlling the situation." & "By 5:30 p.m. it had become quite dark.... **An alarm was given over the Site communications by radio, that the gunman had doubled back.**" & "Gunshots were heard and we were told to turn off the lights, lie on the floor away from windows and be quiet. Many of the people in Clougha had already experienced the shooting at the Café or assisted as volunteers and they **were again being traumatized.**" & "Some became angry and demanded police protection over the radio, some screamed, some shook uncontrollably, some cried quietly, as we waited in the dark. Waited for what?" & "It was **after 7:30 p.m.** when six policemen escorted us on foot in small groups to the Youth Hostel." & "I have been unable to work since the massacre, and am diagnosed with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder." & "I am very disillusioned with the present system which is **denying survivors of such a tragedy the opportunity of presenting their testimony in the cause of truth and justice.**"

COMMENT: The incident was a **premeditated, planned, and professionally executed act of terror** against people at and near Port Arthur. Robyn Cooper's statement describes the way that terror was exacerbated after the gunman's shooting at PAHS had ended. The deliberate false alarm at 5:30 p.m. It had to be deliberate because the cops knew the gunman was at Seascope and had been there since c.2:30 p.m. The deliberate shooting near the Clougha building – if it was an all-clear signal, two-way radios should have been used – to further traumatize people who were waiting for help in the dark. Armed cops in numbers were kept from attending at PAHS until after 7:30 p.m., which was over 6 hours since the first shot was fired at the Broad Arrow Café. For the Tasmania Police (motto: *MANDUCARE ANTE OFFICIUM* – *Eat Before a Job*), having a barbecue near Taranna had priority. Attending a mass murder came second. The cops allowed PAHS staff to drive to the site, but the cops did not bother to go themselves. Two female cops helicoptered in to PAHS were sent there unarmed – this tells us how much top cops cared for the safety of those two women. And the **(cont.)**

³⁸ A small town-area approximately 170 kilometres north of Port Arthur; legal driving time between the places – 2 hours 10 minutes.

see following page

³⁹ It is not known publicly how many cops and agents (includes spooks) of the State were at Port Arthur prior, during, and after the shooting there. We do know one cop who was there out of uniform – **Noble**; NSW Police. We also know that an unidentified **black van** arrived at the front of the Broad Arrow Café and remained there for c.2.5 hours before leaving. There has never been any public announcement explaining: who arrived in this van; what those people did inside the café; and, who departed in this van. It has been suggested that people in that van worked the evidence over in the café and made sure no dead body had personal ID items identifying her/him with ASIO or other intelligence agency. Recall the café is believed to be the second-choice scene for the shooting. The intended target being the *Bundeena* cruise boat and all its passengers. One of the people killed in the café and who it is believed was working with ASIO was Anthony Nightingale. (see *NAME INDEX*)

one armed cop (Peter Hesman) known to be there officially was not wearing a uniform.³⁹ The senior administration of PAHS has done all it can to silence, shut out, and stymie staff⁴⁰ so they cannot reveal what they experienced and know about this State-conducted **psycho-political terror attack**.

WITNESS: **COPPING**, Michael William

DATE: 10 May 1996 (**12 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "As I passed Seascap I looked down towards Seascap as I would normally do. I saw a **yellow Volvo** sedan parked at a slight angle outside the front door to the MARTIN'S house.⁴¹ On the roof of the car was a surfboard in a creamy/yellow canvas style **board cover**."⁴² & "I saw **the yellow Volvo sedan** with the roof racks and surfboard, heading in the opposite direction. I saw a **figure of a person driving the car**." & "At the tollbooth area of the historic site, I again saw **the yellow Volvo sedan** with the surfboard and roof racks. This car was definitely the same car that I had seen at the MARTIN'S house on the previous day, and the car I had seen travelling on the Arthur Highway towards Port Arthur." & "**About four years ago**, my wife Melissa Joan COPPING, complained to me about a male person who was coming into the Fox & Hounds Hotel with his family. My wife told me that this male person had been coming in with his family **every** Saturday night for a spit roast. My wife told me that this male person had been continually staring at her and other female waiting staff at the hotel.... My wife subsequently recognized this male person **at a later date** as Martin BRYANT."

COMMENT: This is a statement that does not withstand analysis. It seems to be a hit-piece. The witness says he saw a yellow Volvo. Then Copping says he saw "the yellow Volvo sedan" at the PAHS tollbooth. And immediately he states, with no evidence or proof, that it was the same vehicle he saw at Seascap and the same vehicle he saw driving down the road. The witness goes from a **casual alleged sighting** of a vehicle to the Volvo belonging to Martin Bryant (though he does not say this), to a confirmation that this vehicle is the same vehicle which he claims he saw three times.

It is obvious from his statement that this witness does not like Martin. In his last paragraph, he starts making statements about what his wife claims to have experienced, but she it seems was never asked to provide a *Witness Statement*. Copping gives no evidence or proof, just his allegation that Martin had upset his wife "about four years ago" – in c.**1992**. Martin is accused of staring at Mrs. Copping and other female staff at the hotel. It is demonization – declare things that make people believe Martin was a monster.

At the time Copping says all this staring was going on, Martin lived with his good parents. He had **no** money to spare from his disability pension. He had **no** vehicle. His father (died in August 1993) did **not** let him drive any motor vehicle because Martin had **no** driving licence⁴³ His parents had **no** younger children. He was **not** married. He had **no** children. He did **not** start driving until 1994. Yet, Copping insists on making **never-proved allegations** – after (**cont.**)

⁴⁰ Staff at the Port Arthur Historic Site have been told **not to discuss** the incident. And the public is also told **not to discuss** the incident with the staff. But now the truth is out and it is not going away. (see the Insert *PAHS MEMORIAL GARDEN BROCHURE* in Part 5)

⁴¹ In an undated *Witness Statement*, the cop Andrew Mark Fogarty states: "My view of the lower area of the house was partially obstructed by bushes close to the residence." It is that lower area of view where any vehicle near the front door of Seascap cottage would have been parked – **if one was parked there**. (see Image of Seascap in Part 4)


⁴² The following statement is from an email (17 March 2013) of Andrew S. MacGregor to the editor: "[L]ook at the photos/videos of the Volvo at the tollbooth. You will see that the surfboard is bare, and is **not in a canvas bag**. Copping would have seen that and noted the bare board, as he claims he did surfing himself. So why did he make a ludicrous statement about the board in a canvas bag? Or, were there **two Volvos with surfboards?**" (amended; added emphasis)

⁴³ Martin did not have a licence to drive any type of vehicle. He knew he **could not pass the theory test**. The yellow Volvo he drove had an automatic gearbox.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

listening to and reading hate-filled media stories about Martin for over 10 days – so the police and public would believe Martin was driving 90 minutes each way to take his “family” to the “Fox & Hounds Hotel” near Port Arthur “**every Saturday night for a spit roast**” where he would be “continually staring” at Mrs. Copping and other females at the hotel.” It is all cruel unproved nonsense.⁴⁴

ARTHUR H'WAY SEASCAPE TURN-OFF



ARTHUR Highway looking south. To the left and almost in the middle is the Seascape turn-off. (between 2nd & 3rd utility poles) Note tree growth around the turn-off. Also note there was vegetation growing around the cottage. (see Image at Part 4) The editor has been told the distance from the highway to Seascape was c.100 metres down a sloping track. It is doubted Copping saw a vehicle at Seascape. If he did, he would not have been able to identify the brand of that vehicle plus the type of material allegedly covering a surfboard. – ed.

WITNESS: **CORDWELL**, Michael John

DATE: 31 May 2013 (**32 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: “I contacted the Hobart Police Headquarters & spoke to an Inspector. I informed him of my concern & enquired if the person involved in the siege was known as Martin BRYANT.” & “Assistant Commissioner WOOLLEY requested that I listen to an audio tape which had previously been recorded in an interview between a negotiator & the alleged gunman before the telephone battery allegedly expired.” & “I was to listen to the said tape for approximately **20 seconds**.” & “Although I cannot recall the entire text of the conversation between the negotiator & the alleged gunman I did however identify the voice of my nephew, Martin BRYANT.”

COMMENT: So there we have it. According to this witness the person whose voice was recorded (audio tape) speaking with the police negotiator was Martin Bryant. And the cops told Cordwell the person whose voice was recorded was the gunman. So Martin Bryant is the gunman, end of story. Well, not so fast.

Michael John Cordwell is what is known as a biased witness. He telephoned the cops because he believed Martin Bryant was involved in the siege. And, he actually mentioned that to the cops. So before Cordwell listened to that audio tape, he was (**cont.**)

⁴⁴ The official **demonizing** of Martin Bryant seems to have appealed to Mrs. Copping and she has added to it. The editor has not been able to find any document(s) corroborating the claims made by Mr. Copping. Nor has the editor been able to locate a *Witness Statement* made by Mrs. Copping. All there seems to be are words by Mr. Copping about what Mrs. Copping said to him. (This is called meaningless **hearsay**.) At the time stated by Mr. Copping, Martin Bryant’s father was still alive and his yellow Volvo was not being used by his son. Nor had Martin been given a vehicle from Helen Harvey who was then still alive. The statement that Martin was, “**every Saturday night**” and with his family, driving down from Hobart to the Fox and Hounds hotel for a spit-roast meal, and while there ogling Mrs. Copping and female staff is **cruel unproved nonsense**. This part of Mr. Copping’s statement has nothing to do with his alleged sightings of some yellow Volvo. But it does have a lot to do with making Martin look bad. This is exactly why the detective who took the statement let Copping go on and on about this Mrs. Copping being ogled.

of the belief that the gunman was Martin Bryant and the cops knew that Cordwell suspected it was Martin Bryant. Now, that's **a perfect witness if you want to set up Bryant**. The cops even sent a special car over to drive good Mr. Cordwell to the cop shop so he could listen to their audio tape, which the cops set up especially for this most helpful witness.

Cordwell came to a definitive conclusion that the voice was Martin Bryant's after he listened to just **20 seconds** of audio tape. Now that's not much. And allegedly, it was recorded during a siege with firearms being discharged ("cough"; "cough"; "cough"⁴⁵). That was definitely not an ideal recording situation. And **two people** were conversing who did not know each other, so the dialogue would not have been relaxed and free-flowing – more stilted and tense than conversational. First one speaking, then the other. So maybe, the alleged gunman spoke a few words during half those 20 seconds of recorded words and ambient noises. Let's say he spoke for 10 seconds, and the person whose voice was recorded would not have been speaking non-stop. So that's not many words on which to base a definitive conclusion.

But there never was any doubt over what Cordwell was going to say. He believed it was Martin Bryant before he even called the cops. He believed it was Martin Bryant after he phoned the cops. He believed it was Martin Bryant as he was being chauffeured to the cop shop in a car sent for him. And he believed it was Martin Bryant after he heard just a few words. The cops would have loved Cordwell for saying exactly what they wanted him to say.

Of course the cops do not want you to know that the last time Cordwell heard the voice of Martin Bryant was, it seems, **back in 1979** – when Martin was a 12-year-old boy who had not then passed through puberty. It seems Cordwell **had not spoken with his nephew Martin for c.17 years**, and when he did speak with him last (in 1979), Martin's voice was still the higher-pitched immature voice of a boy. There was some falling-out in that family and it seems Cordwell intended to be as harmful as he could to Martin his nephew who clearly he strongly disliked.

You can read about this in the book by Carleen Bryant (née Cordwell), who also reveals the following about her evil brother Michael John: "I received a letter from my brother that was hateful and hurtful. Obviously angry with Martin for what had occurred, he **directed this hate at me**. In his letter he promised me that the only time he would see me again would be at our mother's funeral, and that he would **refuse to acknowledge my existence again**. Although much anger has been directed at me since 1996, the hurt you feel when your own flesh and blood levels such an attack at you is beyond description."⁴⁶

Now, does that seem to be a completely objective and unbiased assessment made by good citizen Michael John Cordwell? Or, does that seem to be the subjective set-up of a **patsy** who had the misfortune to have an evil uncle? You decide. And the whole stupidity of all this is that no one has ever denied Martin Bryant was at Seascapes cottage. He was there – that has never been denied. But officials have done verbal and physical cartwheels to try and prove Martin Bryant was the *lone-nut* gunman who killed 35 people and wounded 23 others enroute to Seascapes cottage, who **(cont.)**

⁴⁵ During the stupid SOG siege of Seascapes – the siege that never was – phone conversations between one *Jamie* (in the cottage) and a police negotiator (in Hobart) were recorded. Working with the transcripts of those conversations plus an audio analysis of recorded sounds during those conversations, investigators have determined that what is identified with the word "cough" on the transcripts were actually discharges of a firearm inside the cottage. Over 20 of these discharges were recorded and individually entered on the transcripts with the word "cough." (see *INSERT; PERVERTING JUSTICE*)

⁴⁶ *My Story*; 2010: p. 141.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

took over that cottage, who fought off the cops for 18 hours or so, who killed three more victims there, who burnt Seascope to the ground, and who was the sole person responsible for the entire incident at and near Port Arthur. But officials have failed completely to prove any of this. And whether that voice on the audio recording Cordwell heard was, or was not, the voice of Martin Bryant from 30 Clare Street, New Town, Tasmania, **it does not prove anything significant** – it certainly does not prove Martin was the gunman.

Postscript: This Cordwell himself can't be too bright if he is incapable of remembering that recording: "I cannot recall the entire text of the conversation." It was just **20 seconds** in length.

WITNESS: **CRAIG**, Merran Leanne

DATE: 8 May 1996 (**10 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I reside at the Nubeena Police station residence with my boyfriend Paul Barry HYLAND." & "At 3:08 p.m. on that day I answered a telephone call at the residence. Immediately after that phone call I made notes of the conversation that had occurred over the phone." & "Do you know where your husband is?" & "The male then spoke again saying 'Playing with yourself are we?' & "I then rang Maureen WHITTLE at the Dunalley Police Station. I heard via Maureen that Paul was still talking on the Police radio. I was then relieved, and did not feel the urgency to contact police about the phone call." & "At 3:25 p.m. the phone rang again, and I answered it. All I heard was normal breathing. There were about four breaths, and the phone was hung up." & "At about 1:35 p.m. on Sunday the 28th April 1996, I received a phone call from a John WILSON who said that, 'I don't know if it's real or not but there's gunshots and people running everywhere.' He said this two times. He told me he was at the Port Arthur Historic Site. The male person was panting very heavily. The male person said he'd ring '000,' and he was gone." & "I also received a phone call from the Motor Inn at Port Arthur. I think it might have been Geoff MYERS." & "I also got a call from Helma SWIFT at the Bush Mill who had some people by the name of SUTHERLAND who had had their car shot."

COMMENT: This is a strange and suspect statement. A former cop, Andrew S. MacGregor tells us this: "Police statements are normally written in a chronological order." That makes sense, as statements are not the prose of novels with their flashbacks and retrospective revelations. But Craig's statement is all over the place. She starts her statement with a phone call which she claims she received at 3:08. Then she refers to another telephone call at 3:25. Then she bounces back to a much earlier phone call at 1:35. on the same day (28 April). Then there are references to two more calls, but unlike the others Craig states nothing about the times they were received.

With the first call, Craig says she later made notes of at least nine things the caller (one of the *Jamies*) mentioned to her, including: "Do you know where your husband is?"⁴⁷ She spoke with a *Jamie* for several minutes it seems. Yet, she was **not asked** to identify the *Jamie* on the audio tapes which the police (cont.)

⁴⁷ Craig received a phone call which was unexpected. It disturbed her. The caller asked a question about her partner (husband) which must have made her worry. So what then did Craig do? Well instead of going and listening to the police radio receiver to determine exactly where her partner Paul Hyland was, she made a telephone call to the Dunalley police station and spoke with someone there. And then, even after being assured that Hyland could be heard on the police radio, Craig still did listen to the police radio at the Nubeena station, where she was living. A reasonable woman would have wanted to reassure herself by listening for and hearing the voice of her partner. But Craig said she: "did not feel the urgency to contact police about the phone call. I then went and sat down again."

negotiation recorded. Why?⁴⁸ Well it seems there were two *Jamies* and the one who called the Nubeena police station was looking for Paul Barry Hyland. Now, ask yourself why one of the *Jamies* at Seascapes would have wanted to speak with the Tasmania Police constable Hyland? It very much seems that this *Jamie* was the real gunman, or Michael *Mick/Rick* Charles Dyson, and not the *Jamie* played by Martin Bryant.

You will recall that Hyland was one of two constables who allegedly went off to Saltwater River to look for reported drugs, and who then returned to the Nubeena station at sometime around 2:00 p.m. Well at that time, Craig already had information about the shooting which she was given at 1:35 p.m. by a John Wilson she states. But nowhere does she state that she gave that information to her partner Paul Hyland who allegedly arrived at the Nubeena police station **after that telephone call from Wilson**. So did Craig make this up? Or, did constable Hyland make up his story about being at the Nubeena police at sometime around 2:00 p.m.?

The very specific times and specific content described in Craig's statement conflicts with her failing to reveal everything about what went on that afternoon, and her failing to be more specific with other phone calls she alleges she received. Overall, after studying the statements of Craig and Hyland, and reading the literature in which they are discussed, it seems that the real gunman had earlier contact with Hyland and/or Craig. It is also suspected that Hyland and/or his constable colleague (Whittle of Dunalley police station), both of whom allegedly went to Saltwater River looking for hidden drugs, was/were involved with the abduction of Martin Bryant.

WITNESS: **CRANWELL**, Wendy Irene

DATE: 4 May 1965 (**6 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I can remember seeing a person who I believed at the time was a female because of the person's long blonde hair...was **shoulder length and hanging free.**"

COMMENT: These words by the witness corroborate those of several other witnesses who first thought it was a gunman because of the long female-like free-hanging hair. Again, the hair length which **Martin Bryant NEVER had.**

But what has been done to this statement is very disturbing. Across the top of the first page the following is typed: "This statement, consists of 4 page(s) signed by me is true to the best of my knowledge and belief." Yet, the statement, which bears the **DPP** (director of public prosecutions) **COPY** imprint on each page, actually consists of seven pages – not four. None of those seven pages are signed, nor is there a witness signature. The pagination of the pages does not make logical sense. Several of the pages have the name Wendy **Irene** CRANWELL typed at the top, and several of the pages have Wendy **Inane** CRANWELL typed at the top. Inane means lacking sense or substance. So did this witness think she was making a joke out of a mass murder? Or did someone in the DPP office think it was hilarious to have Irene changed to Inane?

Overall, this unacceptable statement gives the appearance of being two statements being redacted, then photocopied, then stapled together. This is how justice was pursued in Tasmania. *No official gave a damn, it was only Martin Bryant.*

⁴⁸ Given Craig spoke with a *Jamie*, which is what her statement is primarily about, why was she not approached and asked to listen to the recorded voice allegedly of the same *Jamie*? Perhaps she was not asked because those phone conversation recordings involved another *Jamie*. The whole matter of those recordings, and the *Jamies*, and who identified who can only be described with the adjective corrupt. There was the cruel witness Cordwell who said he listened to 20 seconds of audio tape and identified the voice of Martin Bryant even though Cordwell had not spoken to Martin for **17 years**, since he was physically immature with a boy's voice. Petra Willmott heard more audio tape, but no related details were provided to her. Petra was then young and immature herself. Corrupt cops could have told her anything and she probably would have believed it. The one person who should have been asked to identify Martin's voice, his good mother Carleen Bryant, was never asked to do so by the police. In the Port Arthur case, the recordings, the audio tapes, the transcripts, and the identifications are all questionable. There is doubt there, heaps of **reasonable doubt**. But the cops, the DPP, and the judge ignored the many facts that did not fit the official narrative. Martin Bryant was the patsy. He was **set up**. He was sentenced to **life in prison without parole** regardless of all the **reasonable doubt**.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **CROMER**, Denise Heather
DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)
CONCERNS: "We were on the board walk at the rear of the penitentiary we heard a number of shots fired, most in quick succession. [*sic*] At first we both thought it was some kind of re-enactment. We looked across the bay in the direction of the café." & "Although we were up above the buses we had a clear view of the area but it was a considerable distance away." & "I saw a person fall beside the buses as the shots continued and I noticed three people lying on the ground near the rear of the buses." & "A yellow vehicle pulled out from in front of the café. **It had two surfboards on it** and it headed out of the park."

COMMENT: This witness was not the only witness to say she/he saw a yellow vehicle/Volvo, drive away with **two surfboards** on roof racks. This does not fit with the official narrative, but it does fit with the descriptions given by other witnesses.

WITNESS: **CROSSWELL**, Peter David
DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)
CONCERNS: "At this point a male person stood up. He yelled out something like 'No No Not Here.' I then saw the gunman shoot this guy in the head." & "I didn't move but I could see his sandshoes across the floor." & "I then saw a yellow car of some description leave the car park."

WITNESS: **CROSSWELL**, Peter David
DATE: 1 July 1996 (**63 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: "...long shoulder length blonde hair." & "I do however remember that he was carrying a long bag when he came into the restaurant. The bag appeared to be heavy." & "I have been shown a photograph identification board by Detective GHEDINI which consisted of thirty (30) photographs of male persons. I am unable to identify any of these males as being responsible for the shootings in side the Broad Arrow Café."

COMMENT: This witness was wounded inside the café. To his credit and that of witnesses Pamela (*sic*) Law and Thelma Walker who were with Crosswell, none of them identified Martin Bryant as the gunman. It would have been easy for them to say it was Martin. They all saw the gunman, but they said the truth – they did not see Martin Bryant. **Thank you.** The person this witness saw get shot inside the cafe, the person who called out "No No Not Here," is believed to be Anthony Nightingale, a suspected intelligence agent. (see *NAME INDEX*)

WITNESS: **DAVISS** (*sic*), Bernard Joseph
DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)
CONCERNS: "I looked up from the floor and saw a blonde man [*sic*] walk to a yellow/mustard coloured car. At the car he went to the boot of the car and then the driver's side." & "After a short lull I looked up and saw this blonde man [*sic*] running back towards the yellow car. He got in the driver's seat, reversed and then drove off towards the entrance."

*In the case of
Port Arthur,
the public got
immediate answers
– but not the truth.*

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "The male was about 5'4"-5" tall" & "He had **blonde, shoulder length, straight hair.**" & "The vehicle was a mustard/yellow four door sedan." & "I don't recall seeing a surfboard on the car."

COMMENT: This witness was in one of the buses, and on at least two occasions he looked down and over at the yellow car used by the gunman. Again, he looked **down onto the yellow car** and if there had been a surfboard on that vehicle this witness must have seen it. But Daviess says nothing about a surfboard.

The witness says the gunman had **shoulder length, straight hair.** But Martin Bryant never had shoulder-length straight hair. His mother attests to this. So do people who knew him. Even before and during the incident when his hair was longer, it only reached his collar and it was naturally wavy. It was not straight. There is no image, photograph, or memory of him ever having hair that long it hung straight down to his shoulders. Because Martin had blond hair and it was longer than normal, it has been used to condemn him. Officials want to take all the statements that fit their narrative and ignore all those that don't. But this is unacceptable. *Witness Statements* are not to be discarded or discounted because they tell a story which is not compatible with some official narrative. Officials are **not permitted** to pick and choose through the evidence as they wish – but this is exactly what they did in this case.

WITNESS: **DAVIESS** (*sic*), Betty Grace

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I observed the male person with the long blond hair walk from the area of the café towards a yellow car. I saw him carrying a green sportsbag. The male seemed to be walking fairly casually." & "The male then went to the boot of the **yellow vehicle** which was only small. He went to the boot of the vehicle and put the sportsbag in."⁴⁹ & "I then saw him grab a rifle from the boot of the **vehicle**, the rifle had a telescopic sight on top of it. The male person then ran towards the buses where we were." & "I then saw him walk back towards the **yellow car** and go to the boot. He then went to the driver's side and entered the **car,**" & "I then saw the male drive off in the **yellow car** by himself away from the ferry area."

WITNESS: **DAVIESS** (*sic*), Betty Grace

DATE: 21 July 1996 (**84 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I was shown a plan of the Broad Arrow Cafe by Detective RANGER of the Port Adelaide C.I.B. [Criminal Investigation Branch] After having looked at the plan of the cafe, I remember that Martin BRYANT was sitting on the last seat on the balcony outside the cafe."

COMMENT: This witness watched the gunman from inside one of the buses (Trans Otway) parked in front of the café. Three times she identified the gunman at a yellow car/vehicle, but not once did she say she saw a surfboard on that car/vehicle. And the witness would have been looking down onto the top of that vehicle, so a surfboard would have been highly noticeable.

⁴⁹ Another of many witnesses who saw the gunman walk out of the Broad Arrow Café carrying a sportsbag and **place it in the rear/boot** of a yellow vehicle/Volvo parked near the buses. He had left another bag inside the café to incriminate Martin Bryant of 30 Clare Street, New Town.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Like other witnesses, Daviess watched the gunman put a sportsbag into the boot of that yellow car, a bag which he carried back from the café. And the police *training video* reveals the gunman also left a sportsbag inside the café to **incriminate Martin Bryant**.

Then out of the blue, **84 days after the incident** this witness went (voluntarily?) to a police station in South Australia and there spoke as if she knew without any doubt whatsoever that the gunman was Martin Bryant. As we know, the media had been saturating the public with images and stories about Martin being the *lone-nut* gunman. But none of those assertions have ever been proved to be based on truth. In her statement of two small paragraphs given nearly three months after the incident, this witness writes the names "Martin BRYANT" and "BRYANT" **seven times**. The way this short statement is worded, it seems that the witness was told by the detective that the gunman was Martin, then the witness was asked to identify where she thought Martin Bryant sat at the café.

There are no words in this later statement about identifying Martin Bryant or how he was officially identified as the gunman. It is just Martin BRYANT this, and Martin BRYANT that at the Broad Arrow Café. Never forget, some witnesses are easily intimidated and/or highly gullible. Note there is **no** corroborating statement/words from the husband of this witness – Bernard Joseph Daviess.

WITNESS: **DIAMANTIS**, Spiros

DATE: 17 June 1996 (**50 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Between 9:45 a.m. and 10 a.m. I was working behind the counter when a male person with blonde hair came into the supermarket [at Sorell] carrying a large bag in his left hand." & "He crouched down and picked up a bottle of **tomato sauce**...." & "When he got to the counter he paid for the tomato sauce...." & "On Monday the 29 April I saw the photograph on the front page of the Mercury of the male who was allegedly responsible for the Port Arthur shootings."

COMMENT: This is one of the many statements which disproves the assertion that a professional investigation was conducted. It took the cops **50 days**, over seven weeks, to get a statement from a significant person in the case who was easily accessible at Sorell, which is on a main arterial highway just 26 kilometres from police headquarters in Hobart and 74 kilometres from Port Arthur.

Ask yourself why Martin Bryant would have stopped at Sorell early on a Sunday morning to buy a bottle of tomato sauce, and **only a bottle of tomato sauce**. At that time, no one is exactly sure where Martin was but he said he went to Roaring Beach and went surfing. He had **no need for tomato sauce** at the beach. (Maybe he bought it for the barbecue the cops had at Taranna?)

During the interrogation (4 July) conducted by two cops (Paine & Warren) at Risdon Prison, Martin was asked about tomato sauce. He denied buying it. He asked those two mighty inspectors: "Why would I want tomato sauce for?" The cops had no answer. And bizarrely, this tomato sauce is not mentioned again in the case. The bottle purchased, by the real gunman it seems, never appears as evidence. This little bit of sauce buying at some mini-market in Sorell was a marker, part of the official set-up of Martin.

*That
Martin Bryant
owned a
yellow vehicle
does not prove
he killed anyone.*

Within the official literature, there is not even a proper detailed description of the surfboard allegedly owned by Martin Bryant – to the State, that he owned one was enough to lock him up forever.

Someone looking a little like Martin left a trail of purchases along the highway and they were all attributed to Martin. It was important there be a trail left behind by a long-haired male with a big bag. And this is what happened. (Why would anyone carry a big bag into a shop to buy a bottle of tomato sauce? The normal thing to do would be to leave that bag in your locked vehicle.)

The last comment by this witness confirms that commencing Monday 29 April, images of Martin Bryant appeared which encouraged the public to identify him as *the killer, the murderer, the monster*, and other things, were being broadcast around Australia and internationally. **Martin was doomed without a trial.** In Australia, it is illegal to broadcast related details when a case is *sub judice* – meaning when the case will be or is before a court. But no media outlet in Tasmania, or anywhere in Australia, was ever charged with that crime which was perpetrated freely across the country by media outlets. It was part of the set-up to demonizing Martin Bryant, to get Australians to hate him. And it succeeded.

WITNESS: **DUTTON**, James David

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I saw a yellow Volvo sedan with the **surfboards** on top with one male driver. I noticed this because of the **surfboards** and the weather...." & "I also could see a male walking back and forwards with a rifle to his chest and held at a horizontal position." & "He was wearing a **brown jacket**."

COMMENT: Here we have a yellow Volvo with surfboards (plural). And this plural form is used twice. Another yellow Volvo was seen at the historic site. (see P. Cooper, A. Law) Did one of these surfboards end up on another Volvo? This should have been addressed during a trial, but there was **no trial**. The witness seems to have described the gunman aiming the firearm using the sight on it. This is significant as officials placed great attention on rapid firing from the hip leading to a high fatality number. This suited their desire of getting self-loading firearms banned. But several witnesses said the gunman sighted the rifle from the (right) shoulder and fired methodically and intentionally. Finally, note the witness says the gunman wore a **brown jacket** – another of the many colours identified.

WITNESS: **DUTTON**, Joanne Helene

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I would describe him as in his mid 20s, slim build, white blonde **hair below shoulder length**." & "He appeared right handed." & "I believe he was wearing a **grey flannel jumper**, he had long pants on."

COMMENT: Again, another witness says the gunman had long hair. And not just long hair, but **hair below shoulder length**. So again, it must be stated that Martin Bryant NEVER had his hair that long and at the time of the incident his hair was collar-length. The gunman was right-handed, as this witness confirms. Several witnesses have said this. But when it came to using a rifle, Martin Bryant fired from his left shoulder, and he showed the police how he did it. A grey flannel jumper is one more colour and style of clothing which witnesses have described.

FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT
Officer Making Statement Michael (Mick) Charles Dyson

A police statement is a vital piece of evidence and as such is required by the various protocols to be made as soon as possible after the event so as to ensure that information is not lost through loss of memory. Police also use as much corroborative evidence as they can find to back up their statement, and endorse their required *impartial* observations. Police are also trained to be observant and precise, for example when in pursuit of an offending vehicle, they wouldn't state that they were chasing a motor car. They would be precise, they would state that they were in pursuit of, for example only, a black Holden Monaro, with large Mag[nesium] wheels, and with three people on board. They would state the location, direction and speed of the vehicle, and any other information such as the registration number that would assist in the apprehension of the offender(s).

However, **policemen have also been known to tell lies, to fabricate evidence, and to exploit the ignorance of the normal civilian.** With all of this in mind, it is extremely interesting to disseminate exactly what sergeant Michael Charles Dyson of the Tasmania Police says in his police statement in regard to his duties during the Port Arthur massacre. Dyson begins his statement in the normal manner with:

"My full name is Michael Charles Dyson. I am a Sergeant in the Tasmania Police attached to the Protective Security Section at Hobart."

Now this is the required protocol. We have his name, rank and unit within the Tasmania Police Force. However, let us now compare this with signing off and the adoption of this police statement:

"M C DYSON Acting Inspector 12/9/96"

Now a policeman has only one rank. He can be promoted and he can occasionally be demoted, but he can never hold two ranks at the same time. This is rather **sloppy police work.** One may suppose that Dyson was at the time of the Port Arthur massacre, a sergeant, and then at the time of making this statement, he had been promoted to the rank of "Acting Inspector," but this statement is neither clear nor precise.

Now look at the time that Michael Charles Dyson, be he a sergeant or an acting inspector adopted this statement. This statement was adopted by Dyson on the 12th September 1996, **4½ months [139 days]** after the incident. Now this is not only extremely sloppy, but it is the first sign that this statement is a **fabrication.** In any normal court procedure, this statement by Dyson would be **thrown out as completely unreliable.**

However there is another piece of information that tells us even more. After the Port Arthur massacre, Tasmania Police set up the "Port Arthur Taskforce" under the direction of superintendent Jack Johnston to collect all available evidence and statements and to forward this information to the Tasmanian DPP (Director of Public Prosecutions), Mr Damian Bugg.

In a memo put out by Jack Johnston on the 14th August 1996, he stated that all the evidence had been collated and forwarded to the DPP's office, and that the task force would be stood down on the 18th August, 1996.

(cont.)

In other words, Dyson's statement was made almost a **month after** all the available evidence had been forwarded to the DPP's Office, which simply means that Dyson's statement would have been made at the request of the DPP **to cover some anomaly within the police evidence**. With this in mind, let us look at the next portion of Dyson's statement:

"On Sunday the 28th April 1996 I was recalled to duty at about 6pm. I attended the Hobart Police Headquarters and was assigned duties as the Criminal Investigation and Intelligence Liaison Officer at the Major Incident Room [MIR]."

Now for those who did not know, Dyson was the Tasmania Police's highest trained SOG (Special Operations Group) Officer. When an event such as the Port Arthur massacre occurred, one would have expected that Dyson would have been very high on the list of those to be called in for duty, and that would have occurred prior to 2:00 p.m. For Dyson to claim that he wasn't recalled to duty **until 4½ hours after the massacre**, is not believable. Dyson, a man of action then states that he was given the nondescript duties as a liaison officer in the MIR. This statement though does not correlate with his next statement. A liaison officer liaises, he/she does not enter the fray. Dyson's next statement is:

"About 11.00pm, in the company of Detective Constable Simon CLAYTON and Detective Constable RUSSELL, I went to 7 Maritana Place, Claremont where I spoke to Mrs Carleen BRYANT and Miss Petra WILLMOTT. Mrs Bryant said that she was the mother of Martin Bryant and Miss WILLMOTT said that she was the girlfriend of Martin BRYANT. As a result of the conversation I went to 30 Clare Street in Newtown." [* should be Berriedale]*

As already stated, liaison officers do not enter the fray, they liaise and thus we must wonder why Dyson accompanied two detectives to Mrs Bryant's home. However, let's look at the corroborative evidence as per Mrs Carleen Bryant, as per *Martin Bryant's Mother Speaks Out* (members.iinet.net.au)

"Life then continued as normally as possible until 8 p.m. on the evening of 28 April 1996 when two burly plain-clothes police officers knocked on her door in Hobart and asked 'Do you have a son called Martin Bryant?' When Carleen said yes, the officers took her down to headquarters and bombarded her 'with questions about Martin's big house in Newtown and his trips overseas'."

Carleen Bryant says emphatically that she was visited by detectives at 8 p.m., **three hours before Dyson states he visited Carleen Bryant's home.**

Now to detour slightly. You may wonder as to how the Tasmania Police came to be aware of Carleen Bryant, when her son Martin had no police record. The answer is that detective Peter Hesman who was dropped off* at PAHS found [allegedly] Martin Bryant's passport in the glovebox of a Volvo sedan [allegedly]. Not only did the passport contain a photograph of Martin Bryant, and a full history of his overseas travels, but it also contained the name and address of Martin Bryant's next of kin; his mother. [* Why was only one cop dropped off given scores of people had been shot? Why was it Hesman? Etc.]

Now the next piece of corroborative evidence comes from a statement of Petra Willmott, taken by detective Fiona Russell at police headquarters at 11:45 p.m. on 28 April 1996, and finished on 29 April 1996:

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

"Martin's mother (Carlene) rang me straight after the news and said that she was worried about Martin as she couldn't reach him on the phone. I told Carlene that I was worried too. Carlene asked me if I wanted to stay the night. My father drove me to Carlene's house in Berriedale.

When I arrived at Carlene's house, she said there was no need to worry, she thinks Martin has gone to Melbourne. He has apparently done this before and rang Carlene when he got over there. I hoped Carlene was right but asked her if she wanted to go over to his house to make sure. Carlene said she didn't want to as Martin doesn't like people snooping through his things. We just sat down for a while and then the police arrived."

The first thing we note is that the incorrect spelling of Carleen Bryant's first name occurs in both the statement prepared by Russell and the statement of Dyson.

Again it is the police protocols that tell us what would have happened, and Carleen Bryant is quite correct in what she has stated. When the Tasmania Police obtained the evidence from the passport of Martin Bryant that was [allegedly] found by Hesman in [allegedly] Bryant's Volvo at the tollbooth, the information would have been passed to police headquarters in Hobart. Two detectives would then have been dispatched to Carleen Bryant's address, and once they established the relationship between the supposed gunman, Martin Bryant, his mother and his girlfriend, Petra Willmott, then the detectives would have *invited* both ladies to accompany them to police headquarters where they would have been separated and interviewed in an endeavour to find out just who and what Martin Bryant was.

Now this interviewing would have taken quite a long time because the detectives would have been working with extremely limited knowledge of Martin Bryant. This is why Carleen Bryant mentions the questions asked were mainly about the Clare Street residence, Martin Bryant's overseas trips, and the information contained in his passport.

Now once the interviewing detective, and in the case of Petra Willmott, it was detective constable Fiona M. Russell, No. 1902, had obtained sufficient information and completely understood just how much the interviewee knew, then and only then would they begin to prepare a written statement, which is why Petra Willmott's statement didn't start until 11:45 p.m., even though she had been in police custody since about 8:00 p.m.

Now another thing that the Tasmania Police would not want, would be for Carleen Bryant to remove herself from their control and jeopardise their investigation. Mrs Bryant would not have been permitted to leave police headquarters, and when the police had finished with Mrs Bryant, she would have been returned to her residence along with Petra Willmott. This is the normal procedure when interviewing witnesses.

There is one other vital piece of police procedures. When Carleen Bryant and Petra Willmott were taken to Hobart and into police headquarters, the MIR would have been informed. In other words, had sergeant Dyson been the liaison officer, then he would have been informed immediately that Mrs Bryant and Miss Willmott had been taken to police headquarters. We now have a major reason to believe that Dyson's statement above is **not factual** in regards to this point. Dyson then states: **(cont.)**

"As a result of the conversation I went to 30 Clare Street in Newtown."

Even though this statement is **not factual**, it is still an extremely sloppy piece of police work. The conversation referred to by Dyson could not have taken place as Mrs. Bryant at that time was at police headquarters. Dyson's statement here should have been: "As a result of this conversation, in the company of other police officers, Mrs Bryant, Miss Willmott and I then went to 30 Clare Street in Newtown." Again this statement is **not factual**. Dyson's next statement is:

"Mrs BRYANT had a key to that address in her possession and using that key she opened the rear door of the house. An alarm was activated in the process of entering the house but was deactivated by Mrs BRYANT".

Since Carleen Bryant was still at police headquarters, this statement must also be viewed as **not factual**. However it does raise a point of interest. If Dyson was at some stage able to enter the residence at 30 Clare Street, Newtown, what is the possibility that he had possession of a key to the back door, and knowledge of how to deactivate the burglar alarm? Dyson's next statement is:

"As a result of a telephone conversation from the Major Incident Room I had a conversation with Mrs BRYANT and Miss WILLMOTT concerning Martin BRYANT. This conversation took place in the kitchen area and it was at this time I noticed a large quantity of photographs on the kitchen table. I asked Miss WILLMOTT who the photographs belonged to and she said they belonged to her and Martin."

So now Dyson tells us that he has both Carleen Bryant and Petra Willmott with him at 30 Clare Street, Newtown, at the very same time that detective constable Fiona M. Russell has begun to take a statement from Petra Willmott at police headquarters. **This statement is not factual**. Dyson's next statement is:

"I obtained permission to look at the photographs to which Miss WILLMOTT agreed. Having looked at the photographs I selected one and asked Miss WILLMOTT if it would be all right if I borrowed that photograph to take to Police Headquarters to help the Police at Port Arthur to identify Martin if and when he was found. Both Mrs BRYANT and Miss WILLMOTT agreed."

As with the previous statement by Dyson, **this statement also cannot be factual**, but it does raise another interesting point when compared with a statement made by the Tasmania Police media liaison officer Geoff Easton in his report to the EMA (Emergency Management Australia):

"On the Tuesday morning [30 April 1996] the public were greeted by the front page of The Mercury newspaper that showed a picture of Martin Bryant claiming: 'This is the man!' The effect of this was to receive a barrage of calls from the media all claiming foul! and how I had favoured the local newspaper by providing them with a picture of Bryant. With my heart in my mouth I raced to the MIR and with relief found that none of the photographs we had, corresponded with the one in the Mercury. It certainly hadn't come from us."

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

So what Easton was telling the EMA was that the Tasmania Police had possession of the majority of those photographs from the kitchen table, but they didn't have possession of the photograph that was printed by the Hobart Mercury Newspaper, and the question must be asked: "Was the photograph mentioned by Dyson, which he claimed to have taken possession of, the same photograph that later appeared on the front page of the Hobart newspaper, and a majority of Rupert Murdoch owned newspapers throughout Australia?" [It seems so.] The next statement of Dyson is:

"I then informed Mrs BRYANT and Miss WILLMOTT if they would be prepared to go to the Police Station with Constable RUSSELL to assist the Police in their inquiries regarding the situation at Port Arthur and both agreed to do so. I handed Constable RUSSELL the photograph and asked her to deliver it to the Major Incident Room and she then left with the two ladies."

Again this statement **cannot be factual** as at the same time this incident is supposed to be taking place, detective constable Fiona M. Russell is taking a statement from Petra Willmott at police headquarters. Here I would like to raise two points:

1. Sergeant Dyson's statement started with simply himself travelling from Mrs Bryant's residence at 7 Maritana Place, Berriedale, to 30 Clare Street, Newtown. Dyson then introduced Mrs Bryant to open the back door and to turn off the burglar alarm. Dyson then introduced Petra Willmott to receive permission to *borrow* just one of the photographs left on the kitchen table. And then finally, Dyson introduced Constable Russell to return Mrs Bryant, Petra Willmott and *the photograph* back to police headquarters and the MIR. As I said previously, this is very sloppy police work, and demonstrates that this part of the statement is a **total fabrication**.

2. It is also becoming quite obvious that Dyson is working from a copy of Petra Willmott's statement taken by Russell, with that statement being initiated at 11:45 p.m. However, there is no mention of the detectives involved with Mrs Bryant, due to one very simple fact; Carleen Bryant refused to make a police statement on the night in question. Now had this been a *police matter*, then Dyson would have had access to all police activities on that night. But he didn't. He has only used documents forwarded to the DPP's Office, and this means that **Dyson has produced this statement at the request of Damian Bugg**. Dyson's next statement is:

"I then contacted the Major Incident Room and advised them of the action I had taken to that point in time and I asked that a warrant to search for firearms under the Guns Act 1991 be obtained and brought to 30 Clare Street."

All of this action was being taken by the *liaison officer* from the MIR. In other words this statement is again **not factual**. Had sergeant Dyson had Petra Willmott in his company, then he could have asked her for permission to search, and Petra Willmott would have felt intimidated by the events to grant that permission. Dyson's next statement is:

"At 12.30am, Detective Constable Andrew McKenzie arrived at the residence and handed me a search warrant which I read and found to relate to that address and that I was named in the warrant as authorised to search the premises for firearms."

(cont.)

This sentence simply describes the procedures that police are required to go through when they receive a warrant. However, look at the time. Dyson's statement in regard to this episode starts at 11:00 p.m. with his attendance at Mrs. Bryant's residence at Claremont, where there is a brief interview. Then there is the move to 30 Clare Street, Newtown, the entry into that residence, the finding of the photographs, the various telephone calls to the MIR, the final call requesting the required *Search Warrant* which would then require a policeman to prepare that warrant, and then approach the required signatory for the signature that creates the actual warrant, a procedure that normally takes at least one hour. Thus it is the time factor that tells us that **this statement is not factual.**

There is however another source of information in regard to the police search of the Clare Street residence that is in the public domain, and that is the interview by the ABC's Judy Tierney of Hobart with the Tasmanian government's forensic psychiatrist, Dr. Ian Sale. The relevant part of that interview is:

TIERNEY: You went to Martin Bryant's house late on that day. What did you see there that could give you some idea of what you were doing there?

SALE: Right, going to a person's house is often very revealing of a person's personality. There was also some hope, maybe of finding some thing that would indicate his intentions, his motivation, so I went out to his house, I think it was about 10 o'clock when I went to the house with police.

SALE: For example, there was a room where some magazines on firearms and ammunition were found, but there were only about two chairs in the entire room and it was quite a contrast say to some of the bedrooms where you could hardly move about, there was so much in them.

TIERNEY: Was there any evidence of ammunition or guns there?

SALE: There were wrappers to firearms and ammunition found in a sort of scullery room.

Now the police search that Sale took part in was led by the inspector Ross Paine, and again was at the time when both Carleen Bryant and Petra Willmott were safely out of the way at police headquarters. This search would also have taken some time, and thus had Dyson's statement been correct, then Dyson would have entered the residence at Clare Street whilst Paine's search was still in process. This did not happen. Also, a *Search Warrant* is normally made out in the name of the person in charge of the search, and so had a *Search Warrant* been properly made out it would have been in the name of inspector Ross Paine, not sergeant Michael Charles Dyson.

There is now another problem. Dyson tells us that the photographs of Martin Bryant were on the kitchen table. Now no matter how sloppy any police search is, they wouldn't have missed those photographs, and Paine would have seized the entire collection of Martin Bryant photographs, which is confirmed by the statement of the police media liaison officer, Geoff Easton.

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

We now know that the source of the photograph of Martin Bryant that appeared in the Hobart Mercury newspaper and other Murdoch publications had to have emanated from the Police MIR. When Easton stated, "I raced to the MIR and with relief found that none of the photographs we had, corresponded with the one in the Mercury. It certainly hadn't come from us," we know that this statement is **incorrect**. Had somebody passed the photograph to The Mercury journalists, then the photograph would definitely be missing. **For sloppy liars**, Dyson is in good company. His next statement is:

"During the search of the premises, I located a locked safe in an upstairs cupboard and a locked cupboard under the stairs on the ground level. I sought assistance from Jacksons Locksmiths to gain entry to the safe and cupboard."

Now this is the first piece of information that suggests a locked safe and a locked cupboard within Bryant's Clare Street residence. However that does not mean that this information is incorrect. The problem with this statement is that the locksmith from Jacksons Locksmiths **totally repudiates** [rejects the validity of] any suggestion that his company was involved in a search of the Clare Street premises on the 29th April 1996. Dyson's next statement is:

"In the safe I found:

- *.308 calibre rifle ammunition*
- *.223 calibre rifle ammunition*
- *A document purporting to be a last will and testament of Martin Bryant*
- *And other personal papers"*

Again, this is **extremely sloppy police work**. What was the quantity of ammunition found within the safe? How was the ammunition packed; was it loose or was it in boxes? Where is the corroborating evidence to support this claim? There is none, and thus this statement is open to attack that the **ammunition was placed within the safe by Dyson himself**. His next statement is:

"In the cupboard I found:

- *A plastic grocery bag containing several hundred rounds of .308 rifle ammunition*
- *Two rifle cases*
- *One .223 calibre leader semi automatic rifle*
- *A quantity of .223 ammunition"*

A plastic bag containing several hundred rounds of .308 ammunition? Too many to count I suppose, and thus also too many for a plastic bag to contain as such a load would definitely cause the plastic bag to rip. This sentence is **not factual**. Again an unknown quantity of .223 ammunition. Was it two or two thousand items of .223 ammunition? Again there is no description of how the ammunition was found, be it loose or be it in boxes. **This is extremely sloppy for a policeman with Dyson's experience.**

Then we have the two rifle cases and the .223 calibre leader semi-automatic rifle, but in what condition was the rifle found? Did it have a magazine fitted to it? Was it by itself or in its own rifle case? Let us compare this statement with what sergeant Gerard Dutton, the Tasmania Police ballistics expert [alleged] states in his police statement:

(cont.)

"**32.** Also on 3 May 1996, I received the following exhibits from Detective Keygan of Hobart CIB:

(98) A grey gun case.

(99) A black gun case containing a 12-gauge cleaning kit, a .30 calibre cleaning kit, & 2 plastic bags.

(101) A box containing 658 .308 calibre cartridges [twenty two of these cartridges were used for test purposes]; a Daewoo shotgun booklet, a white roll of fabric, a plastic container, 2 keys, a canvas gun case, one box of 12-gauge cartridges. (Box labelled in part, "30 Claire St, New Town." sic)

(104) A patterned gun case containing a .223 cal. Australian Automatic Arms (AAA) self loading rifle, serial number SAR020236, minus the magazine."

What we have here are four gun cases one in each of the itemised lists, including (104) which was a patterned gun case containing the .223 rifle. For Dyson to have claimed he found this rifle in the locked cupboard, then he would have had to have opened the patterned gun case to find the rifle inside. Thus the only explanation that can be drawn from these statements is that **Dyson has lied.**

Now let us look at the plastic shopping bag containing 'several hundred' .308 ammunition. Gerard Dutton's statement lists:

"**42.** On the 21 June 1996, I received from Sergeant Eastwood of the Port Arthur Task Force, the following exhibits:

(154) A plastic bag containing forty one .223 Rem. calibre cartridges. (In a paper bag labelled in part, "Collected from u/stairs b/room No.4 (piano).")

This was the only exhibit from Dutton that involved ammunition in a plastic bag. The several hundred is now 41 rounds and the .308 is now .223 ammunition. Dyson's next statement is:

"In the pantry I found on the top shelves:

- Two empty hand cuff packets
- One packing wrapper with manufacturers drawing of a Smith & Wesson revolver on it
- Two expended .308 calibre bullet cases
- Two expended .223 calibre bullet cases"

Why would anybody place two empty handcuff packets on the top shelf of their pantry? The most natural place to put such items would be in the rubbish bin, which is why police nearly always search the contents of the rubbish bins when conducting searches for illegal items. Again any proper description of these two handcuff packets is missing. The brand name is normally emblazoned on the packet, and as the DPP's assistant Nick Perks tells us that the handcuffs were Smith & Wesson. Thus, we now know that the packets would have that name clearly marked, and that any experienced policeman would never miss such a simple description.

The packing wrapper tells us much more again, and reinforces the question as to why the handcuff brand was not stated. Now although the wrapper is corroborated by Sale's statement that "wrappers" were found in "a sort of scullery room," the actual wrapper was for a Smith & Wesson handgun, and Martin Bryant never owned nor used any type of handgun,

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

let alone a Smith & Wesson handgun. The only logical conclusion that can be drawn here is that **this evidence had to have been planted**. Dyson's next statement is:

"I contacted the Intelligence Officer at Police Headquarters and passed on the information I had found. The items were left near where they were found to be seized by the Criminal Investigation Branch."

I beg your pardon? A *Search Warrant* is a **search and seize** warrant. Once the policeman acting within the conditions of his *Search Warrant* finds items within that warrant, he is required to take possession of those items and produce them to a Court of Law, where the magistrate or judge then has the final say on their legality. What Dyson is stating here, most explicitly is that **he has planted this evidence for the CIB to find**. For Dyson to claim that he only found these items within Bryant's Clare Street residence is irrelevant, as Dyson has no corroborative evidence to back his claims. Dyson's next statement is:

"Some time later, Constable HARTHILL arrived at the residence. He was shown where the items had been located and he was required to remain at the residence to maintain security on the evidence. I returned to the Major Incident Room and continued duty there."

There is no doubt that Harthill arrived at Martin Bryant's residence at 30 Clare Street, New Town, to provide security for those premises. However Dyson cannot shirk his responsibilities in relation to his *Search Warrant* by simply passing those responsibilities onto somebody unnamed within that warrant. But even if that was the case, then Harthill would then be required to remain with the property seized under the *Search Warrant* until such time as the CIB arrived at 30 Clare Street, New Town, on the 3rd May 1996.

It appears Dyson is suggesting that Harthill remained on duty at Clare Street from the early morning of the 29th. April 1996 until the 3rd May 1996, when he was finally relieved by the Hobart CIB. I don't think so. This statement is **not factual**.

From the information given by Sale, we are made aware of the first police search of Bryant's Clare Street property led by Ross Paine at about 10:00 p.m. on the 28th April 1996. We are also aware that **there was no evidence found of firearms or ammunition**. Dyson then makes his statement that he searched the premises at 12:30 a.m. on the 29th April 1996, and found several items of incriminating evidence which he then left in a different position to be found by the Hobart CIB when they made their search of the same premises on the 3rd May 1996.

The differences in each of these three *searches* is remarkable and defies logic in every way except for the conclusion that most of the *evidence* found at 30 Clare Street had to have been planted there by police, and we have **Dyson's admission that it was he who planted much of that evidence**. It is thus worthwhile for the reader to compare the statements of sergeant Michael Charles Dyson with the relevant portion of the *Statutory Declaration* made by sergeant Gerard Dutton. The anomalies will astound you.

Lloyd T. Vance, Steve Johnson (eds.)
in *The truth about Port Arthur*
scribd.com
28 April 2012
(amended; added emphasis)

*The behaviour of
the two Buckleys
does not make
sense
– it should have
been addressed
during a trial.*

NAME: **EDWARD**, June Margaret
DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)
CONCERNS: "We drove to the Gatehouse [tollbooth/gate] where we intended to get a pass for the Historic Site. The woman in the Gatehouse told us that she believed a man was running around with a gun. The lady told us to go for a drive back in the direction that we had come. We were told to come back in about half an hour." & "We could see down into the park over a slight crest. I saw a male person from about his knees up. The male was wearing a **bone coloured coat**, he had **blonde shoulder length hair**. I didn't see his face, I'm not sure how old he was. I saw that he was carrying a gun, that was quite large, it had a long barrel and a long fat barrel underneath. I then saw the male turn side on and point the gun at a woman and a young girl. I then saw both bodies drop to the ground. The male kept coming." & "Two New Zealanders who were also at the Gatehouse ran and jumped in the rear of our vehicle and we drove back up the road approximately 100 yards to a shop." & "The man was arguing, he didn't want to get in. The gunman was forcing him back towards the boot and then managed to get him in the boot and slammed it."

COMMENT: A bone-coloured jacket is just another colour and style of clothing allegedly worn by the gunman. In the Dutton statements above, there is another description for the gunman's outer clothing, as well as a similar description for his hair. **Shoulder length** and **below shoulder length** is not hair reaching the collar, which is the hairstyle Martin Bryant had on the 28 April 1996. It is interesting to note that Edward, who was standing on the other side of the road, described the boot lid being "slammed." But this is not what the witness Kyle Spruce saw and he was at the store watching. He said: "The blonde male then started to pull the boot down, when he just stopped." It seems he partially lowered the boot lid with the man (Glenn Pears) inside, but did not fully close it.

The most significant part of this statement is the reference the witness makes to the: "Two New Zealanders who were also at the Gatehouse." This statement corroborates what those two New Zealanders (allegedly), Debra Jane and Thomas Mark **Buckley**, said in their statements.

But then it becomes bizarre. If those Buckleys were at the gatehouse/tollbooth, why did they run to the Edwards' vehicle? The Buckleys had their own car with them right there. They said they had parked it at the gatehouse so they could ask the site employee what was happening. Mr. Buckley said they parked their "Red Commodore" behind the gold-coloured BMW, which was outside the gatehouse. Both vehicles were facing out of the site, toward the highway which was just a short escape-distance away.

So why would the Buckleys have abandoned their own vehicle and approached the vehicle of someone and ask to be driven away? The Buckleys did not know this witness or her husband Keith. The logical thing for the Buckleys to have done was get back into their own Commodore, then drive directly out of the site and speed away. That was the logical thing to do, but it did not happen. **Why?**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **EDWARDS**, Carmel Veronica

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "[H]e replied but I can only recall him saying, 'I've been surfing all day.'" & "I knew I could [not?] go outside because I heard two shots come from the direction of the back of the building, nothing for a while, then some more shots from further away, so I assumed he had left the area." & "I would describe the male person as being about 5'8" tall, **straight shoulder length blond hair**, about 22-23 years old, clean shaven, slight to medium build and he looked fairly fit."

COMMENT: That Sunday morning prior the shooting at the historic site, several actions took place. They were set up to convey to the public that the gunman was Martin Bryant. (see the following table *YELLOW VOLVO ALLEGED STOPS*) These devious actions took place along the Arthur Highway and left a trail of sightings which unthinking people quickly interpreted as confirmation Martin Bryant was the gunman. The same thing happened again at the Broad Arrow Café. A gunman, with some similar characteristics (build, hair) as Martin, arrived there. The witness Edwards said that she heard him say: "I've been surfing all day."⁵⁰ Another **marker** as Martin Bryant was associated with surfing due to a surfboard (singular) he carried on his vehicle. Note there is no proof that the yellow Volvo with the surfboard(s) seen at the historic site belonged to Martin Bryant.

And there was the bumping together of the gunman with a witness (T. Sloan), and his words about wasps/WASPS, and about the parking problem he had. All so café customers would note him and recall the (gun)man with long blond hair with the big sports-bag. All these little actions/events held people's attention, so later they would recall the blond-haired gunman, who planners wanted people to recall as Martin Bryant. This is exactly what happened.

Two things this witness stated are troubling: **i**. She said the gunman had "straight shoulder length" hair. But as we know, Martin did not have hair that long and it was wavy not straight; and, **ii**. She said she: "went back into the main seating area and wandered around the area not knowing what to do." There were dead and wounded people all around but this is not mentioned by the witness.

WITNESS: **EDWARDS**, Ronald Clarence

DATE: 28 July 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I videoed some of what I saw and past it on to a local Uniform Police Officer." (*sic*)

COMMENT: Officials placed emphasis on the James Balasko video. But it is a **fake**. The witness Kevin Wilkinson admits himself that his video "clip" is poor quality and it did not make anything decidedly certain. Whatever happened with the video made by this witness Edwards? Why has it disappeared and not been made public?

Given that PAHS is a location for visiting tourists, and given the day was sunny and clear, there must have been many cameras clicking away on Sunday 28 April. It is reasonable to believe other videos as well as photographs were sent to Tasmania Police. So what are we to believe? Was all that photographic evidence amateurish rubbish, or did it reveal the official narrative is the deception other evidence confirms?

50 During one interrogation, Martin Bryant actually told the two cops involved (Paine & Warren) that on Sunday he went to Roaring Beach (near Nubeena) where he had gone surfing. No specific time duration is mentioned. But it was not all day, or all morning. It seems Martin had gone surfing naked and he said the water was cold. Based on the website surf-forecast.com, April seawater temperature was 10-15 degrees Celsius. But this is irrelevant. The gunman said he had been "surfing all day" to connect him to the surfboard which was on top of a yellow Volvo. Martin Bryant owned a yellow Volvo and he kept his surfboard attached to roof racks on that car. What the gunman was saying is: **I am Martin Bryant**. But this deceptive plan fell to pieces. Witnesses reported seeing another, a **second Volvo**. Witnesses reported seeing a Volvo with **no** surfboard, a Volvo with roof racks but **no** surfboard(s), a Volvo **with** surfboards, etc. Clearly, the *Witness Statements* confirm the official narrative is nonsense concocted as part of the plan to incriminate patsy Martin Bryant in a mass murder which actually was pre-meditated, planned, and perpetrated **by the State**.

WITNESS: **FOGARTY**, Andrew Mark (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "I was the Bellerive Division Uniform Shift Supervisor, at 1:32 p.m. I became aware of a firearm incident which was occurring at the Port Arthur Historic Site. I left the Bellerive Police Station and commenced to drive to Port Arthur." & "Constable HYLAND informed me that he had seen what he believed was a **naked male person** running between the buildings." & "During my time at the incident site I would state that in the order of 200 shots were fired from various caliber weapons."

COMMENT: Fogarty is very specific about the time he heard of the incident, and what he then did. After that, his words are not so precise. He says: "At about 2:00 p.m. I became aware that a vehicle was on fire in the grounds of Sea Scape." For readers, it is not clear whether Fogarty saw that vehicle on fire, or whether he heard about it being on fire. Fogarty's statement is not precise throughout.

Fogarty says Hyland told him that he (Hyland) had seen a "naked male person." But that is not what Hyland himself said. Hyland stated: "This person appeared to have **black hair** and appeared to be naked." And constable Whittle said: "At one stage saw a **female** running around the back yard naked. Yelling and screaming."⁵¹ Fogarty failed to mention the **black hair** and the sex. It suggests Fogarty tried to turn the sighted female into a male.

Police reported large numbers of shots being fired from Seascope. And given the extreme accuracy of the shooting at the Port Arthur Historic Site, and the gunman's total lack of conscience, we must ask: Why is it that **not one cop was shot** at Seascope? Hundreds of shots fired through the trees and leaves, and onto the roadway, but no cop was hit. It very much suggests an **inside job**.

This is what Andrew S. MacGregor has stated about this Fogarty: "[W]hen Constable Allen had seen the gunman and was in a position to shoot the gunman he was denied that opportunity by Sergeant Fogarty. With that denial, we can then assume that any chance of rescuing the hostages, Mrs. Sally Martin who [it seems] was seen alive by Whittle and Hyland...was denied."⁵² This Fogarty seems to have adhered to another **negative agenda**.

WITNESS: **FRANCIS**, Gordon/George Howard

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I saw a male person who was about 50-60 feet from our bus holding a repeater rifle which had a telescopic sight. I would describe this person as being male, with thin features and long blonde hair."

DATE: 3 June 1996 – 10:25 a.m. (**36 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "The person with the rifle appeared to have very blonde hair & male, aged between mid twenties to mid thirties, I'd only be guessing his height, I can't recall his clothing, I think he was clean shaven." (*sic*)

DATE: 3 June 1996 – 11:00 a.m. (**36 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I recognized photograph numbered 5 as the male who was doing all the shooting."

COMMENT: It is questionable that a witness can identify any person with certainty at that distance: 50-60 feet. This witness could (**cont.**)

⁵¹ Of course officials do not want you to know this. In his undated *Witness Statement*, Whittle **does not mention** he saw a naked woman at Seascope late in the afternoon of 28 April 1996 when the siege had been on for hours. If we did not know this Whittle made debriefing notes that Sunday night (11:25 p.m.), then this whole matter might have escaped us. But there in his debriefing notes in black and white he says that he saw: "a **female** running around the back yard naked. Yelling and screaming." Cops who were on the ground near Seascope stated in writing that they saw a **black-haired naked woman screaming and running outside the cottage called Seascope**. But the sly Fogarty de-emphasized this evidence and turned it into something Hyland merely believed he saw. In Fogarty's words – a naked person with **no** hair colour, **no** sex, **no** movement, **no** yelling; **no** screaming. We should not be surprised by Fogarty's behaviour as it is what cops do and are expected to do. If you would like to know more about the police code of silence, read: Michael W. Quinn. *Walking With the Devil*; 2005. Or just google the topic on the Internet where you will find a staggering series of articles and reports on **police lying** – which is what the code of silence is all about.

⁵² Andrew S. MacGregor. What constable Hyland saw; in *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; 2001-4: p 957. The female seen by Whittle and Hyland had black hair. Sally Martin had grey hair. But witnesses make mistakes, and declared hair colour should not be considered definitive. The woman might have been Sally Martin. If it was not, it must have been another woman. This should have been addressed during a trial.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

not provide a description of the clothing worn by the gunman, and he could not state with certainty whether the gunman was, or was not, clean shaven. The 36-days-later identification of the gunman – an image of Martin Bryant – by this witness is questioned.

WITNESS: **FRANCIS**, John Albert

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "We got out of the car and started walking South toward the bridge crossing the rivulet, heading toward the Penitentiary," & "I would describe this person as having long blonde hair (**shoulder length**), and being dressed in black, possibly a black jacket." & "He then ran to an orange Volvo which had **two surfboards on the roof.**" & "As I neared the south western corner of the Penitentiary, I looked around and saw the Volvo driving out through the carpark."

COMMENT: It is doubted Francis could have seen such details given where he was and his action – running to the penitentiary. From the distance he was from the bus parking area, the witness could not have seen such details nor any specific vehicle. Note he said the vehicle was "orange" in colour and had "two surfboards on the roof." No other witness said the gunman at PAHS was dressed in black.

WITNESS: **GIBSON**, Sylvia Margaret

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "We then got up and saw all the bodies. The whole incident lasted **at least seven minutes** at the most." & "All I saw of this male was that he looked skinny, long blond hair, wearing an akubra hat."

COMMENT: This witness who was inside the café has stated a time which confirms the official time of 90 seconds is not correct. Both times are most probably inaccurate with some time in between being more likely. It seems no other witness saw the gunman wearing an Australian-made Akubra hat. (It suggests a second gunman.)

WITNESS: **GODFREY**, John

DATE: 7 June 1996 (**39 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "We were waiting outside the Information Centre in the carpark with a group of 40-45 people with more than half of the group, North American in the 50-70 age group." & "I saw a male which I could not describe this male other than a dark top and bright trousers." (*sic*) & "When I saw him at the rear of his vehicle, he put a black bat [amended, handwritten "Bag"] into the boot he appeared to be calm relaxed and in no hurry." & "In my opinion **the picture I saw in the newspapers was not the same person.**"⁵³

COMMENT: This reference to North Americans supports the belief that the intended targets for the mass murder were the passengers of the cruise boat *Bundeena*. Note again the description of the clothing, which differs from descriptions given by other witnesses. Placing the bag into the Volvo confirms there were **two sportsbags**, the other one being left behind in the café to incriminate Martin Bryant. The second bag is recorded on the police *training video*.

53 Almost every week during the preparation of this book, the editor was in contact with people living in Australia. Some of them are witnesses in the case, but most were not. He lost count of the number of people who told him: *Martin Bryant was seen at Port Arthur, Martin Bryant did it that's been proved, Martin Bryant is in prison where he belongs; etc.* The only people who have ever told the editor there are witnesses who have said Martin was **not** the gunman are case investigators who are aware of the statements made by witnesses like Godfrey, and Laycock, and Scurr. Officials and the media have completely ignored the fact there are credible witnesses out there who saw the gunman and who state that it was **not** Martin Bryant. All the unproved assumptions and assertions condemn him, and every fact that does not fit into the official narrative is ignored by most people. But these facts will not disappear. They are real. They **will not disappear** no matter what any corrupt official says or does. There is blood on the hands of the State and it won't wash off. Slowly, people have begun to think about all those people killed and wounded – **by the State.**

This fact that there were two sportsbags confirms Martin Bryant was being set up as a **patsy**. That is the only reason the gunman would have taken two bags into the café and then left one behind – supposedly with evidence incriminating Martin, but it was never proved. Another reason the State did not have a trial is because witnesses made it very clear – the gunman who they saw **was not Martin Bryant**. And they have said this in writing.

WITNESS: **GONINON**, *Simon Robert* (Tasmania Police)

DATE: 14 August 1996 (**108 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I was informed that this person appeared to be carrying a pistol." & "I then relayed a description of this person's clothing. It was reported to me as being a black or dark coloured top." & "The person was completely naked and was positively identified as a male person." & "This male person then staggered...and dropped to his knees on the lawn...." & "I observed several bad burns to his back and buttocks." & "Following the arrest of the suspect I assisted in the search of another structure. I located a rifle fitted with a telescopic sight in the corner of one of the ground level rooms." & "I would estimate that the offender fired no less than 200 rounds from various firearms during that period."

COMMENT: Martin Bryant **did not own a pistol**. And there is no record of any pistol ever being found at Seascapes, in any condition. Thus, it reasonable to conclude the other people in the cottage, believed to be the real gunman **Benjamin Overbeeke** or the cop **Michael Charles Dyson** took that pistol away. The statement says the gunman was wearing a black or dark-coloured top. But those are not the clothes it seems Martin Bryant wore to Roaring Beach. There are several references in the statements that Martin ended up naked with the implication being he removed his burning clothes. Perhaps. But he might also have been stripped by some cop(s) when it was realized he was **wearing black SOG clothing**.⁵⁴

Again we have another description of the movements of Martin Bryant immediately prior his apprehension. Which were accurate, which were made up? This witness describes the serious burns Martin had. These are the third-degree burns that he was forced to lie on in hospital c.48 hours after he staggered out of Seascapes. The firearm the witness says he found did not belong to Martin Bryant, and it does not appear on the long list of things Gerard Dutton of Tasmania Police claims were found at Seascapes. **Why?** Note that the number of rounds discharged during the so-called SOG siege is said to be c.200. Another cop has said the same thing. But there is **no proof** that Martin Bryant fired one single round.

WITNESS: **GOODWIN**, *Lee-Anne*

DATE: 2 May 1996 (**4 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "At about 6:30 p.m. that night I was on the verandah of CLOUGHHA with Brian ALISON and John FEATHERSTON fellow workers at the site. All three of us heard three shots, which came in rapid succession from the right hand side, towards Remarkable Caves." & "The shots sounded as if they came from the bushes next (**cont.**)

⁵⁴ No detailed and credible description of the clothes and footwear worn by Martin Bryant within Seascapes cottage has ever been made public. What he was wearing is extremely important and that it has not been described by officials is highly suggestive. Clearly, corrupt officials do not want the public to know. **WHY?**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

to us, and it sounded like a high pitch sound similar to a rifle." & "We quickly ran inside, locked the door and shut the curtains. We also got everyone to sit on the floor away from the windows."

COMMENT: These are the three shots heard on 28 April 1996, which are described in several places within the literature of the case. (They are not the "three very loud explosions" which the constable Hedley George Browning said he heard coming from inside Seascope on 29 April 1996.) It was dark and there was no reason for these shots to be fired. Given hand-held radios were being used at the historic site, the discharging of a firearm several times as an all-clear signal would not have been necessary. Given what had just taken place at the historic site, the probability that the three shots were intended to further traumatize people there cannot be dismissed.

Over the next hour, those people inside Clougha were forced to live through their worst fears. Note that the literature says there were no armed uniformed police at the historic site until after 7:30 p.m. when SOG members finally arrived. (They had been having a barbecue near Taranna.) Two policewomen who were helicoptered in during the afternoon were unarmed. It seems as if an official [not necessarily a local cop] discharged a firearm for no purpose other than exacerbating the existing trauma of all those who were then suffering as a result of the shooting at the historic site.

WITNESS: **GUNN**, Donald Cameron

DATE: 16 May 1996 (**18 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Their names were Julie and Virginia and they were from Sydney." & "Leaning up against the left-hand wall was a rifle.... David had mentioned earlier that he shoots feral cats that come onto the property."

COMMENT: It seems the police did not take statements from this pair Julie and Virginia. Why? Note this mention of and reason for the rifle at Seascope. Gunn was given a tour of the property. He saw no cache of weapons and ammunition which officials said was there.

WITNESS: **HAMMOND**, Christopher Frank

DATE: 9 May 1996 (**11 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "At around 10:30 a.m. to 10:45 a.m. a yellowy coloured Volvo came into the [Taranna] store car park for fuel." & This male got out of the Volvo and asked me for fifteen dollars worth of petrol. I **put the petrol in** and he paid me with a ten and five dollar note."

COMMENT: It as been suggested that the gunman had a container of petrol which he used to ignite the BMW at the Seascope cottage. But there is no evidence of the gunman filling a container with fuel. The petrol that was purchased went into the fuel tank of a Volvo.⁵⁵

WITNESS: **HARWOOD**, Craig (Victoria Police)

DATE: 9 August 1996 (**103 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I was briefed that he was heavily armed with a number of different firearms, had possible access to explosives, **night vision equipment** and that he had weapons possibly fitted with **laser targeting** capability." & "I then heard via radio that S/Constable **(cont.)**

55 This reference to petrol is significant in the official narrative. You are expected to believe Martin Bryant had a container or containers filled with fuel which he used to burn the BMW at Seascope and the cottage too, no doubt. But there is **no** credible evidence of any fuel in any container(s), or of any fuel-filled container(s) in the Volvo, or the BMW, or at Seascope. The narrative says the cops have a photograph of such a container in some yellow Volvo – but which yellow Volvo? On investigation however, it seems said photograph was not taken at the tollbooth where that Volvo should have been photographed, fingerprinted, and forensically examined – **but it wasn't**. And it also turns out that the container is on the rear seat where the victim Robert Salzmänn was seated while he and his alleged wife Helene Salzmänn were having a private discussion with the gunman **inside** that yellow Volvo. So who put that container inside the vehicle after Salzmänn alighted from it to meet his maker? (Corrupt cops it is reasonable to conclude.)

*Being an
eyewitness
does not confirm
unquestionable
accuracy and/or
completeness
of recall.*

JAMES had seen the offender **firing a handgun** on the southern side of the stronghold [Seascape]." & "**The offender was dressed in black.**" & "I then observed a person suddenly appear from the southern western corner of the cottage. The person was engulfed in flames from head to toe. The person was dressed in **blue jeans, a blue jumper and a red, white and blue striped shirt** or similar." & "The person then started to remove its [sic] burning clothing. I then identified the person as the offender."

COMMENT: Craig enjoyed himself immensely, as his Hollywood-like script reveals. Now how did anyone know the gunman had possible access to explosives? Who made this up? He could just as well have had access to belt-fed machine guns, anti-tank grenades, big pointed sticks, and yo-yos. **It is all hype.**

And as for the night-vision equipment and laser sight – there is not one bit of evidence that Martin Bryant ever owned or had seen such things. A sifting search of the ashes of Seascape was undertaken and no remains of any such equipment or sight were ever found. So either they were never there, or they were taken away from the cottage by the gunman: again, **Benjamin Overbeeke** and/or his cop mate **Michael Mick/Rick Dyson** it seems.

The same thing applies to a handgun being used by that offender in black. It mysteriously disappeared. There is no evidence that Martin Bryant ever owned one.

And then the offender again, but this time **engulfed in flames from head to toe**. Just imagine that – but Craig must have had his night-vision goggles on because he was able to describe the clothing down to the last coloured stripe: blue jeans, a blue jumper and a red, white and blue striped shirt. Good man sergeant Harwood – all that through flames from head to toe. (What happened to that man in black? Maybe he had dressed up for the eager media waiting nearby.) Other witnesses said the person, walked, and staggered. But Craig tells us the offender crawled. And Craig said he **knew** it was the offender.

WITNESS: **HESMAN**, Peter

COMMENT: NO statement seems to have been given. **Why?**

WITNESS: **HORNE**, Doug

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I recall coming down the road and there was a pink house, someone told me it was 'Sea Scape.' There was a brown BMW or Vol[v]vo parked outside." & "As we got close to the beige or yellow car I observed a male person standing in front of the vehicle. He had fair hair and I think a check shirt on."

COMMENT: Horne was wounded. He drove to the Fox and Hounds hotel where he would have heard about the BMW and the Volvo. This is reflected in his statement. He could not identify the vehicle (so he said both), and he said he thought the gunman was wearing a checkered shirt. **He was not certain.** And he acknowledged this by honestly saying he would: "not be able to pick the gunman out from the photoboard."

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **HORROCKS**, Lois Elsie

DATE: 29 May 1996 (**31 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I did not get a close enough look at the face of the gunman to be able to identify him. **I have since seen a photo of him in the newspaper this is the only reason that I know who he is.**"

COMMENT: This confirms how the minds of witnesses are contaminated, which leads to bias against Martin Bryant. Horrocks admits not being able to identify the gunman – as she did not get close enough – but then her mind was **contaminated** with a newspaper image. So now she believes she knows who the gunman is. Like the statements of Tony Chan, Jason Graham Cole, and Christine Elizabeth Sullivan, this Horrocks statement shows formatting evidence of having been corrupted. The statements of Chan, Cole, and Horrocks originated in Victoria. The Sullivan statement is from Queensland.

WITNESS: **HOWARD**, Steven John

DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Between 1:10 p.m. and 1:15 p.m. I recall a yellow Volvo with a surfboard on the roof pulling up at the toll-booth." & "I can recall a male person with blond hair and a youngish looking face. He looked slightly dishevelled, like someone would look at the end of the day rather than the beginning of the day. He also appeared to me to be slightly dazed or perhaps slightly anxious."

COMMENT: Howard's description of the driver's appearance suggests the person was not in a calm/normal mental state. (drugged?) This is interesting as another witness (Roger Lerner) said he spoke with Bryant, at a place south of Port Arthur, between 1:10 and 1:15 p.m. However, Lerner made no mention of Bryant looking abnormal, or looking drugged, or having any odour of drugs or alcohol.

WITNESS: **HYLAND**, Paul Barry (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "At the time of the call I was in the Saltwater River area in company with Const. G. WHITTLE." & "I saw a person running past one of the cottages towards the entrance of the main residence. This person appeared to have **black hair**⁵⁶ and appeared to be **naked.**"

COMMENT: There is no proof Hyland ever attended Saltwater River. That he was sent off to a distant location at the very same time a **mass murder** was executed has to be questioned. There is no proof Hyland went looking for drugs at Saltwater River. There is no proof of what it is said was found (soap powder). The telephone tip-off is said to have been anonymous. And it is said the audio-tape recording of that alleged tip-off has been erased. All this is suspect.

When Hyland saw the naked person at Seascope, he wants us to believe he did not notice whether it was a male or female. Regardless, because of the black hair, it was not the gunman, nor was it Bryant, nor it seems was it Sally Martin who had grey hair. It confirms there was some other person at Seascope, some other person who the DPP did not raise with the corrupt judge Cox. Again we have proof that officials ignored and/or denied all evidence which did not fit with the corrupt official narrative.

⁵⁶ See preceding Insert by Andrew S. MacGregor: *DPP TAMPERS WITH & WITHHOLDS EVIDENCE*. This lie was presented by the galling director of public prosecutions to the judge William Cox, who liked to be addressed as *Honourable Chief Justice*. If you see honour in **sending an innocent 11-year-old boy to a prison never to be released, and while there to be tortured by despair until he dies**, email this editor: MARTINBRYANTIS INNOCENT@gmail.com **Thank You**.

Andrew S. MacGregor says: "There is another piece of information that Sergeant Fogarty tells us that was not in Constable Hyland's statement; 'I was informed of the phone number to Seascap by Constable Hyland and directed the Police Communications Section to ring that number continually and attempt to make contact.' Of course this then opens the question of just **how was Constable Hyland able to give Fogarty the phone number of Seascap Cottage?** Did Constable Hyland in fact give this information to Fogarty? If so, did Hyland know the phone number personally, or did he obtain it from a book in his police vehicle?"⁵⁷ And MacGregor adds: "There is one last piece of information to put out about the Nubeena Police Station. There has been a new telephone number issued to the Nubeena Police Station just prior to the Port Arthur Massacre, and that number **was not in the current copy of the telephone directory.** We are also aware that Martin Bryant had not visited the area for about two years, from the conversation Bryant had with Roger Lerner. The question is, where and how did Martin Bryant [one of the *Jamies*] obtain the new Nubeena Police Station telephone number [where Paul Hyland was based and living with Merran Craig]?"⁵⁸

WITNESS: **JAMES**, Timothy Michael (Victoria Police)

DATE: 1 May 1996 (**3 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "At 08:10 hours I observed the long blonde-haired suspect dressed in a **heavy black jumper** appear from the south west corner of the house. He...turned and fired several rounds from what appeared to be a **handgun** towards the west. This belief was reinforced by the sight of muzzle flash and smoke coming from the end of his outstretched right arm." & "A short time later I observed the suspect.... The back of his clothing was smoking and appeared to be on fire." & "The suspect was seen to stagger several steps and collapse into a foetal position."

COMMENT: Again we have the black clothing. Black clothing is worn by the Tasmanian SOG members. There is no evidence Martin Bryant owned any black jumper [pullover, sweater, windcheater] or had one with him when he went to Roaring Beach that Sunday. This cop identified the other *Jamie*, who it seems was **Benjamin Overbeeke** or **Michael Mick/Rick Charles Dyson**. Here we have more evidence related to a handgun, which was seen and which was discharged. Again, Martin never had a handgun and none was found at Seascap after the siege. It was missing. So someone who was at Seascap took it with him when leaving Bryant (*aka* the **patsy**) to be burnt to death at Seascap. Recall the cop Harwood who said he saw the offender **engulfed in flames from head to toe**, then saw him crawling. Well James says he saw the offender with his clothes just smoking, then he saw him staggering.

WITNESS: **KATEROS**, Yannis

DATE: 10 May 1996 (**12 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He had **straight blonde hair.**" & "I have been living in Port Arthur since May of 1996 and have never seen the male who had the firearm before. However my sister in law, Melissa TITTERMAN knows him."

⁵⁷ Andrew S. MacGregor. What constable Hyland saw; in *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; 2001-4: p. 956.

⁵⁸ Andrew S. MacGregor. What constable Hyland saw; in *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; 2001-4: p. 962.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: **Martin Bryant did NOT have straight blond hair.** The editor has not been able to locate any statement given by this Melissa Titterman. It seems the cops never bothered. Or, the cops did take a statement from Titterman and they did not like what she told them as it did not fit with the official narrative.⁵⁹

WITNESS: **KESSARIOS**, Angelo

DATE: 7 May 1996 (**9 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Between 10:30 am and 11:00 am.... A male person came into the shop." & "He walked over to the counter and asked, 'Do you sell lighters?' The question surprised me a little at first because I thought it fairly obvious that a shop this kind would sell lighters." & "the customer was male and wearing a brown coat that came down to his thighs...**lace-boots** and track pants." & "When he came in on the Sunday to buy the lighter he had lost weight and his hair was considerably longer. He used to have **short hair.**" & "He just came in, bought the lighter and left. It was though I was a total stranger to him – which I wasn't."

COMMENT: The statement by Kessarios clearly reveals he was uncertain he had seen Martin Bryant. In fact, his statement only makes sense when the person identified in it is **not** Martin Bryant. So who was it? There is no logical reason for Martin to drive 15 minutes from Hobart then stop at Midway Point, where Kessarios operated his small business, to buy just a cigarette lighter. **What for?** Martin did not smoke tobacco or cannabis/marijuana.

Officials want you to believe Martin then drove another 12 minutes before he stopped at Sorell, where he went and bought just one bottle of tomato sauce. **What for?** (This was the logical question that Martin asked the cops who interrogated him.)

Here is another point to note – neither Angelo Kessarios (at Midway Point) nor Spiros Diamantis (at Sorell) said their customer on that day (28 April 1996) was driving a yellow Volvo. But, both of them said their unusual customer was wearing **track pants**. So what are we to make of this because Harwood, that cop from Victoria, said Martin Bryant was wearing jeans. Reader, surely it is obvious to you there is reasonable doubt. No person should be **imprisoned until he/she dies based on unproved evidence** – evidence like this which was never assessed during a proper trial.

Here's another point. Kessarios said his customer was wearing "**lace-boots.**" But witness Beekman, and others, said that the gunman at the café "was definitely wearing grey/blue Nike sandshoes." Well, maybe after he bought that lighter and the tomato sauce, he took off his lace-boots and put on Nike sandshoes. Maybe he did – but **it was never proved.** Nor was it proved that Martin Bryant ever had lace-boots or Nike sandshoes or runners. Once you study the Port Arthur case and start asking good questions, you will **not** find anything significant in the official narrative which makes sense. It is full of assertions – one after the other.

These comments here must not be interpreted as being criticisms of Diamantis and Kessarios. No doubt they are good people who work hard providing a service the public wants. But, they were sure they saw a person they (mis)identified as Martin Bryant. **(cont.)**

⁵⁹ In Australia, most statements collected from witnesses are collected by police. There is no law saying all statements collected for a case shall be presented to the DPP or to members of the public (aka: **trouble-makers**) who request case-related documents using freedom-of-information legislation. This means statements given in good faith by witnesses can be made to disappear if they contain any facts negative to the position taken by the State. Or they can simply be ignored. There are few witnesses who have the strength to take on the State by demanding to know why her/his statement was considered irrelevant or insignificant. And as you can see in the Port Arthur case, the judge did not bother to read the statements from all the witnesses. If he says he did, then he ignored all those statements which raise reasonable doubts. He did not give credence to all the witnesses who said **Martin was not the gunman.** No. This Cox didn't see any point in having a trial. Why bother resolving all the doubts? No. Everyone knew Bryant was guilty. Even the lawyer John Avery got his client Bryant to agree to that. Now it did take a little *persuasion*, but Bryant was easy to get around given his **IQ of 66** – it was for Martin Bryant the best thing Avery said. So Martin was first softened up with **120 consecutive days of solitary confinement** (*My Story*; 2010: p. 132), and he was probably given mind-bending drugs. There was no need to upset all the relatives of the victims. No. The best thing Cox could do was his duty to God and the Queen and the people of Tasmania. So Cox just ignored all the *Witness Statements* and sent a "social misfit" to Risdon to die – slowly, in agony, in a prison cage. This is how justice is served in Tasmania. *No worries.....*

This is exactly what the impersonator wanted to achieve. Between the Port Arthur incident and when they gave their statements, many days passed: **50** for Diamantis; **9** for Kessarios.⁶⁰ During that time, they no doubt spoke with a steady stream of customers (and others) most of whom would have been vocal about the incident, and who surely voiced their anger at Martin Bryant. All the while the media was screaming **Martin Bryant did it**. That both Diamantis and Kessarios believed Martin in track pants had been in their stores to buy one cigarette lighter and one bottle of tomato sauce respectively, does not prove guilt. But it does tell us just how far officials went to **set up Martin Bryant**.

YELLOW VOLVO ALLEGED STOPS

Sunday 28 April 1996

Witness Statement Times; Official Distances

HOBART	00/91* 00 mins
1. Midway Pt: 10:30-11:00; buy cigarette lighter;	22/69 21 mins
2. Sorell: 09:45-10:00; buy tomato sauce;	26/65 26 mins
3. Forcett: 11:00-12:00; buy cup of coffee;	33/58 32 mins
4. Taranna: 10:30-10:45; buy fuel for Volvo;	86/05 74 mins
SEASCAPE	91/00 78 mins

* 1st number km from Hobart; 2nd number km from Seascapes. – **ed**.

⁶⁰ Over seven weeks (50 days) went by before police took a statement from Diamantis (Midway Point). Yet, a statement was taken off Kessarios (Sorrell) nine days after the incident. And the distance between those two places is – wait for it – 4 kilometres. So was some copper away on leave? Or was there resistance to giving the cops the facts as they wanted them? Or were the cops just too busy with their barbecue program? Statements should be taken as soon as possible after an incident. That the Port Arthur incident was a major one is not denied, but the times to collect some statements are ridiculous and would have been torn apart by a good defence lawyer – which does not include that **piece of excrement called John Avery** who assisted the State put Martin away for the rest of his life. (Avery was supposed to defend Martin, but he worked hard at getting him imprisoned.) Here are some of the times for statements to be taken: **50 days; 52; 52; 57; 72; 77; 78; 94; 103; 108**. This gave slow witnesses lots of time to get the media message that Martin was the gunman. The two statements that took **103** and **108** days to be submitted came from police. Not people gone off on Amazon canoe trips, but police home in Australia: **103** days – **Craig Harwood** of Victoria Police (SOG Sergeant); **108** days – **Simon Robert Goninon** of Tasmania Police (Eastern District Traffic).

WITNESS: **KING**, Gary John

DATE: 17 May 1996 (**19 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Between 11 a.m. and 12 midday on that day I was in the store behind the counter when a young bloke came into the shop." & "He asked for a cup of coffee to take away." & "He went to his car which was parked on the service station forecourt.... I recall the car being a Volvo, a reasonably old one. I don't know what colour it was as I am colour blind. The only other thing of notice about the car was that it had a surfboard on top." & "...he said that he was on his way to Roaring Beach to do some surfing." & "He then took his coffee and sat in his car again. I went on with my normal duties & I think it was about 8-10 minutes after that he drove off...."

COMMENT: The customer who King described seems to have been Martin Bryant. King describes his customer as having blond curly hair and driving an old Volvo with a surfboard. He honestly reveals he cannot give the colour of that vehicle because he is "colour blind." (King could easily have lied and said it was yellow, the colour which he must have heard and/or read, but he did not. This greatly adds to King's credibility as a witness.)

Based on this statement, it seems Martin Bryant was at the Shell Store (with service station) at Forcett on Sunday 28 April 1996. Forcett is 62 kilometres north of Port Arthur and 58 north of Seascapes. King states Martin Bryant could have left this Shell Store as late as 10 minutes past midday. Or, an hour earlier at 10 minutes past 11. But things are not making sense at all now. Go back (**cont.**)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

to the statement given by Hammond. You will see he is very specific with the time a "yellowy coloured Volvo" arrived at his Taranna fuel pump and the driver had \$15 worth of petrol put into that vehicle: "around 10:30 a.m. to 10:45 a.m." And the distance from Forcett to Taranna is 53 kilometres with a travelling time of 41 minutes. (Note Martin Bryant was a cautious driver. He had no driving licence.⁶¹ He did not want to attract the attention of the police – thus, it is believed he did not exceed the speed limits.)

So now we have a yellowy coloured Volvo being fueled at Taranna at the same time as a yellow Volvo, with Martin Bryant sitting behind the steering wheel, was driven toward Forcett where Martin had a cup of coffee. Forcett is 53 kilometres back up the road towards Hobart. Martin Bryant was mentally-handicapped. He is not a magician. He cannot be at two places at once. Nor could his vehicle be at two places at once. The only way these statements make sense is, if there are **two drivers** who have some physical similarities, and there are **two vehicles** which have physical similarities. And that it seems is what did happen.

There is no other way that these statements and times stated therein make sense. Martin Bryant was being set up by way of deceptions involving an impersonator and another similar-looking Volvo. This was not difficult to do. What has exposed the deception are the differing descriptions of clothing, hair, and most importantly, **the times which do not make any logical sequential sense.**

Note that Martin Bryant's destination was not Seascape cottage or Port Arthur. There is no evidence to suggest or even imply that. Martin told the two cop interrogators at Risdon Prison that he drove to Roaring Beach where he went surfing. That beach is near Nubeena (where that questionable cop Hyland was stationed). When he finished surfing, Martin said he went to: "Nubeena and got a coffee and I think I got a toasted sandwich too." One interrogator asked: "Do you remember where that was?" Martin did and replied: "I was at the shop there, it's a little shop near the school." There is no official denial of this fact, yet there is no *Witness Statement* from the person who served Martin that day. His going to Roaring Beach did not fit into the official narrative, so it was ignored.

Lastly, although it is designated a highway, the road from Hobart to Port Arthur must not be thought of as a high-speed expressway. It is a scenic road in an undeveloped part of Tasmania. Tourists driving slowly stopping to view the scenery and take photographs means it is not always possible to travel at the maximum legal speed of 100 km/h. The times stated in the preceding table are reasonable official times given these facts. Even if those times are manipulated, they still **do not make logical sequential sense.**

WITNESS: **KINGSTON**, Aileen Alda

DATE: 2 May 1996 (**4 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: This witness, who was then an employee at the historic site, seems to have been manipulated to write things supporting the official narrative. Given the terrible incident she experienced, this witness was probably unaware of what was **done to her**. Quite a few strange things went on at the tollbooth where this witness was working that Sunday. "Between 1:10 p.m. (**cont.**)

⁶¹ This is what Martin's mother Carleen Bryant said about her son not having a vehicle driving licence: "Martin had never had any driving lessons or held a drivers licence.... Martin would also travel to the farm at Copping, leaving his Clare Street home at 4:00 am. He told me the reason for this was that there were very few other vehicles on the road at this time and he felt safer." (*My Story*; 2010: p. 122.) Note this farm at Copping was not where Martin stored a cache of firearms or practiced shooting, as has been suggested to this editor. In her book (pp. 111, 116), Carleen Bryant says Martin sold his farm in **1994**. All the demonizing talk and words about Martin Bryant having an armoury of weapons is utter nonsense. If there had been, the cops would have exposed it for all the world to see.

62 The official narrative says Peter Hesman found Martin Bryant's passport inside the yellow Volvo abandoned at the tollbooth. But there is **no proof** of this. It is what officials say. Hesman is a cop and we know the word of a cop is **meaningless**. That passport could have been stolen from Martin's home, just as the photos Martin had on his kitchen table were stolen from there. Why is there no mention of any other document with the name Martin Bryant being found in that yellow Volvo? The vehicle was registered, so there could have been registration papers, and insurance papers, letters, invoices, and/or receipts inside it. No. Only his passport was mentioned. And why his passport? Because it would have been the only paper or document bearing his image. This editor has not been able to find any mention in the case literature of dates when the passport was issued or when it expired, and the police have never made public an image of that passport. It seems they have not done this because the ID photo of Martin in his passport shows him with his **normal short hair**. But by waving the passport around, and showing people (Aileen Kingston was one), and telling everyone it was found in the yellow Volvo, which it was alleged belonged to Martin, then the necessary links were seemingly made: *it was Martin's passport, it was found in Martin's Volvo, thus Martin was the gunman*. But it is all **rubbish**. There is no proof that passport was found in the Volvo. There is only the word of Hesman, and **cops lie**. No proof has ever been presented to establish that the Volvo abandoned at the tollbooth belonged to Martin Bryant. A registration plate does not conclusively prove that particular Volvo belonged to Martin. And there is **no proof** that he abandoned it there. In fact, the evidence strongly suggests he did not drive a Volvo to the PAHS tollgate and leave it there. Finally, during one recorded conversation, one of the *Jamies* was asked to state the passport number. And that *Jamie* said the number – as if he had it on a piece of paper. But when Martin was asked for the shorter registration plate of his car, he didn't know it. But you are expected to believe that Martin memorized his passport number. Or, was it the other *Jamie* setting up Martin?

[handwritten above, "1.00pm"] and 1:15 p.m. I recall observing a yellow Volvo sedan in a line of vehicles waiting to enter the site." & "I believe he was medium height 5'8"-5'10" [sic]." & "Frizzy blond hair, **shoulder length**." & "I saw a male person get out of the vehicle [amended, following text lined-out, "I couldn't determine if" and the following written in] "It was the same person who had previously driven the vehicle in." & (Amended text as follows has been handwritten into the statement, but not initialed: "I saw a female standing beside the open front door [of a yellow Volvo]...I saw him raise the rifle and shoot her and she dropped straight to the ground.") & "I left the booth with Athol [Bloomfield] and remember seeing four bodies outside the tollbooth as well as the yellow Volvo." & "I had never prior to this incident seen the male person who was driving the Volvo." & "Blonde hair frizzy med.[ium] height untidy dressed surfing looking. **Comment made re the driver in front**." & "I saw him shoot 3 people from the back window then locked the TB [tollbooth] and myself in the toilet [room]."

COMMENT: This whole statement is questionable because it seems the witness was led to say certain things. **Fifty days** after giving the above statement, the same witness gave a 2nd statement (17 June 1996) to another detective constable of Tasmania Police. In it, she says this: "Further to my statement which I made [for] Police in relation to the Port Arthur incident on the second of May 1996, I wish to add that on the afternoon of Sunday the 28th April 1996 I was shown a passport by Detective Peter **HESMAN** which contained a photograph of BRYANT as being the male who paid his entry fee at the tollbooth to me at around 1.10pm to 1.15pm." (sic)

This means, that four days **before** the witness gave her 1st *Witness Statement* (2 May 1996), a Tasmania Police detective (Peter Hesman) contaminated the mind of the witness. He did this by showing her a passport⁶² in which there was an image and description of Martin. Being a detective, Hesman knew he was contaminating the mind of the witness. It was very unprofessional as the image and name Martin Bryant was then firmly imprinted onto the mind of this witness Aileen Kingston who most assuredly spoke with other witnesses and thereby contaminated their minds/thinking.

There is no way this witness could have accurately assessed the height of the driver of a yellow Volvo when she: **1.** Saw him seated in that vehicle; **2.** Saw him standing down on Jetty Road where he shot and killed the three Mikacs, a distance estimated to be 50 to 100 metres from the tollbooth; and, **3.** Had locked herself in the toilet. And how could this witness have seen "Frizzy blond hair, shoulder length" when the Cheeks outside the tollbooth said the gunman "had long blonde hair which was down **below** his shoulders," and "his blonde hair was long, **below** his shoulders." Another witness who was shot in the café described the gunman's hair not as being frizzy, but being: "long bedraggled hair about 3-4 [inches] **below** the shoulder." It seems that no other witness was spoken to by this cop **Hesman**. And this witness was the only one to use the adjective "frizzy" to describe the hair. From credible statements (cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

provided by PAHS witnesses, the gunman had **long straight hair below his shoulders**, not frizzy shoulder-length hair.

Then this witness states: "I couldn't determine if it was the same person who had previously driven the vehicle in." This statement is credible because the witness admits her limitation. She could not determine something and she admits it. She did not lie or just say what everyone else had stated. Her words suggest that the person who drove the yellow Volvo passed the tollbooth into PAHS, might not have been the same person who drove it back to the tollbooth. This is serious. Something influenced this witness because she lined out **I couldn't determine if it was**, and substituted that with **It was**. So her sentence changed from "I couldn't determine if it was the same person," to "It was the same person." This is a **highly significant change**. It means the witness wants you to believe the frizzy-haired driver who drove a yellow Volvo into PAHS, drove a yellow Volvo back to the tollbooth where he murdered four people. But there are witnesses who watched the shooting at the tollbooth, and all three of them said the gunman had long hair down **below** his shoulders – Martin Bryant **did not**.

There is another amendment to the statement of this witness. It was handwritten but not initialed. We do not know if the witness wrote this amendment, or whether another person did and the witness does not know about it. Or, the witness refused to initial a change she did not make or agree with. Was this witness coerced to change her statement? This amendment reads: "I saw a female standing beside the open front door...I saw him raise the rifle and shoot her and she dropped straight to the ground." Unthinking readers would note this amendment then pour out their anger and hatred toward Martin Bryant. But the witness fails to mention the child who was with the woman. A child who one witness said was standing directly beside the woman (the child's mother). This amendment suggests an addition of something supportive of the official narrative. All the troubling details related to this amendment should have been raised and clarified during a trial – but as we know, there never was a trial because the State did not dare let the truth be revealed.

And, the editor contends the witness did not see anyone murdered at the tollbooth as she claims. She does not mention the arrival of the **red Commodore** which parked behind the gold-coloured BMW.⁶³ Nor does Kingston describe any of the murderous actions which took place directly outside that tollbooth. She does say she heard "at least 6 shots," and before that she does admit locking herself in the toilet room. All we can say from this is that the witness did not see the long-haired gunman close enough to say he was the same person who entered the site in a yellow Volvo. It seems the witness had her doubts about this too. And why would a PAHS employee have noted the entry time of this specific vehicle? Kingston's stating between 1:10 and 1:15 p.m. is highly questionable.

Finally, what does the witness mean by this statement: "**Comment made re the driver in front.**" It suggests one of two things: **i**. There were two vehicles; or, **ii**. There was another person sitting behind the driver of the yellow Volvo. If the "driver in front" was the gunman, who was the other person sitting in the rear of the Volvo? (Robert Salzman? Or, another gunman – Warren Overbeeke? And how did Kingston see all this locked in the toilet room?)

63 At the tollbooth, this BMW was **blocking the entrance lane** into the historic site. Immediately behind it a **red Commodore** vehicle was parked by the two Buckleys (see statements). It is **not believable** that the PAHS employee at the tollbooth did not see these two vehicles. **Something is wrong**. The witness, Aileen Kingston, says this in her statement: "I recall observing a yellow Volvo sedan in a line of vehicles waiting to enter the site." And, "I opened the [tollbooth] door and spoke to the male driver who was half in and half out of his car. The male person told me that there was a man shooting people down on the site." And, "I walked to the rear of the tollbooth and looked out the window there. I observed the same* yellow Volvo stationary on the roadway facing out." And, "I then went to the front of the tollbooth where I locked the window and entrance door." With all this going on, and opening the tollbooth door to speak with a departing driver, and looking out through the windows at both ends of the tollbooth, this witness does not mention she saw a BMW with four people in it parked adjacent her tollbooth. Nor does this witness mention the red Commodore parked behind that BMW which we now know was waiting there for the gunman. Kingston **does not say one word about the BMW or about the red Commodore in her statement**. According to Buckleys, they entered the site then drove down Jetty Road behind that BMW. Then, after both drivers received a *warning* from some "elderly gentleman" (an ASIO agent?), both vehicles were stopped, turned, then driven back and parked **at the tollbooth in the entrance lane**. It is not credible that Kingston did not see them there. Mrs. Buckley said she and her husband "**got out of**" their red Commodore. Mr. Buckley "went to the female attendant" Kingston, and Mrs. Buckley spoke with a person from the BMW. Later, after the shooting there ended and a gunman carjacked the BMW, Kingston left the scene. But she still did not see that big red Commodore which was parked right near her tollbooth. So has Kingston lied? Or has someone corrupted her statement? Or did someone drive that red Commodore away while she was hiding inside the tollbooth? (* Kingston would not have known if it was the "same" Volvo.)

WITNESS: **KINGSTON**, Ian Gregory

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "At about 1:25 pm on Sunday, 28th April 1996, I was working at the Port Arthur Historic Site.... At this time, I stopped a vehicle, a yellow Volvo sedan with surfboards [plural] on top of it." & "...he had long gingerish coloured hair." & "He had a long black bag on the back seat." & "He seemed to sit in the car for probably about five to ten minutes." & "I saw the male come out of the restaurant.... He was shooting in the direction of the buses. **He ran to the Volvo.**"

DATE: 19 June 1996 (**52 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I looked at all of the photos in the folder and although I am not 100% sure, I think the person I saw and spoke to, driving a yellow Volvo at the Port Arthur Historic Site on Sunday, 28 April 1996, was photograph 5. I think his **eyes were a different colour** and his **hair was a little bit different.**"

DATE: 24 June 1996 (**57 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I then looked up and saw a male, 4-6 metres away from me, with his back towards me with a **greeny coloured jumper** on pull a rifle up to his hip and I saw him fire a shot and shoot a person."

COMMENT: This witness gave four statements: 28 April; 19 June; 24 June; and, 7 October. This is a warning signal – be careful of the credibility of such statements. This witness who directed the gunman where to park his vehicle says there was more than one surfboard on the vehicle. He uses the adjective gingerish to describe the gunman's long hair, but it has been said Martin's hair can not be described accurately with that word. In 1996, his mother said his hair was untreated/uncoloured.⁶⁴

The mention of the black bag in the vehicle is significant. But the witness does not mention the gunman took a sportsbag from the café and put a sportsbag back into the Volvo. Other witnesses did. And perhaps because that bag of firearms was heavy, it is said by several witnesses that the gunman did not run to the Volvo from the café. Witnesses have stated the gunman they saw was calm and that he walked – **he did not run.**

Kingston's statement of 19 June 1996 suggests that he was either coerced by some cop(s), or he has a complaisant personality making him keen to please officials. Photograph 5 was of Martin Bryant it seems. And even though his likeness was **not** what the witness saw, and Kingston **openly admitted this**, he picked Martin Bryant with his **different coloured eyes** and **different hair**. And, in his statement of 24 June 1996, this witness gives yet another clothing description and another colour. So, what is the truth?

WITNESS: **LARNER**, Roger/Roy Maxwell

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "At about **1:05 p.m. today, Sunday** the 28th April 1996, I left my premises in my ute and traveled about 100 metres toward the main road." (Palmer's Lookout Rd) & "I then asked him how his health was and he replied, 'I don't drink much anymore, and I don't **(cont.)**'

⁶⁴ "Another witness...who survived being shot in the neck in the Broad Arrow Café, noted anomalies about the shooter. He noted that the shooter's hair was dyed blonde, evidenced by dark roots, whereas Martin's hair was naturally blonde." (Carleen Bryant. *My Story*; 2010: p. 134.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

smoke I'm down here surfing'." & "...said he was looking for some Murray Grey cattle to buy." & "He said 'I wouldn't have minded buying MARTINS place.'" & "He then asked me if my 'Missus' was home. I said 'Yes she is up at the house.' He then asked me if it was alright if he could go up to my house to see her. I then said '**Yes that would be alright**, I will come up.' He then said he might go to Nubeena first, and come back later in the afternoon if it was alright with me. I said that it would be ok." & "...about 1:30 p.m. after I had done a couple of jobs in the shed, I was walk-ing back towards my house I heard a volley of what sounded to be gun shots, which would appear to be from an automatic high powered rifle." & "Since that time he had rung my wife here and made suggestive comments to her I believe." & "I then instructed my wife to make a statement to the police in relation to the phone calls she was getting from him. She did and made the statement to Chris ILES who was at that time stationed at Nubeena." & "I am prepared to give evidence in court if required and am prepared to assist police with any further enquiries they need to make." & "Further to my statement, I have never seen Martin use or own a firearm in the time that I have known him. He was never known to have any."

COMMENT: This *Witness Statement* is troubling but yet exculpatory. It was taken by a cop from Larner who lives south of Port Arthur. Larner was not present during any part of the incident. But it seems that he contacted the police and said that he wanted to give a statement. And this statement was given on **the night of Sunday (28th)**, while the so-called siege at Seascape was underway. Why were the cops so keen to interview Larner? An interview that went on until 15 minutes before midnight.

This discussion between Larner and Bryant was friendly. They exchanged pleasantries about each other and purchasing cattle. Bryant asked a polite question about Larner's wife to which Larner replied in a positive and friendly manner. Larner **agreed** for Bryant to return later that day to say hello to Larner's wife. Bryant, who Larner **did not describe** as being anxious, agitated, or abnormal, then left to go surfing at Roaring Beach near Nubeena. Larner went back to work with no residual resentment or anger toward Martin Bryant, so it seems.

Then in his statement, Larner started going on about Bryant telephoning his wife, and how he (Larner) had "instructed" his wife to submit a statement to the cops. According to Larner, his wife did and the cop involved was the mysterious Chris Iles. (see *NAME INDEX*) But, nowhere in the case-related literature this editor has read is there any mention of Martin Bryant being interviewed by the police about inappropriate phone calls.⁶⁵

If Martin made such phone calls, why did Larner agree to Martin visiting his wife? A normal husband would have said no. But Larner said "Yes that would be alright." Larner gives no dates related to these calls, or a date when his wife supposedly made an official complaint, or what the cops did. There is no credibility here.

65 More demonization. According to another witness, Martin ogled a Mrs. Copping at the Fox and Hounds hotel – **every** Saturday night. With this witness, Martin is accused of making inappropriate phone calls to the wife of Roger/Roy Maxwell Larner. But neither of these witnesses produced any proof of their damaging accusations. Nor did the cops produce any proof arising out of their investigations. And, this accusatory mongrel Larner actually consented to Martin visiting his wife. Now, if your spouse had received inappropriate telephone calls, would you be friendly with that caller/person and later give your consent for that person to go and visit your partner? This editor is not denying Mrs. Larner might have received inappropriate phone calls. But who made them? It very much seems Roger Larner was determined to see those alleged phone calls be blamed on Martin. **But where is the proof?** Any male could have phoned poor Mrs. Larner and said it was Martin Bryant calling. Again, that Roger Larner made no objection to Martin visiting his wife tells us Roger Larner is either devious or not the full dollar. Larner was so keen to cause trouble for Martin that he (Larner) called the cops and gave a *Witness Statement* on Saturday night – BEFORE Martin had even been apprehended. And in his statement, Larner actually gives the model number of a Volvo which Larner alleges Martin was driving. All of this suggests that Larner had either voluntarily agreed to, or had been coerced into assisting officials to set up Martin Bryant.

*Be wary
of the words
of an overly
willing witness
– someone like
Roger/Roy Larner.*

There is no evidence other than Larner's very talkative tongue to support the allegations he makes about Martin Bryant. The cop Chris Iles is no confirmation as he is a significant witness who disappeared in this case.

Larner also spoke about hearing firearm discharges at 1:30 p.m. His words suggest they were fired by the accused, but Martin Bryant could never have fired them – if indeed Larner heard any shots. Note that Larner claims he left his premises (which is c.3 kilometres from the Port Arthur Historic site carparks with the toll booth stop enroute) at 1:05, then drove 100 metres towards the main road. Then, he said he saw a yellow Volvo which sounded its horn then stopped – let's say at 1:10 p.m. Martin Bryant was the driver and he spoke with Larner – let's say for 5-10 minutes. Thus, the earliest Bryant would have driven away from Larner was c.1:15. (more realistically 1:20) But at that time, witnesses Aileen Kingston and Steven Howard were at the tollbooth to the historic site where they both agree that, between 1:10 and 1:15, they took an entry payment from the driver of a yellow Volvo.

Again, Martin Bryant could not have been at two places, nor can his vehicle have been seen at two places, at the same time. **Nothing is more suggestive of there being more than one yellow Volvo, and more than one blond-haired male driver than the statement given by Roger/Roy Larner.**

WITNESS: **LAW**, Ashley John

DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He was holding it at the shoulder height and the butt was against his right shoulder." & "The next thing I recall was the gunman at the vehicle I know was the yellow Volvo. He was so casual, like a Sunday stroll there seemed to be no urgency with him." & "At this stage he would have been around 100 yards away from me." & "Between the church and the JMOs [Junior Medical Officers historical residence] a **yellow Volvo** appeared behind us. People screamed it was then realised it was somebody on site with an earlier model Volvo." & "I yelled to Vicky to stop the driver and tell them to get out – the reason being that if police arrived they may mistake the driver in the car." & "Probably around this time would be about 2:20 p.m. I saw the ambulance going down towards the car park."

COMMENT: This is a long (six pages) statement with some gems of information. Very clearly the witness describes the gunman shooting a firearm from his right shoulder. But Martin Bryant shot his from his left shoulder, and he demonstrated this to the two cops who interrogated him. Again, we have a witness who says the gunman was calm and collected, not hurried. It is reasonable to associate such cool behaviour with a professional hitman, or at least a gunman who knew he need not be worried about being challenged. Martin Bryant, however, was always worried about being caught by the police for not having a driver's licence. Not only is it inconceivable he was the gunman, it is also inconceivable that he would have displayed nerves of steel – simply because Martin Bryant did not have them.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Law's statement is a good example of post-knowledge contaminating his recollection of the incident. He admits that he was at last 100 metres away from the gunman. But, he says he saw the "gunman at the vehicle I know was the yellow Volvo." With people having been shot to death and others wounded, with the confusion and people running in panic, with the boot of that vehicle being open, and a vehicle he had not seen before, at a 100 metres it is doubted Law could have identified any type of vehicle in that carpark.

Later, this witness did see an abandoned yellow Volvo near the tollbooth, and he understandably transferred that vehicle type back to the vehicle he saw (at 100 metres) in the carpark. He might have been right and he could have been wrong, because as the witness himself admitted, **there was another yellow Volvo at Port Arthur.**

Note the witness recorded the arrival of an ambulance. Officials did arrive at PAHS (recall the mysterious black van; see *SUBJECT INDEX*), and two unarmed policewomen were helicoptered in. And ambulances personnel risked their lives to get through. But the mighty SOG of Tasmania Police did not arrive at the site for over six hours after Wendy Scurr made the first phone call for help just before 1:30 p.m. They were having a barbecue near Taranna while traumatized victims and visitors at the historic site were left in the dark in a high level of distress.

WITNESS: **LAYCOCK**, James Clement

DATE: 10 May 1996 (**12 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I unlocked the door and stepped out and saw the young man and this blonde figure which I didn't know was a female of male, because of the length of the blonde hair and the way it was flowing out and hanging loose." & "he had on a coat...khaki green in colour and appeared to come to his mid thigh." & "Constable ILES arrived about 3 minutes after the last incident, he asked me to get in the car and we would follow the vehicle, but after he had seen the young deceased female he decided to **leave me at the scene.**" & "**I did not recognize the male as Martin BRYANT.**"

COMMENT: Again a description of long hair, so long that the witness thought the person/gunman might have been a woman. And again, we learn about the disappearing constable Iles. What was this cop doing so far out of his district? The Port Arthur incident had just occurred. No official notice had gone out to all cops in the area. In fact, Laycock said that the cop he spoke to over the telephone "questioned the seriousness of the situation."

This Iles knew something was going on and it seems **he was in some way involved.** His police station was at Sorrell, 70 kilometres to the north and close to Hobart. Iles had no publicly-required reason to be at the entrance to the Port Arthur Historic Site in a police vehicle, on that Sunday. And at the time he was there, no official announcement had been made about a gunman being on the loose at or near Port Arthur. So, what was this Chris Iles doing so far from his station, in uniform, in a police car? And then, Laycock states this cop **Iles behaved bizarrely before he completely disappeared.**⁶⁶

⁶⁶ This bizarre behaviour and subsequent vanishing of this Tasmania Police constable confirms criminal activity was taking place. There is no other reason for Chris Iles to have disappeared. Additional police were flown from Victoria to Tasmania. Yet there was a Tasmanian cop who went AWOL and officials have refused to reveal what happened to him. Periodically in Tasmania, people go missing and the police do not seem in any big hurry to find them. That alleged bagman for the cops **Ronald Jarvis** seems to have been one of those people who mysteriously disappeared. (see *NAME INDEX*) It has been suggested to this editor that it was Iles who drove the gunman away from the area and to an air/sea port so the gunman could get well away from Tasmania.

THE ZAHORCAK STATEMENT

ACCORDING to their statements prepared in New Jersey (USA), both dated 1 August 1996 (95 days after incident), Cynthia C. Zahorcak and James/*Jim* Balasko were **travelling together** and were at the Port Arthur Historic Site on 28 April 1996. There seems to be only one reason why this alleged witness Zahorcak submitted a statement from New Jersey – bolster the assertion that Balasko made a video of the gunman during the shooting incident there. (see Balasko statement) But like her partner’s statement (see FOOTNOTE) Cynthia Zahorcak’s statement lacks credibility too. Here is just one example.

SHE: “Then I look toward the front of the bus and a man with long wavy, blond, almost bleached blond, shoulder length hair **wearing a pale yellow shirt**, was holding a rifle.”

HE: “He was young, late twenties...about 5’10”, thin build, long shoulder length dirty blond hair. It was unkempt, it wasn’t combed. He had a **black jacket on.**”

Part of the Zahorcak statement consists of this alleged witness giving answers to questions posed by two New Jersey police personnel (Olenick & Repsha). It is reasonable to conclude the questions would have been sent to New Jersey by Tasmania Police or by the office of the director of public prosecutions in Tasmania. Without the slightest doubt, the process was weighted in favour of officials in Tasmania, **not the objective determination of truth.** Here are some examples.

Q: After this incident, did you see pictures in the newspapers or television that were reported to be the man who did the shooting?

A: Yes, they were pictures from the front. I only saw him from the side. The news photos I saw appeared to be him, but I only saw him from a side view.

Q: Ms ZAHORCAK can you look at this photoboard and tell us if you recognize the photograph of the man you saw with a rifle on April 28 1996 at Port Arthur, Tasmania?

A: Yes, he’s in here. It’s number (5). The hair is the same, the features or shape of the nose is the same. Yeah, that’s him.

Q: Did you see the car leaving or did you only hear it?

A: I saw it. It was a yellow Volvo Station Wagon [*sic*] with a surfboard on top of it. [But which Volvo did the witness see? Bryant owned a yellow Volvo **sedan**. Was the other Volvo which was seen that day at Port Arthur, a yellow Volvo **station wagon**?]

So here is Zahorcak admitting “I only saw him from the side,” but never revealed from what distance. **But distance does not matter when it came to setting up Martin Bryant.** Then this Zahorcak admits to seeing pictures of “the man who did the shooting,” pictures which appeared internationally in magazines, newspapers, and on television. And then, *lo and behold*, there is the picture of the same man in the photoboard sent to the New Jersey cops. Reader, don’t be surprised by the fact that it was the same photo – the same photo that Tasmanian cops took from Martin’s home. Steal the photo. Give copies of one to the media. Put the same one in the photoboards. **BINGO!** Martin Bryant is on the trapdoor – *everyone knows he did it.* – ed.

NOTE When Cynthia Zahorcak was asked who she was travelling with, she said this: “Jim BALASKO, Bill and Marianne BITTNER.” Whether Zahorcak is the wife, fiancée, or friend of James/*Jim* Balasko is unclear. Also note the name of the employer of the witness has been censored. So who does Zahorcak work for? A police agency? – ed.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Then there is the statement by Laycock that the gunman who he saw that day **was not Martin Bryant** who he had known for c.13 years. Laycock does say that the gunman who killed the four people at the tollbooth and took their BMW vehicle was the same gunman who killed a woman (Zoe Hall) at the Port Arthur general store then took her partner (Glenn Pears) away in the BMW. But his words clearly **do not say** the gunman was Martin Bryant.

WITNESS: **LEVER**, Coralee Helen

DATE: 1 June 1996 (**24 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He was wearing dark clothing and I think a dark jacket." & "I can remember that his face seemed thin and was expressionless at no time did I hear him speak."

COMMENT: Yet another description of the clothes allegedly worn by the gunman. Two other witnesses, Colin and Iris Williams, both said they heard the gunman speak with an **Australian accent**.⁶⁷

WITNESS: **LOUGHTON**, Carolyn Anne

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I would describe this person as having lanky long blonde hair, skinny, 'bouncing' around, early to mid 20s." & "I can't recall what he was wearing." & "He was carrying a long sportsbag turquoise blue colour.... The bag looked as though it had weight but no bulk." & "I want this person charged with the murder of my daughter, and the attempted murder of myself, and I am prepared to testify in court." & "I have been shown a number of photographs by Inspector Maxwell number 1 to 30 and I can identify the gunman as photo number five. I have avoided all newspaper and television and have not seen any photos of this person until I was shown the photoboard."

COMMENT: Lanky long blonde hair is not frizzy blonde hair. (see statements by A. Kingston, J. Laycock, G. Lynd, D. Rabe, I. Williams) So how do people describe hair, supposedly the same hair, so differently? And the turquoise-coloured sportsbag is one of many colours described by the witnesses. It is most understandable that the person who murdered Laughton's daughter, and wounded the witness as well as her partner Graham Collyer be brought to justice. **But this has not happened.** A patsy is now paying the price for heinous crimes which he did not commit.

But there seems to be something wrong with this statement. This editor does not believe any mother who had lost a child would avoid information related to the person responsible. It would be the opposite. A mother would want to know. Why did this witness make a point of declaring she had "avoided all newspaper and television and have not seen any photos of this person until I was shown the photoboard"? Why? According to her statement, it was given at 2:19 p.m. on 29 April 1996. Martin Bryant was only apprehended less than six hours earlier – at 8:35 a.m. Are we to believe the cops then prepared photoboards with 30 images and were using them just six hours after Bryant was apprehended? Or were the boards prepared beforehand, waiting to be used? Or has the original statement of this witness been manipulated by the cops?

⁶⁷ That the gunman was thought to have spoken with an Australian accent needs to be given serious consideration. People can adopt an accent when they speak. Accents of Whites from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, *etc.* can be, with some people, somewhat similar. Also note none of the three witnesses who said the gunman had an Australian accent spoke with the gunman during a lengthy conversation. Their beliefs were based on a few words, some phrases, *etc.* Also note that because some person speaks with an accent described as Australian and who was born in Australia, does not necessarily mean he/she lives in Australia.

WITNESS: **LYND**, Gaye Ester

DATE: 30 May 1996 (**32 days** after incident; partly illegible)

CONCERNS: "We arrived at the [Lufra] hotel at approx. 12 o'clock. We purchased a packet of cigarettes then drove to the Devil's Kitchen carpark.... We were enjoying the day and feeling very happy. We parked at the Devil's Kitchen carpark and sat in the car for about five minutes. We then drove in a southerly direction toward Port Arthur. We drove past the Seascape Bed and Breakfast accommodation house and talked about how pretty it was." & "Whilst sitting on the bank a couple of cars drove past and then a motor vehicle pulled up **behind our van.**" & "When he was close to me I noticed an **odour** about him which was quite strong. It was a musty type of smell." & "When I turned around I nearly knocked Vicki over, then went to the xxide of the van and tried to start the car. It would not start. The man leant into the xxgh the open side door of the van and held a loose battery lead to the terminal. The xxxd and I left it idling." & "...then the man saidxxve you got anything to sell? I presumed that he meant marijuana and reached xxxilo box and showed him a small satchel which I had. He said "How much." I xx jokingly, "Fifty dollars will do." He then pulled out fifty dollars and gave it to me." & "I walked to the driver's side of the car and as I did so he xxxx me at the Café at Port Arthur and you can shout me a cup of coffee." & "I got into xxxd drove towards Port Arthur. He got into his car and did the same. I don't know xxx of car he was driving but I can say that it was a dull yellow colour." & "I can describe this man as having long bleached blonde hair. He xxxxd to me to be about 19-20 years of age." (*sic*)

COMMENT: The odour might or might not be sinister. It could have been something benign like mouldy clothing. Or, it could have been his expired air revealing his ingestion of a drug to prepare him for the killing he was about to do. The buying of marijuana seems to be another trail marker, just as the cigarette lighter and the tomato sauce were. Recall that Martin Bryant did not smoke anything, and he did not ingest or inject any form of illicit drugs.

The description **long bleached hair** is significant coming from a female. (see extract from the witness **Iris Williams** who said the gunman had "natural blonde" hair) So two female witnesses, both it is reasonable to believe would know something about hair-colouring, described two different hair types – for the same person? Martin Bryant was never known to have bleached his hair.

Then we get to the mechanical and electrical aptitude of this person. He knew very quickly why the van engine would not start and he solved that problem immediately. Martin Bryant did not have that aptitude. His mother said the following on this subject: "Martin's IQ was that of an 11-year-old.... He would struggle with simple things such as how to remove a wheel from a bicycle, how to construct something from a Meccano set or build a simple airplane such as young boys enjoy making. Martin could drive an automatic car but he could never sit for a driver's licence."⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Carleen Bryant. *My Story*; 2010: p. 134.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Martin it seems was not someone who took up combustion-engine electrics later in life as a hobby. And another thing that confirms this male person with "long bleached blonde hair" was not Martin Bryant is the statement given by Roger/Roy Larner. This witness said that **at approximately the same time** Lynd was speaking with the man with long bleached hair, he (Larner) was talking with Martin Bryant (who Larner knew personally) at Larner's property south of Port Arthur. It was simply impossible that these two encounters involved the same male person. Lynd's description of her experience supports the reasonable conclusion that there were at least two similar yellow Volvos, and two similar drivers. **All of these witnesses are not lying and are not mistaken.**

*Martin Bryant
was condemned
with an
endless stream
of official
unproved
assertions.*

WITNESS: **MALONEY**, Joyce Ann

DATE: 25 June 1996 (**57 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I recall the man with the gun had long blonde hair almost gold in colour, it was most striking. **His hair was flowing in the breeze.** He had a 3/4 length coat on which was a brownish in colour. The coat was not done up and it was flapping open. The sleeves were pulled up and I could see the sleeves of a lighter coloured jumper below the pulled up sleeve. I could see the lighter jumper under the open coat. The lighter coloured jumper was an off white cream colour. I do not recall anything about his face. I thought he was about 18-22 years old, only a young lad."

COMMENT: Many witnesses described the length of the gunman's hair – **below his shoulders; flowed down onto the chest; long and straight;** etc. Here, the witness Maloney says the gunman's hair was so long it was "**flowing in the breeze.**" It is very obvious the witnesses are not just referring to hair covering the ears.

WITNESS: **MARSHALL**, Eugene Bernard

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I then saw a male I would describe as 23-24 years, slight build, collar length straight hair, fair complexion." & "There was a pause in the shooting so I again looked out the drivers side window and saw the same male open the boot of a yellow small car. I don't know what model/type. This was parked about 4-6 cars away from our bus. **I noticed surf board racks on the roof, I can't remember seeing any surf boards though.**"

DATE: 3 June 1996 (**39 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I have been shown a photoboard by Det Jones which illustrates 30 males, however I am unable to identify the male person with the firearm I saw at Port Arthur on Sunday 28 April 1996."

COMMENT: Like the witness Beth Grace Daviess, this witness who was also inside one of the buses looked down through a window and onto the top of a small yellow-coloured car. Neither of them said they saw a surfboard or surfboards on top of that car. And this witness recalls seeing "racks on the roof" of a "yellow small car." It would have been so easy for this witness to say it was Martin Bryant (photograph no. 5), but he told the truth. **Thank you.**

WITNESS: **MASON**, John Anthony

DATE: 29 May 1996 (**31 days** after incident)

CONCERNS. "At about 12:25 p.m. we left the Cafeteria and returned to our car. We then drove out of the site intending to return to Hobart. On the way into Port Arthur I remembered seeing a nice looking Bed and Breakfast place along the main road into Port Arthur about 4 or 5 minutes drive from the historic site. The Bed and Breakfast was called "Seascape." & "I pulled in off the the road into the driveway of "Seascape" then parked along side the house. I remember seeing a car parked in a cleared area in front of the front door. **I can't recall** the type of car it was because I didn't pay particular attention to it. It seemed to be a lightish colour, older model, sedan with squarish features."⁶⁹ & "...a young man suddenly appeared from the doorway. This person looked to be about 20 to 21 yrs of age. He had youngish features. He had **shoulder length, lanky, lightish hair.**" & "The person seemed very agitated. He was moving his hands around very nervously." & "His tone of voice was excitable." & "...he said 'My parents are away for 10 minutes'." & "He definitely gave me the impression that he didn't want to show us inside the house." & "I believe we arrived at about 12:25 p.m. We would have departed about 3 or 4 minutes later." & "On Tuesday morning **30th April** I was at home reading the Herald/Sun newspaper. There was a front page article about the Port Arthur massacre with a picture of the alleged gunman. When I saw the picture I immediately recognized the face as the young man who we had spoken to at 'Seascape' on Sunday 28/4/96 at about 12:25 p.m."

COMMENT: This on its own is an interesting statement. Combined with the statements of Larner and Lynd it confirms doubts, undeniable and serious, about what transpired around the middle of that day (Sunday), who was really involved, and what sequence of events is credible – if any are credible. In his four-page statement, this witness Mason gives **over 50 numbers related to dates, heights, times**. He does not just say he and his wife visited named places. He states exactly how many minutes their visits lasted. It gives the impression he is very conscious of what is going on around him and of being precise in his descriptions.

But then, he describes some motor vehicle at Seascape, which the reader is to conclude was THE Volvo, when in fact it could have been any number of other sedans with squarish angles. And, the witness **could not even recall the colour of that vehicle**. So did Mason really see a vehicle there? Or, was he encouraged to say something by some cop? This witness makes no mention of any surfboard(s) being on the roof of that sedan with squarish features. According to the witness Michael William Copping, he saw "a surfboard in a creamy/yellow canvas style board cover" and that it was "on the roof" of a "yellow Volvo sedan." Copping says he saw a surfboard on a vehicle at Seascape, when he was about 100 metres away driving down the highway. Yet, Mason didn't see (cont.)

⁶⁹ The shapes of passenger vehicles are often similar. A new shape by any one vehicle manufacturer is often adopted by other manufacturers of similar vehicles. This results in different vehicle brands manufactured around the same year having shape similarities. And some shapes become trends which last for several years before being replaced with another *new* shape. In the Port Arthur case, an emphasis has always been placed on a yellow Volvo. But Martin Bryant was **not** the only person to own such a vehicle. In his *Witness Statement* (30 April 1996), the PAHS employee Ashley John Law states there was another **similar yellow Volvo** at the site during the incident there. Those who think being quick with a retort shows intelligence will shout out *coincidence*, but they are **unable** to prove this. Nor was the particular model Martin had the only brand considered squarish in design. Here, the witness Mason says he saw a vehicle with "squarish features," but that should **not** be immediately interpreted to mean it was a Volvo. Other manufacturers made vehicles with squarish features. Volkswagen is one such vehicle manufacturer. In fact, it was reported nationally that the gunman arrived at the PAHS in a Volkswagen: "On a seemingly usual Sunday – Port Arthur's busiest day – an angry young man drives into town in his VW, a surfboard on the roof-racks." (Susan Horsborough. *Murder and mayhem*; newstext.com.au; 29 April 1996; article appeared in *The Australian* on p. 12.) And just like the quick misidentification of the blond-haired gunman – who some witnesses saw at great distances at which it was impossible to see any facial features distinctly* – *it was a yellow Volvo* joined *it was Martin Bryant* in one statement after the other. Unproved certainty trumped similarity. (* Some witnesses were not even sure the person was male due to the hair **below the shoulders**.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

a surfboard when he was allegedly standing right beside a sedan with squarish features parked, so Mason says, right at Seascapes cottage. Copping even had a colour for the alleged surfboard cover. But Mason, with all his precise times, **could not even recall the colour of the entire vehicle.**

Mason said he and his wife drove off "3 or 4 minutes" later from Seascapes, which would have been about 12:30 p.m. So then, the gunman, let's say Mason did meet the gunman at Seascapes, had to put the surfboard on the sedan with squarish features before heading south to Port Arthur. Then as he was driving down the road with his quite **strong odour**, the gunman saw a van on the side of the road with two women nearby. One of them was the witness Gaye Lynd. So the gunman thought that before he did the all the official killing at Port Arthur, he would just ask two complete strangers on the side of the road if they had any marijuana for sale. (Martin didn't smoke anything.) That must have been the gunman's reason for stopping – because before he stopped he had no idea the engine in that van Lynd was in would not start.

So then, the gunman buys some marijuana from Lynd and by doing so **leaves a mark along his trail.** (Recall the silly cigarette lighter and that bottle of tomato sauce.) He got the engine of that van to start, then the two vehicles drove to Port Arthur.

But what happens with Lerner's experience with Martin Bryant? It just does not fit in with the statements of Mason and Lynd. When Martin Bryant was up at Palmers Lookout Road south of Port Arthur, where he spoke with Lerner, another person, in another yellow Volvo, was in the tollbooth queue at the historic site. It was impossible for Martin Bryant to end his conversation with Lerner and to get to the historic site tollbooth in the time stated by several witnesses.

There are lots of questions and thus considerable doubt associated with parts of these statements (and others). And no one is entitled to fiddle with the times, the vehicles and their colours, and the surfboard covers to make everything fit with the official narrative. *If it doesn't fit, you must acquit* – not just ignore the facts that don't make Bryant the gunman who witnesses here say had long lanky hair **below his shoulders** and a musty (druggy?) smell.

Another thing to note is that Mason gave his statement about **30 days** after his alleged experience. During all that time, there was intense media coverage of and hype about the incident. Not just a stolen image of Martin Bryant appeared in the media, but vicious, cruel, and suggestive stories which demonized him. Research has confirmed that facial recognition is one of the primary causes of miscarriages of justice. Too often people who are so certain about having seen someone are later proved mistaken.

With a mass of media exposure condemning poor Martin Bryant, which the witness Mason acknowledged he himself saw and read as early as 30 April 1996 (over four weeks before he gave his statement), it can only be concluded that Mason could have been influenced against Martin Bryant. It might be denied, especially by Mason, but it cannot be disproved. There is **reasonable doubt**, lots of it. There are **physical impossibilities**, well defined. All of which confirm Martin could not have been in all three places at the times given by the three witnesses (Lerner, Lynd, Mason) mentioned here.

*Sightings of
surfboard covers,
surfboards,
square-shaped
vehicles,
separate Volvos,
sandshoes and
Blundstone boots
– rule out
statements of
certainty,
and rule in
doubt.*

WITNESS: **McCUTCHEON**, Douglas William (see SIMMONS, AD)

DATE: 9 July 1996 (**72 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "On Sunday the 28 April 1996, sometime between 10:00 a.m. and possibly 11:00 a.m...I heard a series of rapidly fired shots which appeared to come from the direction of Seascape." & "My property is about 500-600 metres towards Port Arthur away from Seascape." & "between 1:30 and 2 p.m., I heard more shooting, the same sounding weapon, but more shots with shorter bursts." & "I'm aware Martin BRYANT shot at people in vehicles and I believe this is what I heard."

COMMENT: The shots McCutcheon heard between 10 and 11 a.m., where the shots which the DPP claimed Bryant fired to kill David and Sally Martin. This makes no sense at all. Note the table at the summary of the statement presented by Gary John King. It reveals that witnesses who claim to have seen Bryant that Sunday morning recorded their sightings were between 9:45 and 12:00 (midday).

It is just physically impossible for all those sightings to have occurred at four places north of Seascape and then for Bryant to be at Seascape killing two people between 10 and 11 a.m. Then there is the documented sighting of a **naked female** at Seascape that Sunday afternoon. This sighting was recorded by the cops, and the female had black hair. Thus, the woman seems not to have been grey-haired Sally Martin. And there seems to be no evidence that Bryant's girlfriend Petra Willmott was at Seascape. So who was it?

Some person other than Bryant fired those shots and Mr. Martin did not own such a powerful weapon. Finally, note how the name of Martin Bryant became part of the local vocabulary. Mr. McCutcheon is an educated person, yet even he saw nothing wrong with stating: "I'm aware Martin BRYANT shot at people." That is what he and many others have heard about Bryant, but it has never been proved. It is an allegation and a belief. And although it is understandable why people spoke/speak in this false way, it was/is wrong to do so. All that can be rightly said is that an **unidentified gunman** shot people and shot at people during an incident which included a number of crimes scenes at and near Port Arthur.⁷⁰

WITNESS: **McELWEE**, Ian Robert

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "[H]e was wearing some sort of coat that went to his knees, had hair shoulder length and was wearing jeans and **white sandshoes** with a blue stripe." & "I noticed the Volvo had a surfboard strapped to the roof with a **silver cover on it.**"

COMMENT: The witness Beekman, who was inside the Broad Arrow Café when the shooting began, said the gunman was wearing grey/blue Nike **sandshoes**. This seems to be similar to what McElwee says he saw at that café. But in addition, Beekman says the gunman was wearing "light coloured trousers," whereas to McElwee the gunman had a pair of jeans on. The surfboard with an alleged **silver cover** is another variation of the many descriptions related to the surfboard/surfboards. It was the witness Copping who claims that he noticed a surfboard in a "creamy/yellow canvas style board cover." It all suggests some sort of intended deception had occurred.

⁷⁰ There are seven distinct but linked crime scenes in the Port Arthur case: **1.** Broad Arrow Café; **2.** Bus Parking Lot; **3.** Jetty Road; **4.** Toll-booth; **5.** General Store; **6.** Arthur Highway; and, **7.** Seascape Cottage.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **McKENNA**, Rebecca Kate

DATE: "28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "...around 1:30 p.m., I noticed a male person come on to the balcony part of the cafeteria. This male was carrying a tray with his food on it as well as a sportsbag and video camera over his shoulder. I would describe the bag he had over his shoulder as being a 'Prince' tennis bag. It had a long strap and was **pink, blue, and yellow** in colour with the 'Prince' symbol on it." & lined out "Ugly in appearance." & "He appeared '**dopey**' looking, his **eyes appeared to be bloodshot**. His facial skin appeared to be freckly and he was pale. His ears were fairly large." & "He was wearing a ski type jacket which was zippered all the way up. I think it was either **navy, blue or grey** in colour.... He appeared to be wearing **tracksuit pants**. I'm not sure of the colour. He was wearing grey coloured 'Nike' sandals." & "I noticed that he had a can of Solo and a plastic Schweppes cup on the table." & "Although I noticed the food on his plate, **I did not see him eat any of it**. I saw him drink his cordial and I noticed that he appeared anxious, constantly looking around in the direction of the car park and into the cafeteria area." & "...he was also talking to himself. He was mumbling." & "He appeared to be very uncomfortable, constantly looking around and fidgeting with his hands and not eating his food."

COMMENT: This witness says the gunman sat "two metres" from her and her boyfriend Michael Beekman on the balcony at the café. Like several other statements, hers contains interesting and troubling recollections. Her description of the Prince sportsbag seems to be on its own: "pink, blue and yellow in colour." Given the close proximity, her words about the gunman's facial features cannot be dismissed quickly: "He appeared 'dopey' looking, his eyes appeared to be bloodshot." The gunman was probably drugged.

Note neither the witness Lerner nor the witness Lynd mentioned anything similar. But the historic site employee Howard said: "He looked slightly **dishevelled, like someone would look at the end of the day** rather than the beginning of the day. He also appeared to me to be **slightly dazed** or perhaps **slightly anxious**." It is reasonable to conclude the gunman was probably under the influence of a drug to assist him commit the heinous crimes he did.

The mention of the meal tray on which there were items (cutlery, plastic cup, plate, Solo drink can, etc.) which the gunman had also handled are significant. All those items are recorded on the police *training video*, and it is in relation to all these items the police did not conduct any forensic tests upon, or take fingerprints from. **Nothing**. This **goes against all investigative procedures**, and it confirms the belief that officials did not want the gunman identified. If Martin Bryant had been the gunman, his fingerprints would have been all over the mentioned items. A direct fingerprints comparison could have been made easily and quickly. But the cops did not take Martin Bryant's fingerprints it seems – because, it is reasonable to conclude, his fingerprints were not on any of those items.

*Never forget
– memories
are malleable.*

MIND MANIPULATION BY STATE

PAHS management (possibly acting upon the orders of a higher authority?), convened the first of what they audaciously called a “debriefing session”, late on the night of the tragedy. I’m confident none of the Management would dare challenge my judgment that this get-together, or debriefing, was in reality nothing less than **an unnecessary interrogation**. For this is the description used by several former staff I have questioned on the matter: “They just kept on pumping us all for information about the massacre,” one staff member explained. I’m not overstating this aspect when I say their *debriefing* could be likened to the time honoured utilitarian methods employed by Port Arthur gaolers – a hundred and fifty years earlier! Nothing has changed: the century alone has moved on, but the penal mentality remains unaltered.

Remember it wasn’t until 19:30hrs, on the day of the massacre, that Tasmania Police finally chose to appear on site in numbers. Put another way, it was **6hrs and 11 minutes** (sunset plus 2hrs and 15 minutes) after the first shots rang out inside the Broad Arrow Café, before the Police SOG arrived on site. This means Tasmania Police were almost a “work day shift” late! You may consider the on-going contemptuous behaviour (perhaps even my description is too kind), of their senior officers of what is officially called – now please, no laughing – the Department of Police and Public Safety Tasmania; I kid you not!

These, dare I call them, *constables*, were all drawn from what Deputy Commissioner McCreadie later referred to as his “finest”, the SOG. Of course one must remember commissioner of police, John Johnston had become from the outset of this terrorist exercise, almost irrelevant (for reasons that have been already been thoroughly examined, when his deputy Richard McCreadie usurped that role). All the SOGs were attired in **all-black ‘ninja’ gear** of bullet-proof vests, storm-trooper helmets, high-top boots and self-loading, holstered, pistols. In 2000, it was these same elite SOGs who came under the glare of the public spotlight and severe criticism during the Mahoney Commission of Inquiry (a report, a third of which remains hidden from the public to this day!), which scrutinised their indiscretions in the **shooting death of the Vietnam veteran, Joseph Gilewicz**, in what one Tasmanian journalist explained to me was commonly referred to as a classic example of an **“assassination that in Tassie we call a white-wash.”**

But here as night settled on the Historic Site, these SOGs arrived to *save the citizens*, each of them with their personal assault weapon and all of its trappings. [M]ore than 31 people surrounded by SOGs or men-in-black, and in the gathering gloom they were herded like sheep from the Clougha cottage along the alleyways and up into the Backpackers’ Hostel for a “debriefing” session. By about 20:30hrs (8:30pm), Management had seen fit to provide the Hostel common room for the purpose of this interrogation.

When Wendy Scurr entered the room, the night was dark and the air ‘chilling’ and most of the 31 staff and volunteers, who had been working on the Historic Site that day, were by then seated around the room. Few if any of them had eaten a morsel of food since the first shots rang out at 13:23hrs: seven arduous, fear-filled, traumatic hours earlier, and they still didn’t know where the shooter was. **On the other hand, the SOG, the men-in-black could well have been still wiping the residue of tomato sauce and “snags” off their faces; leftovers from their earlier barbeque at Taranna!** But PAHS Management on the other hand chose to starve their people! No hot drink, no beverage, not even a meat pie or sandwich. Remember too that all the staff and volunteers

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

assembled there **were still terrified, traumatised, stressed and fatigued, and suffering the onset of deep shock.** All had been held inside the blacked-out Clougha, when just two hours earlier at 18:30hrs, three loud gunshots rang out close by to the cottage where they sheltered. All were as a result re-traumatized! The three police on site at the time never bothered to mount a search for the culprit and the incident itself was swallowed up in the overall aftermath *exercise*. Come to think of it, the two female constables who had been flown on-site earlier that day, were themselves, both *unarmed* anyway!

Returning to the Backpackers Hostel: Chairs had been placed around the room and a large kitchen boiler [pot] placed on the floor in the centre. This boiler was filled with potable, cold, water. A single ladle had been generously provided from which all present were expected to sup communally if need be; please keep this scene in mind. Two people were introduced to the assembly as *counsellors* and shortly after a bus was organised to convey selected witnesses from among the visitors to their segregated overnight accommodation in the empty dormitories of the Police Academy at Rokeby near Hobart.

Though in the Hostel common room, the interrogation commenced, with the 31 staff requested to tell their individual stories of what they saw and knew of the event. **All 31 potential witnesses were there together in the same room and so any future statements to Police were contaminated and inadmissible in any future Court action!** The indiscretion of conducting a communal interrogation of potential witnesses was even mirrored, by the deplorable actions of Rupert Murdoch's *Mercury* newspaper which [illegally] published a full front page photograph of the accused, on Tuesday 30th April 1996!

But in the Hostel, the staff sat huddled together in an attempt to comfort and keep each other warm; some were crying. The assembly was designated as a "staff debriefing." But Rob Atkins was outside that category. Mrs. Wendy Scurr and another staff member later identified this male as Mr. Rob Atkins from a media video and still shots the author has on file. **Atkins was exposed, by the investigator and former policeman Andrew MacGregor, as a cop from NSW, who on the day worked there undercover** – accompanied by his very pregnant wife Karen. As was the case that when any opportunity presented itself, Rob Atkins repeatedly mentioned his infamous hearsay claim (he allegedly heard it - *second hand*), of the blond-headed gunman allegedly saying, "he intended to kill some wasps" that day. **"It was as if Atkins needed to coach those present in that room to cultivate the 'wasp' aspect of the event as being fact,"** a witness told me.

As if management and the counsellors believed these 31 traumatised staff would benefit from *a slap in the face with a dead fish*, a large black Labrador dog appeared. Owned by Peter Roach, the Lab dawdled over to the kitchen boiler and lapped to his fill, then as nonchalantly as it had entered, the dog trotted back out the door and into the night. Staff exchanged looks of astonished outrage; but a realisation was seeping into their subconscious from that moment, as this incident exemplified the opinion *Authority* had of their worth. This was a *dog act* and **it highlighted a madness that ended their day of horror.**

Stewart K. Beattie

A Question of Egress Denied

2009: pp. 14-15

(amended; original & added emphasis)

NOTE The shooting, lock-down in Clougha, denial of needs (emotional, physical, security), and the interrogation/indoctrination are techniques associated with mind manipulation. – ed.

71 This witness has given quite a number of facts, which are corroborated by other witnesses. This witness seems to have given a credible statement. So it would be wrong to hastily conclude that he made a mistake with the number/registration plate. He is apologetic for only getting "the first two letters, **DC**." These two letters were not the first two letters on the yellow Volvo owned by Martin Bryant which allegedly was the Volvo the gunman abandoned at the tollbooth. To compound all this, recall the witness Aileen Kingston said in her *Witness Statement* (2 May 1996) that she was **not sure** if it was the same person who drove a yellow Volvo back to the PAHS tollbooth as the person who had earlier driven it through the tollbooth. Was it really the same Volvo? The same driver?

72 This is what the case investigator and author Stewart K. Beattie has stated about these yellow vehicles: "[B]e aware that the yellow Volvo abandoned at the Toll Booth was almost surely **not** the sedan driven to the Tasman Peninsula that day by Martin Bryant. As far as our investigations have shown, this particular vehicle was **one of three** 'clone' yellow Volvos on the Peninsula that day. One of those three 'clone' yellow 244 GI Volvo Sedans was certainly parked, then removed (AGAINST the advice by Paul Cooper a staff member) from among the cottages near Clougha on the Port Arthur Historic Site. The Volvo abandoned at the Toll Booth had a **mobile telephone antenna** centre-mounted on the rear window, and this antenna was deliberately 'blurred-out' in all but a single photo of the Volvo parked at the Toll Booth published. I have not been able to confirm if MB ever did have a mobile phone antenna fitted to his sedan but I believe not." (added emphasis) email to editor; 19 December 2012. An antenna on a yellow Volvo at PAHS is highly significant. This editor had a similar sighting raised during his research into the whereabouts of Peter Marco Falconio whose burnt-orange VW van was seen, by a German tourist, with a small black antenna on 13 July 2001. But on 14 July 2001 that antenna was gone from that VW van. Falconio vanished on the 14th July.

McKenna writes about what she identified as the anxiety of the gunman as he looked around in the direction of the car-park and the café, and fidgeted. She did not see him eat his meal. It has been suggested that he would logically have been concerned about anyone blocking off his vehicle which was his escape method. It has also been suggested that he was waiting for a signal vehicle to arrive (yellow Volvo?), telling him the shooting was to begin.

WITNESS: **MOORS**, Jennifer Margaret

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I think there was another man which I believe might have been a Mr. OVERBE[E]KE, marked (12) & he was attending to a body close by."

COMMENT: A witness who survived the murdering in the café. The reference to **Mr. OVERBE[E]KE** is interesting because investigators believe his sons Benjamin and Warren were possible gunmen in the Port Arthur incident. Although Hans Overbeeke was inside the café and handled a body (bodies?), this editor has not been able to obtain a copy of any *Witness Statement* taken from him. And case-related literature says Hans Overbeeke was video-taped on the café balcony immediately after the shooting. Why was he really at Port Arthur?

WITNESS: **NEANDER**, Ronald Francis

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I noticed a male person carrying a very large bag. It looked like a tennis bag, it was about 3'6" in length. The **bag was blue** and had 'Prince' written in white lettering on the bottom." & "Myself and a couple of other people looked out the window to see the gunman going to a mustard coloured sedan with roof racks and a surfboard on the right side over the passenger side of the car." & "I then saw the gunman drive off. I tried to get the number plate, but could only manage to get the first **two letters, DC.**"⁷¹ (see WILLIAMS, IE.)

COMMENT: See the description of the sportsbag given by McKenna: "It had a long strap and was **pink, blue, and yellow in colour.**" But witness Neander said it was just blue. Both described the colour of the bag which the gunman had in his hands at the café. How could two witnesses give such different descriptions?

What is more significant is Neander's recollection of the registration plate. He recalled the first two letters: **DC**. But, the correct sequence for the Volvo belonging to Martin Bryant is said to be **CG 2835**. Here is more evidence suggesting there were two vehicles. And given, according to Neander, the gunman drove away in a yellow Volvo with **DC ???? plates**, this tells us the gunman was **not Martin Bryant**, and that he was impersonating Martin Bryant to fool people into believing Martin had done all the shooting at and near Port Arthur.

In Tasmania, vehicle registration plates (plates affixed to the front and rear of all vehicles) then displayed two letters followed by four numbers. Neander's statement that the two letters were **DC** can only mean: **1**. Neander made a mistake; or, **2**. There were at least two yellow vehicles with different registration plates. (Note that Neander does not say Volvo.)⁷²

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **NEWITT**, Karen Gaye

DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "The sound was different on occasions because one was a 'cannon' sound and one was a cracking come pistol sound." & "I cannot describe the clothing of these people. I knew that they were bodies because it is only **about 500 yards from where I was watching**⁷³ to where all this was going on across the bay." & "Once the male got to the Volvo he got into the drivers side and I saw him throw a bag or something into the car and then he got in the car and calmly reversed back and drove slowly away towards the toll booth, I think it was 2:30 pm at this stage. The driver drove very slowly about 20km per hour. There did not appear to be anybody else in the Volvo and he was the only person to get in the car." & "I believe the man with the gun had blue denim jeans on. I am unsure of his top, he appeared to be about 5'6"- 5'7" in height and aged in his 30's. His hair as I said earlier was yellow blonde shoulder length and curly, this was really distinguishing as his hair appeared to be like wavy, curly, surfer hair. The male had white skin. I did not hear him speak and was of stocky build." & "At one stage he fired the pistol I believe because of the cracking sound about two to three times into the water of the bay." (*sic*)

COMMENT: This *Witness Statement* is a classic example of utter nonsense. In her own words, this witness **was only 500 yards** from where the shooting was taking place. At that distance, there is no way the witness could estimate the gunman's height to be 5'6" or 5'7". Then there is the description of the gunman's hair – all six descriptions: blonde; curly; shoulder length; surfer; wavy; yellow. Every word and adjective the witness heard over the two days following the incident this witness packed into her statement.

WITNESS: **NICHOLS**, Jai Craig

DATE: 8 May 1996 (**10 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "About 12 noon on Sunday 28 April." & "I saw a yellow Volvo with a surfboard on top coming down the highway towards me." & "I kept walking for another two or three minutes when the Volvo passed me going in the same direction as I was walking." & "The Volvo didn't stop it turned right and went down the driveway into Sea Scape."

COMMENT: This witness did not identify the vehicle driver. But the time he gave and his activities means the vehicle arrived at Seascape well after the shooting heard by McCutcheon and the Simmons.

WITNESS: **NIXON**, Sidney Kenneth

DATE: 24 July 1996 (**87 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "My full name is Sidney Kenneth NIXON and I live at XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX I married Mary Rose (Rosemary) XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX and I have two living children and one deceased son. Mary Rose had visited her mother at Bilambil Heights in New South Wales (**cont.**)

⁷³ For those who need reminding, this distance is nearly 0.5 of a kilometre. Yet, this witness has given details which people at half that distance could not have noted so distinctly. At this distance, movement is noticeable, but clothing details and body features are not.

*Anyone
having details
related to
Sidney Kenneth Nixon
and/or his daughter
the physician
Dr. Rosemary Nixon
is asked to
contact
this editor.*

and had returned to Tasmania on Saturday the 20 April 1996." & "On the Monday the 22 April 1996, **Mr and Mrs Robbie and Helene SALZMAN** [also spelt SALZMANN] and **Jim POLLARD** arrived at our house to stay for three days and then travel around the [s]tate." & "Rosemary and I lent **our friends** our BMW sedan, tan in colour, registration number DI 5858, to save them the expense of a hire car." & They enjoyed their stay with Rosemary and myself and so decided to remain the entire time with us with the BMW at their disposal." & "Rosemary was acting as their tourist guide and I remained on our property working." & "On the Sunday the 28 April 1996, **the four of them** set off to visit Richmond and Port Arthur. Their intention was to visit Port Arthur first, they left around **9:30 am.**" & "My daughter [Dr. Rosemary Nixon] rang me about 3:30 pm that afternoon to enquire if Rosemary and her friends were visiting Port Arthur because she had heard of the incident." & "**When Rosemary left she was wearing a purple leisure suit and Helen SALZMAN was wearing red pants and a white top.**" (*sic*) & "The BMW was jointly owned by myself and Rosemary, it was a 1980 model with 62,000 km on the clock. We purchased it in 1991 in Bermagui in NSW and it was maintained in a meticulous fashion, in fact the **boot had never been used** and we purchased it as an investment, it still had it's original tyres which weren't replaced until 1995. The vehicle was valued at \$18,000." & "No one had permission to take this vehicle apart from Rosemary and her friends and set fire to it as what occurred down at Port Arthur. Martin BRYANT did not have permission to take the BMW." (*sic*)

COMMENT: Nixon says he was married to Mary Rose (Rosemary) who, according to the official narrative, died at the PAHS entrance on Sunday, 28 April 1996. We are led to believe Mrs. Nixon had been shot to death. And the vehicle she was associated with, a vehicle she owned together with her husband, had a major part in the Port Arthur incident. Yet, no statement was taken from this Sidney Kenneth Nixon until **87 days** after the incident. **Why did it take the cops three months to get Nixon's story?** It suggests that officials had to figure out their story/narrative first.

Nixon figured it was important to reveal where his wife had been, even though it had nothing to do with the Port Arthur incident – **or did it?** According to him, Mary Rose returned to him in Tasmania on Saturday, 20 April 1996. Why would Nixon think the cops or anyone else would need to know that his wife returned home on 20 April 1996? That was eight days before the incident at Port Arthur. Nixon does not make any link between the two dates, but there must be one, otherwise he would not have mentioned it. If Mary Rose had gone shopping on 20 April 1996, do you think her husband would have mentioned it? Of course not. There is no linkage between the shopping and the killing. But if Mary Rose said she met someone whilst shopping and that this person said he was going to kill people at Port Arthur, there would be a link.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

So what is the link between Mary Rose going to the mainland, then returning to Tasmania on 20 April 1996? Who did she meet there that prompted her husband to mention it in his suggestive *Witness Statement*. It seems the date of 20 April 1996, and what occurred for Mary Rose prior to it, is related to the deaths.

Then two days later, the 22 April 1996, four people arrive at Mr. Nixon's home. Was he running a bed-and-breakfast premises? A hotel? He does not say. Were those four people invited? Or expected at some time? Nixon does not say. Was their arrival planned on the mainland, when Mary Rose visited her mother at Bilambil Heights in New South Wales? Nixon again does not say. Nor does this witness say how those four people arrived. If they were the friends of the Nixons, why didn't one of the Nixons go and pick those four up at their air/sea port of entry? Nixon does not say. They just arrived, he said. We are to believe people arrived out of nowhere with no form of transportation and with plans to stay three days. Do you believe this? Was the visit really just a drive around Tasmania and see some sights type of visit? Was it just a benign little holiday in the Apple Isle?

According to Nixon's statement, those three were friends of his and his wife. But Nixon did not reveal where they were from, where they lived. Nor did he reveal how they arrived in Tasmania. Nor did he reveal whether his (Nixon's) home was the first place in Tasmania his guests visited. Had they been somewhere else in Tasmania before arriving at Nixon's home? Nixon said his guests were in the state as tourists – but was that the truth? The whole truth?

There are many unanswered highly significant questions in the Port Arthur case. Here is another one. Nixon said his house guests had such a great time that they decided to stay and he and his good wife Mary Rose gave them the Nixons' investment BMW to travel around Tasmania in. (Nixon seems to have later regretted he did, as we will see.) And it was on Sunday, 28 April 1996, that: "the four of them set off to visit Richmond and Port Arthur. Their intention was to visit Port Arthur first, **they left around 9:30 am.**" So they drove away that day with Mary Rose acting as the helpful tourist guide. And according to Mr. Nixon's witness statement: **"When Rosemary left she was wearing a purple leisure suit and Helen SALZMAN was wearing red pants and a white top."** But he makes no mention of what Russell Pollard was wearing, nor does Nixon reveal the colour or type of clothing worn by the other male person Robert Salzman. It seems that Mr. Nixon might have been more concerned about his investment BMW vehicle.

The following is what an eyewitness saw on one of the dead bodies: "She was wearing a pink, blue and white knitted jumper." (*sic*) This description was provided by Rabe on 28 April 1996. It is believed to refer to a jumper (upper and outer piece of clothing) on the body of Helene Salzman who had been sitting inside the yellow Volvo at the tollbooth where she and her **alleged husband Robert Salzman** conversed with the killer who, their behaviour suggests, they knew. But according to Mr. Nixon, that woman left his home wearing **"red pants and a white top."** So was it the dead body of Helene Salzman, or the body of some other person? It was not the body of Mrs. Nixon as she had driven away from her home that morning wearing a "purple leisure suit."

*A tollbooth,
dead bodies,
a BMW,
and the name
Overbeeke
– all of it
adds up to
a secret story
of the State.*

Then there are other witnesses who saw bodies at the tollbooth. Popa said this: "One body was that of a female dressed in a light coloured, possibly pink, **fleecy track suit**." Prout said this: "I could see two people laying in the middle of the roadway. I recall thinking that one was a lady & I think she wore red tracksuit bottoms & a white top." Given what we have been told, it seems that Prout saw the body of Helene Salzmann. But who did Popa see?

What happened to Mrs. Nixon who was wearing a purple suit? Was the naked woman running and screaming at Seascope cottage actually Mrs. Nixon after her BMW had been taken from her? And of course the question arises, if, according to the official narrative, four adults died at the tollbooth, why did several eyewitnesses state they only saw **two bodies** on the ground there?

CAUTION WITH CLOTHING, COLOURS, CORPSES

PROBABLY not one of us has had to contend with what witnesses at the PAHS tollbooth experienced. It was an unusual and unanticipated situation, which induced fear. It was obvious, or it appeared to some, that there were bodies (wounded or dead? exact number?) on the *ground*. Clothes on those bodies were in different colour combinations. There were vehicles in different colours and makes. For some witnesses, people were moving about. And definitely there was human shock. With situations such as this, memories are not infallible, especially when recall is documented hours or days later. And when firearms and violence are part of an incident, research says it can distort witness recall. What really happened there, and how, and to whom, must be assessed extremely cautiously. With the PAHS tollbooth incident, serious facts remain unknown to the public. That there was NO re-enactment has compounded things. Officials said Martin Bryant was there as it suits their narrative. But there is no hard evidence he was there. – ed.

74 Mr. Nixon lost his wife. He also lost his investment BMW which was taken and destroyed by fire. That the boot had not been used in that BMW was/is of no concern to most people. But it was/is a primary concern of Mr. Nixon, otherwise he would not have told us this fact in his *Witness Statement*. It is believed this witness wants to tell us exactly what happened to his prized vehicle. He did not go on about the new tyres he had just put on it, tyres which went up in smoke. No. Mr. Nixon told us about the boot which had never been used. Do you really think Mr. Nixon was troubled by the fact a clean-cut young man (Pears) was transported in the boot of his BMW for a few minutes? Or, do you think Mr. Nixon expressed disgust that the clean-cut young man (Pears) was burnt alive in that boot of his BMW? Or, was Mr. Nixon disturbed about some young man (one of the Overbeeke brothers perhaps) being driven to the PAHS tollbooth in the boot of his gold-coloured BMW? And also note this, several witnesses describe a BMW with different colours: brown; gold; tan; *etc*. First impressions lead to a quick conclusion the difference in colour descriptions is insignificant – the witnesses were describing the same vehicle. But were they describing **the same BMW**? The State does not want you to know several yellow Volvos were seen during the incident. And the State would also not want you to know if different BMWs were used during the incident.

Then witness Sidney Kenneth Nixon makes a Freudian slip. After going on about his BMW – he even told us when the tyres were replaced, but not much about his dead wife – he stated this: "it was maintained in a meticulous fashion, in fact the boot had never been used." Now what does that have to do with the incident at the tollbooth during which his wife was, the official narrative tells us, shot to death by a gunman. On first impression, it seems to be as meaningless as Nixon telling us his wife returned from visiting her mother in northern NSW, on 20 April 1996.

But there is meaning to both these statements. The reference to the boot (luggage compartment; trunk) tells us that what happened to Nixon's prized BMW, more specifically within the boot of his vehicle, bothered him. He wants to talk about it, but he knew he could not. So he tells us his boot had not been used **by him**. But it was used that Sunday afternoon. Evidence suggests Glenn Pears was burnt to death inside that boot when a SOG member (possibly Andrew Mark Fogarty) fired an incendiary device into the BMW soon after it arrived at Seascope. The death of Pears might have been unintentional, but regardless his death occurred in the boot of that BMW, the boot Nixon told us he had never used.⁷⁴

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

The best comes last, as it usually does. Mr. Nixon does not blame Martin Bryant for burning his prized BMW sedan. Nixon could have, but he did not because he knows Bryant did not burn the BMW with Pears inside his meticulously kept boot. But he does blame Bryant for taking the BMW, and Martin himself said he took it – at Fortescue Bay, **NOT the tollbooth**. Nixon **does not blame** Martin for killing his mysterious *friends*. Nixon **does not blame** Martin for killing his wife, because it seems Nixon knew he was innocent. But he did blame Martin Bryant for taking the BMW.

WITNESS: **NOBLE**, *Justin Mark* (NSW Police; not related to editor)
DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)
CONCERNS: "Caucasian in appearance, wearing blue long pants with a long-sleeved top, walk from the café with with a long rifle held in both his hands with the butt of the rifle against his shoulder...." & "A short time later I was contacted by Police Radio, Hobart."⁷⁵ & "I then yelled to to SES Ian Kingston and [*sic*] SES officer, north of the toll booth my name and that I was a member of the NSW Police Service." & "By that time I had obtained my Police Identification and was wearing it." & "I was then given permission to remove my property and vehicle and leave the scene."

COMMENT: This witness was/is a New South Wales cop. (So too it seems was Rob Atkins who pretended to be a visitor.) Never trust any cop – thus, Noble's recollection of the incident will be biased and will lean toward the official narrative. He says the gunman wore **a long-sleeved top**. What is this? A shirt? A pullover? A jacket? A coat? What? Noble did not say anything about seeing the gunman carry a sportsbag with him from the café. Other eyewitnesses saw the gunman with that sportsbag, but Noble could not say anything about it even if he did see it as that would completely ruin the official narrative.

Two sportsbags **prove Martin was set up**, so the truth of two sportsbags can never be included in the official narrative. And yet not even being able to see clearly what the gunman was wearing, Noble says this in his statement: "I feel confident that I could identify him from that position." You can bet whatever his cop mates in Tasmania wanted him to say, this Noble said it.

He makes an effort to tell us that he "contacted Police Radio in Hobart **via triple 0**." Noble claims to have run around all over the site warning people to flee. Then he saw someone (no name given) outside some PAHS cottage and he asked to use a telephone inside. It was no problem for Noble to get through to Police Radio in Hobart – 000, just like that. Phone lines must have been melting from all the emergency calls, but Noble got through to Hobart – **immediately!** (Were they waiting for his call?). Then he was out of there to direct traffic and save even more lives. Then, somehow, Noble does not say how of course, this happened: "I was contacted by Police Radio Hobart." The literature says Noble actually had a two-way radio with him, but he wants us to believe he was just having a happy picnic with his good wife Kathryn before he sprang into action and started herding and hollering and telling people he was a member of the New South Wales Police Service.

⁷⁵ Think about this. The phone networks linking the Tasman Peninsula to Hobart were probably close to the point of **total overload**, or they were overloaded. Witnesses who tried to make phone calls from the site said they were unable to get through. Yet this Noble^{*} claims that not only did he make his telephone call, he made such an impression that soon after "Police Radio Hobart" contacted him. Of course Noble does not say anything about having a two-way radio with him, but he must have had one. (* You are to believe he was just an innocent visitor to the historic site who tried to help. Yes siree – *and the band played Waltzing Matilda.*)

Some cop in Hobart wanted him, *Captain Courageous*, to risk his life again by going back there: "leave my position and re-enter the site as there was no other officers in the historic site to assist. (Of course there weren't any. Tasmania Police were preparing for their **big barbecue bash** and sing-along near Taranna in a few hours. To hell with all those whining victims at the historic site.

Then Noble states he yelled to "SES Ian KINGSTON" who Noble claimed was north of the tollbooth. (In his four statements, Kingston does not mention Noble or ever being near the tollbooth, though he does say that he phoned Aileen Kingston there.) And guess what Noble yelled out? Yes. His name and that he was a member of the NSW Police. Why Noble identified Ian Kingston with SES is suggestive. Kingston was a volunteer with the State Emergency Service. But, he was a full-time employee at the historic site. That day, Kingston was doing his job as site security officer not working for the SES. So how did Noble even know Kingston was an SES volunteer? Did they meet sometime before the incident when official plans for the mass murder that day were being discussed?

More yelling, more herding, then Noble says: "By that time I had obtained my Police Identification and was wearing it." People like Noble revel in self-perceived authority. Where he got his ID from he never said, just as there are other things he did not reveal. Allegedly, he was videoed on the café balcony with Hans Overbeeke, father of the alleged gunmen **Benjamin & Warren(?) Overbeeke**.

WITNESS: **OLSON**, Mary Lee

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "...the person with the gun was young and he was wearing a jacket that I think was green. The jacket was quite long. He had longish blonde hair. It would come to about shoulder length."

COMMENT: This witness was/is the wife of Dennis Olsen. He is the American tourist who displayed shotgun-pellet wounds on his torso, but which the **State insisted were not shotgun pellet wounds.**⁷⁶ (No statements seem to have been taken from him. Why?) Mary Olsen's statement seems credible as her words are supported by several other witnesses who were in and around the Broad Arrow Café.

WITNESS: **OVERBEEKE**, Hans

COMMENT NO statement seems to have been given by this witness. Why has he been given special attention by being ignored by the State? What does this witness know that the State does not want the public to know? This person was inside Broad Arrow Café after the shooting there. Witnesses say he handled at least one dead body. And after the shooting there, it is said he was videoed on the balcony of the café together with Justin Noble as well as that infamous character who used/ uses the name Joe Vials.

There is a swirl of allegations around Hans Overbeeke. His image, as well as the image of a male person said to be his son Benjamin Overbeeke – **who it is said is the Port Arthur gunman** – are on the Internet. This editor has not found any statements, nor anything official or from Hans Overbeeke himself, which provides a credible clarification. Given the case in which he was directly involved is a case of mass murder, public clarification is badly needed.

⁷⁶ Shotgun pellet wounds caused at Broad Arrow Café were observed by Wendy Scurr and at least one ambulance attendant. They were also observed by the surgeon Dr. Stephen Wilkinson who worked with incident victims at Royal Hobart Hospital.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **PARKER**, Colleen Maree

DATE: 2 May 1996 (**4 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He got to the end of the table he was about a metre from me and he produced what I believe was a shotgun, from the left side of his coat. It was light in colour, wide butt and had a scope attached." & "...he was maybe 5'7" to 5'8".... He was clean shaven, golden blonde hair, wavy/curly **shoulder length** hair." & "...he either punched or smashed the driver's window⁷⁷ to his car because I heard glass break. It was a yellow Volvo car which had been parked on the waterfront."

COMMENT: Several witnesses said the gunman wore a longish coat. That he, according to this witness, produced a shotgun from the left side of his coat (not from the sportsbag) suggests the coat might have concealed that firearm. Another witness (Freda Cheok) says: "I have a recollection of something else on his hip, it might have been another gun." And why did this witness say she believed it was a "shotgun"? Was Parker familiar with this type of firearm?

Breaking the driver's window of a yellow Volvo seems significant. The witness Ronald Francis Neander said, in his statement of 3 June 1996, the gunman "opened the driver's door and lent in." Breaking such windows can be associated with vehicle theft – windows are broken to gain access into the vehicles to drive it away. Did the gunman lock that Volvo and mistakenly lock the keys inside? Or, did the gunman arrive in another vehicle and the Volvo (signal vehicle?) identified by Parker was placed there by an accomplice?

Recall at least two yellow Volkos were seen at PAHS. And recall witness Aileen Kingston was not sure the person who drove the vehicle out was the same person who drove it into PAHS.

WITNESS: **PEARCE**, Kenneth Jones

DAT: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "...in his early 20's with **shoulder length** blond hair. He was wearing a dark blue jacket. He was about 5'10". He left in a yellow car, I think it was a **ute**. I don't think I would recognize him again."

COMMENT: Again the shoulder length hair which Martin Bryant did **not** have. And what are we to make of the reference to a ute (utility vehicle) and not a sedan? It is wrong just to dismiss this as a mistake made by the witness, as it might not be a mistake at all.

WITNESS: **POPA**, Mirella Nicole

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "One body was that of a female dressed in a light coloured, possibly pink, fleecy track suit."

COMMENT: There is no other reference to a fleecy track suit in any of the other *Witness Statements*. See the statements of witnesses Sidney Kenneth Nixon and Colin Frederick Prout.

WITNESS: **PRITCHARD**, Robert George

DATE: 12 June 1996 (**45 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I saw him open the boot of the car with a key."

COMMENT: Refers to the gunman who had walked from the café to a yellow Volvo near the PAHS car/bus parking area.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ Strangely, it seems that only this witness describes this vehicle window being smashed. That she might have been the only person to hear it being smashed is puzzling. This editor has not been able to find any other mention of the breaking of this window in the case-related literature. Note the witness Treffett stated the following about the BMW: "I could see that the rear window, passenger side, was smashed." Thus, both cars had one side window broken. It has been suggested to this editor that it was done to minimize the sound and blast pressure from the high-powered rifle shots discharged within the cars. But, it is not certain why these side windows were smashed.

⁷⁸ It seems the gunman closed but not completely and thus not locking the boot lid of this Volvo. At the toll-booth, the witness Rabe described how the gunman went to the boot of the vehicle (she said the colour was **blue**) he had arrived in and opened the boot without a key. This same process seems to have occurred with the BMW. At the Port Arthur general store, witness Spruce saw the gunman open the boot of the BMW without a key, which is similar to what Rabe described.

*What can be
(mis)interpreted
as coincidence,
might really be
intentional and
planned.*

WITNESS: **PROUT**, Colin Frederick

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I could not work out what was going on as I could see two people laying in the middle of the roadway. I recall thinking that one was a lady & I think she wore **red tracksuit bottoms & a white top**. She appeared to have an ear to the ground as if she was listening to something." & "I recall a 3 Series BMW parked on the roadway." & "I recall a vehicle with its doors open, I think the colour of the vehicle was **green**." & "I cannot recall how many vehicles were in the area but I know that the lane of the roadway I was in was blocked in some-way." & "My attention was drawn, as I heard a further two gunshots to [*sic*] the green car with the doors open. I saw someone walking towards our direction along the passenger side of this car, which was facing in our direction." & "I would describe this person as a young male, long **shoulder length blonde hair**, & I think **he was unshaven**. I have this feeling that he wore a jacket which I think was green in colour & it was loose below waste level. I saw that he had a firearm."

COMMENT: This witness says he only saw two bodies and he describes the body of the woman believed to be Helene Salzmann. This means he did not see the body of either **Robert Salzmann** or of **Jim Pollard**. So were the bodies of those men on the ground? Or had one been removed? Prout, who seems to know vehicles, reports a **green vehicle** with doors open. Some quickly conclude that Prout meant a yellow Volvo. But did he? He said the vehicle was green and he did not say a word about a surfboard or surfboards on that vehicle. The witness Paul Cooper says he was at the tollbooth, and that he had driven a **green vehicle**.

WITNESS: **QUINN**, Neville John

DATE: 2 May 1996 (**4 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I do not know whether I would be able to recognize the gunman again, but I do know that I never want to see him again."

DATE: 18 July 1996 (**81 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I was half way between bus (1) & (2), when I saw BRYANT at the front between bus (1) & (2). I saw him scope up, I dodged and a bullet whizzed past my head." & "I would be able to recognize the gunman again." & "He looked about 30 years to me." & "To this day I have never read any item on the incident or the gunman."

COMMENT: This witness was also a victim and his wife was fatally shot. His 1st statement (2 May 1996) about the gunman seems honest and is most understandable. Then things changed. What compelled this witness to give another statement? He gives no reason why he made a second statement. Surely he did not want to start focusing on the incident again by voluntarily walking into a police station to give a statement. Maybe the police contacted Quinn and asked him to give another one. Notice the big difference between the statements. In his first (**4 days** after the incident), the witness expresses doubt about being able to identify the gunman. **(cont.)**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

But in the second statement (**81 days** after the incident), not only does the witness say he would recognize the gunman, he actually says it was Martin Bryant. What caused the **total change in his recollection** of the incident? It is troubling.

It strains credibility to believe a man who was nearly killed by a gunman, and whose wife was killed, had "never read any item on the incident or the gunman." Some would say the exact opposite could be expected – a spouse would have read everything he/she saw to try and comprehend what had happened and why. And if this witness really had not read anything about the incident, where did he get the name Bryant from? And how did the witness know it was Martin Bryant? Just because that name was used by the media, and the cops, and members of the public, does not prove the gunman was Martin Bryant.

The plain truth might be the witness saw an image, an image presented by the media and/or the cops, and the witness unthinkingly accepted what the media and/or cops said: *the gunman was Martin Bryant*. (That the witness would want some closure is understandable.)

WITNESS: **RABE**, Debra Lee

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "They were on the wrong side of the road, facing in the wrong direction. I am not really sure why this car was there. This car was a gold coloured car, and I think it was a late model BMW." & "A man and a woman were in this car." & "Parked on the other side of the road was a **pale blue older style sedan.**"⁷⁹ & "There were two men arguing outside the car, at the front of the car." & "The woman in the BMW was still waving me back, but a blue Falcon sedan, a hire car, had pulled in behind me and I couldn't back out." & "One of the men (who turned out to be **a gunman**) appeared to be angry and was gesturing towards the other man." & "At one stage I think the 'gunman' kicked the person he was arguing with." & "The older man got out of the BMW and walked around the back of his vehicle, as if to go over to the two arguing." & "At the same time the 'gunman' walked calmly but purposefully to the rear of his **pale blue sedan**. I thought he was going to put something in his boot, and drive away, but he removed two guns from the boot of his car. I remember he **didn't use a key** to open the boot of his car."⁸⁰ & "As he got it out of the boot he had ammunition with him, which he loaded into the handle." & "He had something else, which I took to be more ammunition that he put into his coat pocket."⁸¹ & "He also got a normal hunting type rifle out of the boot." & "In a matter of seconds he had the rifles out of the boot, the big one loaded and he shot the person he had been arguing with. The bullet appeared to go through this person's chest, and out his back." & "The person who was shot fell to the ground and didn't move." & "I heard another two shots. I looked again, and the older man from the BMW was on (**cont.**)

⁷⁹ See the two-page Insert following: *VOLVOS, A VOLKSWAGEN, A BLUE SEDAN, A GREEN SEDAN*.

⁸⁰ Note that a similar comment was made by the witness Spruce.

⁸¹ Yes, this might have been ammunition, perhaps full magazines. Or, was it a two-way radio? If it was such a radio, who was the gunman communicating with? That the gold-coloured BMW and those in it waited at the tollbooth for the gunman is suggestive. Recall that people in the BMW knew the gunman, and spoke with him whilst seated inside the gunman's vehicle. Here it must be said there is **no record** of that pair (Robert & Helene Salzmann) having known Martin Bryant. In addition, there is **no record** of the other pair (Jim Pollard & Mary Rose Nixon) in the BMW ever having known Martin. That BMW and its occupants did not park and wait for Martin Bryant – they waited to meet the gunman. That BMW went there and arrived at the correct time. Two of its four occupants then spoke with the gunman who did not like what they said to him, so he killed all four of them. In his book *9/11 Synthetic Terror Made in USA*; 2008: p. 93, author Webster Griffin Tarpley says this about intelligence agents/spooks: "They come from out of town, and disappear as soon as their work is done. Their main occupational hazard is not that of arrest by the police, but the risk of being liquidated by their own employers as a basic security measure." This editor wonders if some of those four people associated with that BMW were agents/spooks/handlers. Was that why they waited for and spoke with the gunman? Had he been given a superior order prior the incident to **eliminate those four people**, which he did? The gunman got rid of witnesses (people who knew what was going on), and he raised the number of kills to blame on the **patsy** – Martin Bryant.

the ground, along with another woman. This woman was on the road between the gunman's car and the BMW. I'm not sure where she came from. She was wearing a **pink, blue and white knitted jumper**. I think he (the gunman) dragged her out of his car, but I am not sure." & "By this time I was able to reverse away, and I reversed all the way up the road. I then heard another shot, which I believe was aimed at the woman in the BMW." & "With this car gone I was free to back out. A white Corolla beside us was also pulling out...the gunman pulled up in the gold BMW, blocking the Corolla." & "He also appeared to have something heavy in his pocket of his coat." & "He walked straight towards the Corolla and scruffed hold of the man who was in the drivers seat." & "It seemed like he scruffed him through the drivers side window. We drove off up the road" & "The gunman was about 20-22 years old and average height. He had curly blonde hair, possibly permed, just **below his shoulder**. I remember he was well groomed and clean. His hair was clean and shiny." & "His dress was neat. He was wearing a 3/4 length jacket, like a bush walking jacket. The main colour was emerald green and it had a navy blue colour on the top parts. It had a hood." & "He had jeans on and **Blundstone type boots**."⁸² & "I remember he was **very neat and well groomed** – this sticks in my head."⁸³

DATE: 22 July 1996 (**85 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I cannot tell you anything more about the sedan mentioned in my previous statement. I have since spoken to Freda CHEOK who claims the car was yellow, but my recollections on the night [*sic*] bring me to think it was **pale blue**." & "**I don't recall seeing a surfboard** on the roof of this vehicle." & "I don't remember much about the male person the gunman was arguing with... he had his back to us. He was similar build to Martin BRYANT, but he had short brownish hair." & "the folder states 'Port Arthur Photographic Identification Board No. 21.' I have indicated number 5 [Martin Bryant] as being the person I saw at the Toll Booth."

COMMENT: This witness was the driver of the car in which another two witnesses were passengers: Freda Cheok (mother) & Nicholas Cheok (son). All three were witnesses at the historic site tollbooth and beyond at the nearby Port Arthur Store. Several things are disturbing with Rabe's two statements which focus on the dreadful experiences she and the Cheoks became involved with.

Rabe seems to have had a keen eye and has described details on the gunman's clothing. She also described a victim having worn a knitted top. This is a very precise observation. So her seeing a "pale blue older style sedan" with no surfboard should not just be dismissed as a mistake. This witness describes three sightings of that vehicle. She talks of **a gunman** not of the gunman. She talks of that person opening the boot of his pale blue sedan without a key. Another witness also saw the boot of the BMW being opened without a key or any use of a lever by the gunman. (see SPRUCE, K)

⁸² See Note 23 in this Part.

⁸³ What an interesting observation this witness made at the Port Arthur Store. By the time he reached there, the gunman had **murdered over 30** people and wounded over 20. And even when he arrived to enter via the tollbooth he looked rough around the edges. The witness Howard said: "He **looked slightly dishevelled**, like someone would look at the end of the day rather than the beginning of the day. And witness McKenna said: "He **appeared 'dopey' looking**, his **eyes appeared to be bloodshot**." But at the store after all that killing, Rabe says: "I remember he was very **neat and well groomed** – this sticks in my head." Rabe also says the gunman who she saw wore Blundstone-type boots. But inexplicably, the witness McKenna said the gunman wore Nike-like sandshoes. So did these witnesses observe the same person, or did they see **two different gunmen**? (Benjamin & Warren Overbeeke?)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Rabe said the gunman wore "Blundstone type boots," not sandals as two other witnesses did. (see McElwee, McKenna) And, her second statement confirms she was biased against Martin Bryant whose name she used negatively before she had even looked at the ID board presented to her by the police.

WITNESS: **RICHARDS**, Faye Eila

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I dived under the table and stayed there until everything was quiet, and there were no more shots." & "I was too scared to even turn my head." & "He was carrying a large blue nylon sportsbag with red handles. It didn't appear to have much in it and I remember thinking that it's a very large bag to have and not carry much in. It appeared to be flat." & "I don't know if I would recognise his face again as my attention at the time was mainly on his bag."

DATE: 29 May 1996 (**31 days** after the incident)

CONCERNS: "About one week after this incident, I saw a photograph of a male person in the Herald Sun newspaper and I instantly recognized that person as the Port Arthur gunman." & "The folder has no. 14 on the front. I can positively identify the Port Arthur gunman as the male person depicted in photo no. 5." & "...the person at no. 5 definitely looks the same as the person I saw walk into the cafe that day." & "I would say the person in the photo looks to be a younger version of the person I saw in the cafe."

COMMENT: Here is another example of how memories are corrupted and/or created. On the day of the incident, the witness admitted: "I don't know if I would recognise his face again." She admits she was focused on the bag. Then, she was beneath a table too scared to even turn her head. The witness was not studying the facial characteristics of the gunman.

But after a month of official and media announcements that Martin Bryant was the *lone-nut* gunman, this witness had a miraculous realization. After reading the Herald Sun newspaper and seeing a photo of Martin Bryant, which had been stolen from his house and which ended up in the photoboard used by the police, she said she had seen Martin Bryant in the café. Richards said she could positively identify him. And she was definite about it.

But then, she admitted the likeness was not certain or perfect. She did think the photograph she saw "looks to be a younger version" of the person she thought she saw in the café. The person who she first said this about: "I don't know if I would recognise his face again as my attention at the time was mainly on his bag." This is not a credible identification.

The image used by the media was of Martin Bryant. This same image was used on the police photoboard. So of course they were the same. And the shooter did have physical characteristics which were similar to Martin's. And with officials, the media, and the public crying out the name Martin Bryant, it should not surprise us that witnesses were deceived – and they were **wilfully deceived** by the State and those in its employ.

*The presence
of weapons
and the condition
of trauma
have been shown
to influence
witness recall.*

WITNESS: **RICHARDS**, Lindsay Alexander

DATE: 29 May 1996 (**31 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I immediately recognise photo no. 5 as the person I believe to be the gunman. But I must be honest here with this identification and that is to say that I have been definitely influenced by media coverage of his photo in relation to an identification. I did not have eyeball to eyeball contact with the gunman."⁸⁴

COMMENT: Like all the other Port Arthur case witnesses who took part in the corrupt identification conducted by the corrupt cops, this **witness was deceived**. But unlike most of the other witnesses, he qualified his so-called identification by honestly admitting he had: "**been definitely influenced by media coverage of his photo in relation to an identification.**" (**thank you**; see statement of COOK, BA) This was the reason why the State – literature says via Geoff Easton public affairs manager for Tasmania Police – released the **stolen** image of Martin to the media where it was published **ILLEGALLY**, in conjunction with **big bold screaming headlines** over the top of cruel demonizing articles.

WITNESS: **RIVIERE**, John Michael

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "...as I approached the bar, I walked passed a male person, holding a plate of food and a blue sportsbag." & "The man wasn't saying anything, but he was laughing, more an aggressive laugh than anything." & "I kept running up towards the motel. I was approximately a **couple of hundred yards away** from the male when I saw him open a boot to a yellow Volvo, probably a '75, '76 model. He stood there near the boot a minute or so and I heard a couple of further shots." & "The male person with the gun looked to be a young white 19-20 years old, messy **shoulder length** hair, he was wearing a 'High length' black jacket."

DATE: 1 August 1996 (**95 days** after Port Arthur incident)

CONCERNS: "...he was carrying a large dark blue sportsbag. I think this bag had striping down the side or some sort of log[o]." & "He had the bag in his right hand and he had a plate of food in his left hand. As we manoeuvred between the space I saw a video camera sitting on what is marked as table 3." & "He was wearing a mid-length **heavy black jacket.**" & "The male with the gun didn't say anything. He appeared to be grunting, a hyper ventilating sort of noise." & "I ran towards an office and I yelled at a guy who looked like he worked at the place. He had a two-way [radio] in his hand and a wide-brimmed hat on." & "I kept heading towards Jetty Road. I saw another lady who I believed worked there and she was telling me to calm down." & "The carpark had a lot of cars, buses and coaches in it. He went to the rear of the yellow sedan and he opened the boot." & "I saw what I thought was an early model Volvo, yellow in colour." & "I recall that the Police showed Mick a picture board. **I never got to see this picture board.**"

⁸⁴ An honest revelation by this witness. Thus the only characteristic he could have used to make an ID is the fact Martin Bryant had blond longish hair. This editor has been told that the image of Martin Bryant on the photoboard used by police was the only coloured image. It seems that this image was a copy of an image which was given to the media and which was published nationally. So after **31 days**, this witness had inevitably seen this published image and had been told and/or read that Martin Bryant was the gunman.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: Note the witness Rebecca McKenna states the gunman had a tray in his hand on which there was a plate of food. Note that she said the gunman was also carrying a "fairly large" video camera, whereas Riviere makes no mention any such camera in his first statement. It is **doubted** Riviere could have identified, down to the year, any vehicle at a couple of hundred yards after fleeing for his life. It seems he might have seen a yellow Volvo later as it was driven toward the tollbooth and transferred that description to when he saw the alleged gunman standing near a vehicle.

Then, **95 days after** his first statement of three pages, this witness gave a second statement of 15 pages. In it, this witness says his friend Mick Sargent was shown a "picture board" but that the cops did not show it to him. This bothered Riviere. Later, Riviere was shown identification board No. 4. Whether it was the same board as Sargent saw is not revealed. It seems the cops used at least **21 such photoboards**. Whether they all contained the same number and type of images is not known. It is said the image of Martin Bryant was the only coloured image on those boards. If true, this is an unacceptable form of identification by image comparisons.

WITNESS: **ROBERTS**, Phyllis Esther

DATE: 3 June 1996 (**36 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "In relation to the vehicle that I saw the male person with the firearm get into, it was a yellow sedan. It was large, squarish type of car. It had metal roof racks on it, and a surfboard on the roof racks. The surfboard was white in colour." & "He was wearing a 3/4 length **black** duffle coat that was unbuttoned."

COMMENT: Another description of a surfboard, which other witnesses stated was in a yellow-coloured cover, and a silver cover. Another description of a coat worn by the gunman. But with different descriptions like that given by witness Cynthia Zahorcak, it is not unreasonable to think there were two gunmen. Zahorcak said the gunman she saw wore a "**pale yellow shirt**." Not one witness said the gunman he/she saw removed his coat. Witnesses described several different types of footwear on the gunman they saw, but not one said the gunman he/she saw changed his footwear.

WITNESS: **ROBERTS**, Raymond Malcolm

DATE: 3 June 1996 (**36 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "The male person opened the boot (it appeared as though the male person **did not use a key**) and put the rifle in the boot."

COMMENT: Several witnesses described similar observations they had – the gunman opened the boot lid of the vehicle he had without using a key. This happened with a yellow Volvo and with the gold-coloured BMW – **the boot lids were not locked**. The lid of the boot for each vehicle might have been opened from inside those vehicles before they were stopped. This suggests prior planning and that what actions took place after the gunman alighted from the vehicles were not spontaneous acts. This means, the gunman knew he would abandon the yellow Volvo at the Port Arthur Historic Site tollbooth, and it means he knew he was going to put someone into the boot at the Port Arthur general store.

Witness after witness stated facts contrary to those making up the official narrative – which is why the State made sure their statements were never presented in a trial.

*Seascape
might well be
the nadir of
Tasmanian Police
incompetence,
inhumanity,
and unethical
behaviour
– though
it does seem
everything
about the police
is constantly
worsening.*

One of the two people who owned the BMW said it was maintained in meticulous condition. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude the lock on the boot lid worked properly. This editor has not read any statement or report revealing the lock on the boot lid of that yellow Volvo was in any way malfunctioning. So if both lids were opened without keys, either the locks had been removed, or the locks were opened (electrically or mechanically) by the driver inside the vehicles before those vehicles stopped. This forethought, in conjunction with the very serious acts that followed (killing and kidnapping), confirms a level of thinking which it is believed was not something Martin Bryant was capable of. His girlfriend at the time stated this: "He doesn't remember a lot of things that I say to him and he forgets what he's doing sometimes."

Everything that the gunman did reflected a planned, determined, and a smoothly executed exercise. The gunman was not some amateur on a *killing spree* as the media has portrayed him. What he did and how he did it confirms that he was highly trained and competent in his horrible trade. He was not some forgetful low-IQ type person like Martin Bryant.

WITNESS: **ROGANOVIC**, Denise Suzanne

DATE: 14 May 1996 (**16 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "When we were in front of a bus in the car park, I heard noises and I really don't know what it was. It sounded like something exploding in the kitchen but I remember there was a lot of them. If I had to guess I would say it was about forty times."

COMMENT: This revelation by the witness tells another story than the one in the official narrative, in which far fewer shots are said to have been fired. This played up the power and potential danger of the firearms that the State wanted to ban – with legislation written before the official killing. Not only were there **more shots fired** as this witness describes, all those many shots were fired over a longer period of time than is declared in the official narrative.

WITNESS: **ROGANOVIC**, Milo

DATE: 15 May 1996 (**17 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I have seen several photographs of this man in the newspapers but I am positive I could have recognized him without reading the newspaper"

COMMENT: This revelation by the witness confirms that witnesses did see photographs of the alleged gunman in newspapers. With respect to the identification, if there are repeated images and accompanying accusatory text about any person, it becomes extremely difficult for a witness – for some it is impossible – to maintain an objective perspective. **People can be and are misled.**

WITNESS: **ROOKE**, John Douglas

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I was going to take my rubbish to the Port Arthur Tip, because the one at Taranna had been closed I was driving along the Arthur Highway towards Port Arthur I was near Seascape – when a brown coloured BMW which was travelling in the opposite direction to me cut straight

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

in front of me and stopped in the driveway of Seascap. A male person got straight out of the front passenger side and pointed a rifle straight at me. I was about 20' [20 feet] away from him. I heard two shots that were very very loud, I couldn't believe he missed me I thought they must have been blanks, because he was so close." & **"The person who shot at me was a male aged about 30 years slight build, about 5.5" short mousey coloured hair with a full faced beard that was light in colour.** I can't remember what he was wearing. I[t] appeared to be a white Australian. I didn't see anyone else in the car but he definitely got out of the passenger side. I would definitely recognize him if I saw him again." (sic)

DATE: 24 July 1996 (87 days after incident)

CONCERNS: "I would still describe him as in the previous statement." & "The male could have been crouching beside the BMW, he did not appear to be much taller than the height of the BMW. I can't recall what he was wearing other than dark clothing." & "I could not identify the gunman from the photoboard shown by Detective JARVIS. The manila folder contained 30 photographs of males on three pages and was photoboard number 21."

COMMENT: This witness was pulling a trailer behind his Datsun 180B sedan. In both statements, he said he was travelling at about 50 kilometres per hour. It was daylight, Rooke had been working, and there is nothing to indicate he was drugged or intoxicated. So at that slow speed, and at the distance of 20 feet from the gunman, it is reasonable to believe Rooke had a good sighting of that small man who had: **"short mousey coloured hair with a full faced beard."**⁸⁵ Rooke had ample time (87 days) between his two statements to reconsider his sighting, and/or to go along with what other people were saying – *the gunman had long blond hair*. But Rooke did not. He stuck with his original description of the gunman he saw.

The witness was approached by the police and presented with a photoboard on which there was a coloured image of Martin Bryant. But Rooke did not identify any image on that board as being that of the small man who shot at him.

There is no reason to believe this witness had a reason to lie or exaggerate. This editor believes Rooke stated the truth. Now, he might have been wrong. But if Rooke made a mistake, it must also be said that all the other witnesses might have made mistakes when identifying the gunman. What we must not do is dismiss Rooke's two statements because what he reveals in them does not match what is in the official narrative.

Whatever fits with that narrative is officially accepted as being the truth. Whereas what does not fit with that narrative is identified as being false – when the reality is, it might be profoundly accurate and true.

WITNESS: **SARGENT**, Michael Robert

DATE: 29 April 1996 – 11:47 (1 day after incident)

CONCERNS: "I looked at him and I saw that he was sighting the rifle up on me. He was holding the rifle at chest (cont.)

85 Rooke says that on the afternoon of 28 April 1996, he saw a small man with **"short mousey coloured hair"** and **"a full faced beard."** But most people will find it easy to dismiss this sighting because it does not match what other witnesses allege they saw that Sunday afternoon: a shooter with longish blond hair standing at the side of the road near Seascap and who was shooting at them. Well those people should not be so certain in their dismissals, because in life things are not always what they seem to be. In several parts of this book, the obvious point is made that Martin Bryant alone could not have conceived, planned, and perpetrated the incident at and near Port Arthur. He did not have the intelligence. The entire incident at Port Arthur was the *work* of a number of people having State approval. Nothing confirms this more than the prior preparation of the **22-body refrigerated mortuary truck** and the **special embalming equipment**. And given the size of the incident, no planner would set it up with a single shooter. If anything went wrong – illness or accident – months even years of planning would lead to nothing. Getting everything and all the players in place at a specific time on a specific day requires considerable planning and coordination. Thus, there would have been more than one shooter available for or active during the Port Arthur incident. Two people named in the literature as possible shooters are Benjamin & Warren Overbeeke. And this witness Rooke identified another shooter by his physical features.

Port Arthur Shooter?



Note the **full-faced beard** and **short mousey coloured hair**. The image is from the Internet and it is associated with the case. Is he the person who, outside of Seascap standing on the Arthur Highway, discharged a rifle at John Douglas Rooke?

VOLVOS, A VOLKSWAGEN, A BLUE SEDAN, A GREEN SEDAN

CORRUPT officials did everything they could to make the **mass murder** at and near Port Arthur become associated with the patsy Martin Bryant. They had **no** incriminating DNA results. They had **no** incriminating fingerprints. They had **no** forensic evidence. They had **no** rock-solid identification. (The eyewitness identification they did have made it clear Martin Bryant was **not** or might **not** have been the gunman. At the very least, written statements from eyewitnesses raised a considerable amount of doubt about many things in the case.)

To overcome the absence of inculpatory evidence, the State focused on two things which it believed could be presented to the public in such a way the public would accept those things then accept Martin Bryant was the gunman. One thing was his hair, the other was his vehicle.

In 1994 it seems, Martin acquired a used Volvo sedan. It was not rare, it was nothing special. It was a yellow colour and Martin kept his surfboard (singular) attached to roof racks on that sedan. So those wanting to set him up for the mass murder needed to bring that Volvo into the incident because it could be and would be associated with Martin Bryant whether he was at Port Arthur or anywhere near Port Arthur. People (witnesses) would see a yellow Volvo. Then, once they were told that it belonged to Martin Bryant, the link was obvious to those people: it was Bryant's car; so Bryant was there; thus, Bryant was the gunman. Or: it was a Volvo; it was yellow; it belonged to Martin Bryant; thus, he was the gunman. Or: It was a Volvo; It was yellow; there was a surfboard on the roof; thus, Martin Bryant was the gunman.

So the significance of a Volvo is the linking of it to Martin Bryant, which the official narrative tells us was done through the colour of that vehicle, the surfboard on the roof racks, and the driver having blond hair. So if there were witnesses who said the colour of that Volvo was yellow, and there was a surfboard on roof racks on that vehicle, and the driver had long blond hair, then that would be circumstantial evidence that Martin Bryant was the gunman. Well there were witnesses who said such things. And some others said all three things. But, there were also witnesses who said very different things. Other things which raise **so many questions** any thinking person (and court) would have reasonable doubts.

Martin Bryant only owned one Volvo, and could only drive one (automatic) Volvo at a time. So what are we to make of all the sightings putting him and a Volvo quite some distance from Port Arthur whilst the incident there was underway. He was at Seascapes when the SOG siege was underway, but his Volvo was not. And no one can say with certainty how he got to Seascapes and how his Volvo ended up elsewhere. People have speculated. And assertions have been made. But there is **no hard evidence**.

Now the matter of colour is raised as if it was definitive proof. But it isn't. In fact, an employee at the historic site has said there was **another yellow Volvo at the site** and he and co-employees saw it. (see P. Cooper, A. Law) These sightings cannot be dismissed by saying that Volvo was an older or newer model. Where is the proof? Eyewitnesses saw two yellow Volvos at the site during the incident. This second Volvo might have delivered and/or removed another gunman, one of two. That there was a second yellow Volvo, with surfboard roof racks the editor has been told, strongly supports the setting up of Martin Bryant. (cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Immediately, those who think the surfboard on roof racks is what incriminates Martin Bryant start raising their concerns. But please wait a second. If the vehicle and the ownership of that vehicle underneath that surfboard, or **surfboards** (plural) as some witnesses have documented, is not certain, you cannot prove anything with the surfboard(s). Along Australian coasts, lots of cars have a surfboard or two on top. And lots of those cars might be yellow. Anyone can put a surfboard on a vehicle. On a yellow Volvo vehicle. (Recall there were two seen at PAHS.) But does that prove the vehicle belongs to Martin Bryant? **No**. Does that prove Martin Bryant was the gunman? **No**.

And for those who have a keen interest on the surfboard(s) in the Port Arthur incident, do you know what type or make it was? **No**. Were there any fingerprints lifted off the surfboard allegedly found on the yellow Volvo left at the tollbooth? **No**. Is there any hard evidence proving there was a cover on that surfboard and what that cover was made from, and what colour that cover was? **No**. Is there any hard evidence which proves that surfboard on that Volvo left at the tollbooth belonged to Martin Bryant? **No**. It seems no cop ever asked him. It was one assertion after another. So what are we to make of the statements from witnesses who said that surfboard had: "a creamy/**yellow** canvas style board cover" (see Copping); and, "the Volvo had a surfboard strapped to the roof with a **silver** cover on it." (see McElwee) Some witnesses saw surfboards. (see JD. Dutton, I. Kingston) Others saw just one surfboard. And some saw no surfboard(s) at all on the Volvo(s). So what really is the truth? Just saying Martin Bryant owned a surfboard does not prove anything conclusive about him or his behaviour, or his yellow Volvo. Was it really his surfboard? Really his Volvo? **No proof was determined**.

If that was not uncertain enough, what are we to make of those statements in which witnesses describe **a gunman** in another vehicle all together? That their statements do not fit with the official narrative is obvious and this is another reason why the State avoided having a trial. This is what Rabe said, and you are reminded she was the witness who watched the murders at the tollbooth: "Parked on the other side of the road was a **pale blue** older style sedan." & "[T]he 'gunman' walked calmly but purposefully to the rear of his **pale blue** sedan." (Rabe said nothing about a surfboard.) And the witness Prout, who was at the tollbooth when the gunman was there, said: "I think the colour of the vehicle **was green**." (Prout said nothing about a surfboard.)

Compounding this fact is an article (*Hostages held in final siege*) which appeared on 29 April 1996 in The Australian. The reporter Bruce Montgomery quotes a witness believed to be Rebecca McKenna: "He was a young fellow, about 18 or 19, he looked like a surfer, **he arrived in a Volkswagon** [*sic*] and he walked into the cafeteria carrying a tennis bag." (added emphasis) And compounding it further is the original statement (2 May 1996) of Aileen Kingston who worked at the tollbooth: "I couldn't determine if it was the same person." It seems this witness had doubts whether the man who drove a yellow Volvo into the historic site was the same man who drove a yellow Volvo out. So, was it the same driver/person? Was it the same yellow Volvo?

So many significant questions have not been answered. What the State has done is just keep asserting Martin Bryant was the gunman, because he had a yellow Volvo on which there was a surfboard, and because he had longish blond hair. All the witnesses who saw anything else were ignored, even ridiculed. That is not how real investigations are undertaken. That is exactly how a patsy like the innocent Martin Bryant is set up. – **ed**.

height aiming at me." & "...long blond hair...**passed his shoulders.**" & "I remember him wearing a blue jacket." & "...something tells me he was wearing blue jeans." & "He had a big blue tennis bag and video camera – **which was still on the table in the café after I made the '000' call.** I actually looked in the bag and noticed clothing, a metre to 2 metre length of white rope." & "I would say he was 18 to 20 years." & "I do not recall that person saying anything throughout the duration of the incident." & "I believe I can identify this person again."

DATE: 29 April 1996 – 15:26 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I have been shown a manila folder containing 16 photographs which were numbered 1-16.

COMMENT: This witness, who was wounded, claims he was, at one stage, no more than four metres from the gunman. Unlike the witness Riviere who was with him, Sargent did not recall any grunting or hyperventilating by the gunman. In a later statement (Sargent seems to have given three), he confirms the gunman shot in a righthanded manner. (Martin Bryant shot lefthanded.)

The bag and camera which Sargent saw also appear in the police *training video*. This confirms the gunman had a second sportsbag which he took with him from the café, and which witnesses confirm the gunman placed in the boot of a yellow Volvo. The so-called identification set up by the cops is not the same as other witnesses have described. (**No descriptions** of the photographs and photoboards are provided by any witness, or the police, or the DPP.)

WITNESS: **SCOTT**, *Malcolm James* (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "At about 7:30 a.m. on Monday 29 April 1996 I withdrew from my observation position to the Special Operation Group Holding Area on the Arthur Highway near Seascope. On arrival I was briefed in relation to plans, including an arrest plan. Sometime shortly after 7:30 a.m. I became aware of smoke coming from the location of the Seascope."⁸⁶ & "Constable HAWKINS informed BRYANT that he was under arrest and after a short struggle handcuffed him with assistance." & "On route to the Royal Hobart Hospital at about 9:20 a.m. I cut the handcuffs from BRYANT's hands at the request of the ambulance officer allowing him to perform medical treatment to BRYANT's entire back." & "On arrival at the Royal Hobart Hospital, I escorted BRYANT into the Casualty Section. I took BRYANT by the arms and assisted hospital staff to move him to an operating table. When my head was close to his he said, Shouldn't I get a lawyer or something now? I said, That's up to you." & "At about 10:36 a.m. at the request of medical staff I cut the handcuffs that were restraining BRYANT's ankles."

COMMENT: The statement by Scott confirms the burning of Seascope was a deliberate act of arson by Tasmania Police. (see Insert *WE FORCED THE GUNMAN TO COME TO US* in Part 5) (**cont.**)

⁸⁶ It is shockingly obvious that the cops burnt Seascope to the ground. In legal terminology it's called arson. Of course the cops will say there is no proof they did. But there is no proof that Martin Bryant did. What **true facts** are known about that cottage conflagration strongly suggest police guilt, not the patsy who exited with his back all in flames. According to his statement, the cop Scott was pulled from his position to prepare for an arrest. Then, and what convenient timing it was for the cops, Seascope just burst into flames sending that *lone-nut* gunman all ablaze and wearing Nike sandshoes (or was it Blunstone-like boots?) and dressed in black with a striped shirt out onto the lawn. How convenient that evidence-destroying fire was for the State.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Scott wants you to believe there was a "short struggle" prior to Martin Bryant being arrested. Martin was bewildered, was naked, was on the ground, and was burnt (third degree) on his back and buttocks. Yes, he might have resisted those SOG thugs as they mistreated him by cuffing his hands **behind his back**. The mongrels even put cuffs on his ankles. This meant he could not walk, and he must have been **dragged around** – it seems the more pain Martin Bryant felt, the better those sadistic SOG thugs liked it. That Martin raised the matter of a lawyer with Scott cannot be confirmed. It is believed Scott stated this to create the impression Martin was guilty and that he knew he needed to get a lawyer to defend himself. (Note that Martin later told police interrogators that he did not believe them and that he was being "falsely accused"; see WARREN, J.)

WITNESS: **SCURR**, Wendy

COMMENT: see Part 4 and *NAME INDEX*

WITNESS: **SHARP**, Marlene Joan⁸⁷

DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I noticed a long sportsbag which I think was either blue or green, and white. It had two handles.... The bag was open. I think it had a zip. I looked in and saw clothing or rags, not much bulk, I pulled it open slightly with my hands. This was on a small table which was behind where I had been standing earlier." & "Michael told me to **'not touch it, don't pick it up, it's his.'**"

COMMENT: This statement confirms there were two sportsbags, which in turn proves Martin Bryant was being set up by officials. Several witnesses have said that after the shooting at the café, they saw the gunman place a sportsbag into the boot of a yellow Volvo. This second bag identified by Sharp, which is on the police *training video*, is a different colour and it contained items which officials asserted belonged to Martin Bryant. But nothing was ever proved.

WITNESS: **SHILKIN**, Helen Ruth

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I noticed he was holding a gun aimed at us. I heard a large bang and the front windscreen had smashed. Doug then said words to the effect that he's been shot. Neville yelled at us to get down so we slid down on the back seat." & "When we arrived at the Fox and Hounds there was mass confusion and fear."

COMMENT: This statement is from a witness who was a passenger in a vehicle being driven on the Arthur Highway near Seascapes on Sunday 28 April 1996, c.2:30 in the afternoon. Several vehicles and their occupants were shot at that location around that time. Whether this was done by the same gunman who earlier had killed and wounded people at and near PAHS was not proved.

The last sentence of this witness is extremely troubling. Known facts – there are many of them – indicate "mass confusion and fear," as this witness experienced and described, is what officials wanted to achieve during their **psycho-political terror exercise**. By traumatizing the public, the State set the stage for the introduction of ready-to-go gun-control legislation throughout Australia.

⁸⁷ Then the wife of Kevin Sharp who died inside the Broad Arrow Café. The brothers Kevin and Raymond Sharp are said to have been fatally shot in that café. But for some reason unknown to the public, the name Raymond Sharp **does not appear** on the memorial garden plaque at PAHS. Visitors to PAHS will only find the names of 34 victims, not 35, on said plaque. (see Image at Part 9) This editor was told that the Sharp family asked to have the Raymond Sharp name removed from or kept off that plaque. **Why?** It is **highly questionable**. Was this Raymond Sharp negatively involved with the incident in some way? Was he or had he ever been connected with ASIO? Did the Sharp family blame him for the death of Kevin Sharp? If you know or determine any fact(s) about or related to this, the editor would appreciate receiving your findings. MURDER.RESEARCH@gmail.com **Thank you.**

WITNESS: **SHILKIN**, Neville Morris

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I noticed a brown coloured car parked off the side of the road, the left side, towards a driveway to a house."
& "...**shoulder length** blonde hair...**wearing a checked top, possibly a jacket and blue checked.**"⁸⁸

COMMENT: Of all four people in the vehicle in which this Shilkin was being driven, he was the closest to the gunman. Thus, Shilkin's description of what the gunman was wearing has some credibility. But his clothing description is yet another of the many which witnesses made. It must be noted that because the gunman fired the rifle from his right shoulder, the stock of that rifle would have covered a good part of his face. Any person driving south down the highway would not have seen a clear close-up view of the gunman's face.

WITNESS: **SIMMONS**, Andrew David (see McCUTCHEON, DW)

DATE: 4 May 1996 (**6 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Either on Saturday the 27th April 1996 or Sunday 28th April 1996 I know **it was prior to 11 a.m.** I was in my front yard with my wife.... I heard very clearly two shots ring out. They sounded as though it may have come from a rifle about the caliber of .22. The direction it came from was from the area of Seascope."

COMMENT: These two shots might have been the ones that killed David Martin, the co-owner of Seascope. Note that at this time, witnesses place a yellow Volvo sedan some distance from Seascope. (see Insert *YELLOW VOLVO ALLEGED STOPS* above) And, there is no proof Martin Bryant was ever at Seascope at that time, and no proof he ever discharged any firearm there at that time. This is what officials have asserted without a scrap of **hard evidence**. That Martin Bryant was apprehended at Seascope on the morning of Monday, 29 April 1996, does not prove any significant thing related to any shooting, or killing, or wounding, at or near Port Arthur. The State never did prove how Martin Bryant arrived at Seascope cottage, when he arrived there, or why he was there. The State has just made one assertion after another about him, but not one of these assertions has been proved. Even with his limited intellectual capacity, Martin realized he was being set up and he expressed this.

WITNESS: **SLOAN**, Terry James

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "I would describe the male as being about 23 to 25 years of age, a little bit taller than 5'10", average build, blonde wavy-hair extending **below his shoulders.**" & "wearing faded blue jeans, a **lumber jacket chequered with various colours.**"⁸⁸ & "As I made my way back to the coaches, I saw a yellow old model Volvo, mustard colour, driving away from the area along the main road leading into the area." & "I have been involved with firearms **all my life** and own various high caliber firearms. The shots that were fired in the dining room ranged from cracking ones to muffled ones. It sounded like a **shotgun could have been used** because of the muffled thudding sound."

⁸⁸ The witness Shilkin had his experience with the gunman on the Arthur Highway near the turnoff to Seascope cottage. Sloan had his experience at the Port Arthur Historic Site. Both made their statements within c.24 hours after their experience. And both say the gunman was wearing a chequered jacket of more than one colour. But, other witnesses who had experience with the gunman between the site and the cottage turnoff give other top garment descriptions: "wearing a long dark coloured coat just above his knees." (**F. Cheok**) & "wind cheater on, dark coloured." (**N. Cheok**) & "he had on a coat...khaki green in colour and appeared to come to his mid thigh." (**Laycock**) & "bush walking jacket. The main colour was emerald green." (**Rabe**); "Yellow coloured long-sleeved T shirt." (**Spruce**). So, between the historic site and the cottage turn-off, where two witnesses say the gunman was wearing a chequered jacket of more than one colour, there are five different descriptions of upper garments worn by the gunman. Such a variation from seven witnesses who saw a gunman with their own eyes confirms how inconsistent descriptions by witnesses can be. And of course we must ask, did all those witnesses see the same gunman? From the clothing and footwear descriptions, it seems not.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: Yet another clothing description – multi-coloured lumber jacket. Note this witness was attentive and noted a yellow Volvo being driven away, but he did not mention anything about a surfboard on that vehicle. And having been involved with firearms all his life, what Sloan says about them must be given serious consideration. He described the sound of different shots as “cracking” and “thudding.” He associates the latter with a shotgun being discharged in the café – a shotgun which officials denied was used, but which the wounds on Dennis Olsen **confirm was used**, and which reports from the physicians at the Royal Hobart Hospital **confirm was used**.

WITNESS: **SPRUCE**, Kyle

DATE: 2 May 1996 (**4 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: “This male had a rifle in his right hand and was pushing the other male around with his left hand.” & “The blonde male was pushing and directing him towards the boot area of a dark gold BMW. The blonde male then started pushing this bloke into the boot of the BMW. **I don’t know if it was already open, or if he had to open it, but he did not go back to the front of the car to a lever or anything.**”⁸⁹ (*sic*) & “he was wearing light blue faded denim jeans, **yellow coloured long sleeve T shirt.**” & “At the time I was seeing the events at the shop, I would have been about ten to fifteen metres away from the Corolla and the BMW.”

COMMENT: This witness refers to the hostage taking and killing at the Port Arthur general store on Sunday the 28 April 1996. He says he was “ten to fifteen metres” away from the two significant vehicles and it seems he had a good sighting of a gunman there. But strangely, even though this witness says he would “definitely recognize” that gunman, it seems he was never asked to do so by the cops. Or, did the cops ask this witness to identify that gunman and the person did not identify Martin Bryant? Recall that the witness James Laycock also saw that gunman at that store, and in his statement Laycock said **it was not Martin Bryant**.

Immediately before the hostage taking and the killing at the Port Arthur general store, a gunman killed four people at the nearby tollbooth of the Port Arthur Historic Site. Several witnesses saw what he did at that tollbooth and the clothing they said he was wearing is not the same as clothing described by Spruce. To compound this matter, one witness (White) who saw a gunman standing at the entrance road to Seascape and firing at vehicles passing by described yet another type of clothing.

WITNESS: **STAINTHORPE**, Peter Francis

DATE: 30 May 1996 (**32 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: “I was in the tree line, I looked back towards the car park when I did this, I saw a man at the back of a yellow Volvo sedan. He appeared to be **putting a bag** or something into the boot.” & “When he drove out he did so **very fast** and appeared to be staring straight ahead.” & “I also recall two other cars left the car park just after the shooting had happened and drove out towards the tollbooth.”

⁸⁹ Note that a similar comment was made by witness Rabe. Her observation was made in relation to a yellow Volvo parked at the tollbooth, and the observation by Spruce was of the BMW at the Port Arthur store. There is the possibility that both boots were opened from inside the vehicles before the gunman got out of them. If this is true, it indicates that the gunman intended to take something out of or put something into those boots. And this is what he did. It all suggests planning, not spontaneous acts arising after he alighted from the Volvo, and out of the BMW.

*Facts
must be proved
true or false
– not ignored
because they
do not fit
with the
official narrative.*

COMMENT: This witness says a man appeared to put a bag into the boot of a yellow Volvo. And, this man drove that vehicle away “very fast.” But two other witnesses, Godfrey and Law, respectively said: “The male appeared to be lounging in the vehicle and was not driving quickly,” and “travelling at maybe 25 kilometres an hour. I seen him wave and tooting his horn.” Now what does this mean? Was this just a simple misjudgement of the speed of the vehicle? Or, did these witnesses actually see the same yellow Volvo or was it two different yellow Volvos? (Note Law does not say that he saw a surfboard or surfboards on the Volvo he said he observed.)

WITNESS: **SULLIVAN**, Christine Elizabeth

DATE: 6 June 1996 (**39 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: “I heard him say to someone, ‘Oh, I’ve just been surfing’.” & “He was wearing a surfie type multi coloured jacket.” & “After he spoke about the surfing, he seemed to include me in the conversation.” & “It seemed to me that he was speaking to almost anyone who would listen.... I did not make any eye contact with him.” & “I heard him say to the people he was now facing, ‘It’s very busy here today. Did you have any trouble parking? Where did you park’ or words to that effect.” & “On the **3 1 st day of April** [*sic*] on returning to Brisbane I bought the Courier Mail Newspaper and saw one of the Sydney Newspapers. The picture in The Courier-Mail had a colour picture of a male person. The Sydney Newspaper also had a photograph of this man. **I hadn’t seen the gunman’s face in detail at Port Arthur**, but I thought that the picture in the newspapers certainly looked like the person I had seen in Port Arthur.”

COMMENT: This witness said the gunman wore a multi-coloured jacket. But other witnesses described a singled-coloured dark jacket. Again we see the marker events like buying the tomato sauce, and the bumping into a customer at the café, and the comment to anyone about surfing, and parking. All of them saying, *remember me*. To her credit, this witness Sullivan did not say the gunman she saw was Martin Bryant. There was his stolen image in the newspapers – distributed by the State and published illegally – yet this moral witness refused to succumb to the pressure to say it was Martin. **Thank you** Christine. Formatting of this statement from Queensland strongly suggests it was corrupted – note the date and its layout.

WITNESS: **TRIFFETT**, Colin Andrew

DATE: 24 June 1996 (**57 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: “I am the Storekeeper of the Port Arthur General Store.” & “I was looking out of the front window, looking towards the Port Arthur entrance. I saw a green/gold BMW pull up, facing north, on the right-hand side of the road, near the store sign. I could see that the rear window, passenger side, was smashed.” & “I saw a male get out of the driver’s door, as he got out, with his right hand he pulled out a rifle, I think it had a brown wooden butt.... As soon as I saw the gun I went out the back and got the kids to lie down on the floor.” & (**cont.**)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

"By the time I had loaded my rifle and came out of the store, the BMW had gone as the male who I saw get out of the BMW." (*sic*) & "I would describe the male that got out of the BMW as: 6'-6'1", Gaunt narrow face."

DATE: 1 July 1996 (**63 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I identify photo no. 5 as the person I saw that day."

COMMENT: This witness says a window of the BMW was smashed. How did that happen? Note the witness Colleen Maree Parker said a rear window on a Volvo was also smashed. Triffett said the gunman got out of that vehicle then reached for a rifle. Immediately he saw that rifle, Triffett went to protect his children. When he returned the gunman was gone. So, based on that very brief sighting at an undeclared distance, Triffett identified photo no. 5 as the gunman. But Martin Bryant is not 6'-6'1". And he certainly does not have a gaunt narrow face – but it seems **Benjamin Overbeeke** does/did.

WITNESS: **VALLANCE**, Patricia Ann

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "This person then ran a short distance...to a yellow car with a yellow surfboard on the roof."

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He did not go to the boot but appeared to fumble with a large set of keys beside the driver's door." & "I witnessed this from the penitentiary, looking out the fourth window along from the left as you view it from the cafe."

COMMENT: As also stated elsewhere, the editor has been told the distance from the front of the Broad Arrow Café to the penitentiary is **150-200 metres**. This witness could not have seen what she alleges she saw. It seems she is repeating what she heard from others.

WITNESS: **VANDERPEER**, Sarah Elizabeth

DATE: 19 June 1996 (**52 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Whilst I was under the table, I heard about 20 to 30 gunshots. These were over a period of about 5 minutes although, I wish to state that with all the confusion and fear, it is very hard to estimate times." & "I did not see his face, I could only see his legs. He was wearing jeans." & "A short time later, I can remember hearing sounds that were similar to a weapon being re-loaded. There were no shots whilst this re-load took place. There had been frequent shots up until this re-load. I think I can remember hearing shots after the re-load. These shots were coming from the café area." & "I then tried to ring '000' but **I couldn't get through.**"

COMMENT: This person was in the Australian military at the time. Thus, her statements related to the number of shots fired and the reloading have credibility. This witness clearly states she was unable to get through on the emergency number 000. But recall what the NSW cop/witness Justin Noble claimed. He said he used 000 to get through to "Police Radio in Hobart," even though he phoned later when more people would have been trying to call. So how did Noble do this? His statement says he was a visitor to PAHS, but he got an immediate connection with "Police Radio in Hobart." Evidence strongly suggests that Noble was officially involved with the incident.

*All the
phone calls and
conversations
in the
Port Arthur case
are associated
with doubt and
questions
– recordings have
gone missing.*

WITNESS: **VIALLS**, Joe

COMMENT: There is a swirl of allegations and mystery around this person – aka: Otho Jewell Vialls; Ari Ben-Menashe.⁹⁰ His(?) image is on the Internet. This editor has not found any statements, nor anything official or from Vialls, which provides a credible clarification. Given the case in which it seems he was directly involved is a case of mass murder, public clarification is badly needed. His book *Deadly Deception at Port Arthur* is incomplete, ill-referenced, and deceptive.

WITNESS: **VILLIERS**, Caroline Elizabeth Anne

DATE: 10 June 1996 (**43 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He was about 20 years of age...real yellow looking hair which was **shoulder length** and scruffy. He was wearing a **jumper or windcheater which was dark blue**. I recall this person seated at a table who had a big bag which was blue." & "When things went quiet in the Café after about 5 or six minutes." & "A couple of people came in from the side door and one of them was wearing a uniform.... I think the man in the uniform said that the person shooting was out the front somewhere." & "I remember seeing an old yellow Volvo which had a surfboard on the roof rack going up the main road.... The car was tooting its horn."

COMMENT: This witness says a 20-year-old male had yellow looking hair which was shoulder length and scruffy. But the witnesses Colin and Iris Williams who sat opposite the same(?) man, at the same table, said he looked neat and tidy. So did Rabe. But witness Howard said he looked dishevelled and dazed. That the driver tooted the horn was also recorded by the witness Ashley John Law.

WITNESS: **WANDERS**, Michael Gerard

DATE: 27 May 1996 (**29 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I didn't take that much notice of the [BMW] vehicle or the male. We would have been about 50 metres from the male when I noticed him raise a gun. The male put the gun to his shoulder as though he was aiming at our vehicle." & "I am sure the first shot hit our vehicle on the top right-hand corner of the windscreen [which shattered]. This shot was rapidly followed by several more shots which were fired in rapid succession. I remember the passenger's side door window smashing and falling in on me." & "I looked across at Linda and noticed that her right forearm had been injured."

COMMENT: This statement is from a front-seat passenger in a car which was being driven south passed the Seascope entrance from the Arthur Highway. So let us conclude this vehicle was being driven at 80 km/h. (The legal maximum is 100 km/h.) And at some point up to 50 metres distant, the gunman fired a shot shattering the windscreen. Then several more shots were fired into the car. Then the door window glass was smashed and it fell in onto the witness. It is believed these **rapidly occurring events, all shock inducing, would have denied the witness a clear sighting of the face** of the gunman. But regardless, this witness identified photograph number 5 (Martin Bryant) as being the gunman.

⁹⁰ On 8 December 2012, Global Research (globalresearch.ca) reported a story under the heading: *Who bombed ex-Israel spy Ben-Menashe's house?* Reports exist that Joe Vialls died in 2005, but it has been suggested that Vialls and Ben-Menashe are the same person. It has also been said Vialls trained the gunman son(s?) of Hans Overbeeke. All of this is disconcerting and it all requires public clarification – **not more cover-ups**.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS: **WARDLE**, Ann Elizabeth

DATE: 12 June 1996 (**45 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I was driving down a small incline in the roadway." & "When I first saw this person he was about a distance of about **40 metres**."

COMMENT: This witness drove a passenger vehicle south along the Arthur Highway heading toward the Port Arthur Historic Site. She had three passengers in her vehicle. Wardle noticed a man in the middle of the road who shot at them. So she stopped her vehicle and reversed back the way she had come. Given all this – driving at highway speed; being confronted by a gunman unexpectedly in the middle of the road; having the car being hit by a bullet; reversing north back up the incline; being anxious of reversing into some vehicle driving south; turning her vehicle; driving away in great fear – Wardle claims that she saw the facial features of the gunman well enough to be able to identify him. **Over six weeks** after the incident, during which the **media published super-size images** of Martin Bryant, Wardle said photograph number 5 was the gunman – *of course it was Martin*. Do not forget that other witnesses who drove by the gunman and who were also shot at along the Arthur Highway **described a person different to the one Wardle described**. Of course Wardle would have thought she was doing the right thing.

WITNESS: **WARREN**, John Arthur (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "I remained at the Port Arthur Site in charge of investigations until **the following Monday** afternoon when advice was received that alleged offender may be in a position to be interviewed at the hospital." & "Detective Sergeant Bennett and myself **returned to Hobart**. Arrangements were made for the portable video unit to be set up in Mr BRYANT's room. We endeavoured at 6:41 p.m. to interview BRYANT, however after repeated attempts were made which were unsuccessful, we concluded at 7:17 p.m." & "On the following morning, Tuesday 30th April 1996, Detective Sergeant BENNETT and I again returned to the hospital. We proceeded to BRYANT's room and saw Dr. BELL. At 9:25 am...BELL said to BRYANT, How did you get your burns? BRYANT said, **I don't remember anything**." & "I said, to remind you I'm Detective Inspector WARREN. Do you recall us speaking to you yesterday. He said, **I can't remember anything**." & "I must warn you that you are not obliged to answer any questions or make any statement unless you wish to do so. Anything that you say will be electronically recorded. Do you understand that. He said, **I don't know anything** I was a long way from Port Arthur, surfing."⁹¹ & "Are you prepared to take part in a video recorded interview. He said, I'm not talking to you, **I'm being falsely accused**."⁹² & "I said, given the circumstances, that you are not prepared to be formally interviewed,⁹³ I'm now arresting you for the murder of Kate Elizabeth SCOTT. He said, I don't believe you. **I'm being falsely accused**."

⁹¹ Cops must never be trusted. So, we do not know if this statement was actually made by Martin Bryant. If it is true, it suggests he did not recall anything about Seascope and his actions there, whatever they were. Again, do not trust what cops say or what anyone from the DPP office alleges Martin Bryant said or did. All they have done is make assertion after assertion – **with no credible proof** whatsoever.

⁹² Again, we do not know if these words* were said by Martin Bryant, or whether they have just been added to this statement by Warren. If Martin really did say he was being "falsely accused," it informs us that even with his low intellect Martin sensed something **was not right**. (* Did Warren make a Freudian slip?)

⁹³ If what Warren alleges here actually happened, it was held against Martin Bryant. Like most idiot cops, Warren was labouring under the delusion that people have to do what police want. Like every other person in Australia, Martin had every right not to participate in any so-called interview – formal or informal. But Warren doesn't understand this, so he puffed up his big hairy chest and told Martin he was being arrested. Think about it. Martin had no guardian with him. No proper lawyer with him. And he had to endure a bully of a cop intimidating him to submit to a formal interview. That, no doubt, would have been videotaped then used against Martin – a *boy-man* with the verbal skills of an 11-year-old.

OFFICIALS DECEIVING AUSTRALIANS

TWELVE days after the shooting, massive new restrictions were imposed on the civilian possession and use of firearms – restrictions specifically designed to reduce the number of lawfully owned guns in the hands of Australians. It was a scenario all too familiar to American gun-owners. A high-profile shooting occurs and new laws are demanded – laws designed to render civilian firearm possession all the more difficult.

With Port Arthur, however, many Australians believe that the firearm-prohibitionists weren't willing to leave anything to chance. Fueling the fires of suspicion, **major discrepancies in the official accounts of what transpired at Port Arthur surfaced** in the years that followed and charges of cover-up and conspiracy were leveled against the Australian government. Even if the exact details may never be known with certainty, some light may be shed on the answers by examining the question of whether Martin Bryant was capable of acting alone.

Twenty-eight-year-old Martin Bryant had an IQ of 66 and was considered incompetent by the [Tasmanian] state at the time of the shootings. In February 1984, a psychiatric assessment was undertaken for the purpose of determining Bryant's eligibility for a Department of Social Security **invalid pension**. It was granted because of Bryant's mental deficiencies, that he been unable to hold a job and was incapable of managing his own affairs. In addition to his pension, he had been left a legacy of over one million dollars.

If Bryant had co-conspirators who made themselves scarce after his actions, then might not their motive be the facilitation of a political agenda? Sufficient evidence now exists in the public record to strongly suggest that **Bryant could not have acted alone**, either in planning or in executing the massacre. Charges of a conspiracy designed to stampede Australians into surrendering their guns becomes all the more credible.

About an hour before the shooting commenced, an anonymous phone call was made to the police. The unidentified caller reported a large quantity of heroin stashed at a coal mine situated near Saltwater River at the extreme west end of the Tasman Peninsula. The only two policemen on the Tasman Peninsula were sent to investigate this report. One was dispatched from Nubeena, the closest police station to the Port Arthur site, 11 kilometers away. The other officer was dispatched from Dunalley, a small town to the north with the "swing bridge" capable of isolating the Tasman Peninsula from the rest of Tasmania. On their arrival at Saltwater River, the police found only glass jars filled with soap powder. Within minutes of the officers' phone call reporting their position at the coal mines, the shootings commenced at the Broad Arrow Café. Was that anonymous phone call a coincidence? Was it simple oversight that, in all of the government documentation, there is only a single reference to this phone call, and of the subsequent dispatching of the only available police officers to far away Saltwater River?

Without any suggestion that the phone call might have been used as a diversionary tactic, the reference appears in the official report of commissioner of Police Richard McCreadie. He noted: "[T]he local police were at the Saltwater River area...." There was neither any further interest, nor any follow-up investigation of the origins of that anonymous phone call. Wendy Scurr was the first one to call in the report of the shootings to police and is a senior instructor at St. John Ambulance. In her spare time, she worked as a volunteer with the Tasmanian Ambulance Service in the Port Arthur area. About the anonymous phone call, Scurr said:

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

"I became aware that the only two local police were dispatched to Saltwater River. I was chatting to the Nubeena policeman and he told me where he was when the shooting began. His name is Paul Hyland. The other policeman was stationed at Dunalley. He would back up Hyland as they were told heroin (soap powder) was found at Saltwater River." & "This meant that the only 2 local police were at least 25 minutes away from Port Arthur. Very convenient. I don't know when, where, or who rang and alerted the police to this so-called heroin haul..." & "I know it should have been on tape. But I went to Hobart about a week after the shooting to a meeting of the ambulance service. A comment was made to me that the tape recordings of the day's events had been accidentally wiped. The chap who told me was a senior ambulance officer. I traveled with him to the meeting, and it was during this journey that I was given this information."

If Martin Bryant was too incompetent to plan and execute this complicated scenario, then there was at least one other person who helped Bryant by diverting the police from the café, and providing Bryant more time. Who was that person? Did he use the swing bridge at Dunalley to make good his escape? What is known about the events following the carnage at the café is that the gunman, upon leaving the café, switched from the .223 Colt AR-15 semi-automatic rifle used inside the café to his other rifle, a .308 Fabrique Nationale FAL semi-automatic, and fired several shots.

He then drove 100 yards to the tollbooth at the Port Arthur historic site, shot four people who had arrived in a gold BMW, and exchanged vehicles. He drove another 200 yards to a service station, blocked off a Toyota Corolla driven by Glenn Pears, and took Pears hostage at gunpoint, forcing him into the trunk of the BMW. As Pears' female companion Zoe Hall attempted to get into the driver's seat and make her escape, the gunman then shot her. He then drove the BMW to the Seascape Cottage, a holiday accommodation with the back of the property facing Long Bay.

A state of siege ensued upon the arrival of the police. Police superintendents Barry Bennett and Bob Fielding discussed the Seascape siege in the March 1997 issue of the Association of South Australia Police Journal. They noted: "There was some suggestion that there may be two suspects. It appeared at one stage that two gunmen or some people or hostages at Seascape were exchanging gunfire with the gunmen as there appeared to be shots coming from two separate buildings..."

According to autopsy reports, two of the hostages – the elderly couple who owned and operated Seascape, David and Sally Martin – were killed early on Sunday, **before Bryant had even driven into the Port Arthur area.** According to the official court transcripts, the burned corpse of the third hostage, Glenn Pears, was [officials allege] recovered with his hands secured behind his body with a pair of handcuffs. [No proof of this has ever been presented. There is evidence suggesting Pears was incinerated within the trunk of the BMW.] It is highly unlikely that Martin Bryant, alone, could have been shooting from several buildings at once, while spending the time he did on the phone with the hostage negotiators. With all three of Bryant's [alleged] hostages accounted for, and no one else found in the buildings at Seascape besides Bryant, **who was the other gunman?** By early the next morning, smoke was seen billowing from the building, forcing Bryant out, his back on fire and into police custody.

Events following Bryant's arrest should be familiar to most American gun owners. The Australian media, in lockstep, condemned Bryant as guilty **without any evidence.** Because semi-automatic firearms were used, the firearm-prohibitionists and their allies in media and the government pulled out all the stops to ban these firearms.

(cont.)

Bryant's lawyers **accepted the premise that he was guilty of all charges**. However at his court appearance on September 30, 1996, Bryant pleaded "not guilty" to each of the 72 charges leveled against him. That decision was untenable for David Gunson, one of Bryant's legal representatives, who was replaced by John Avery. Although **Bryant never made a detailed confession** concerning the Broad Arrow murders, Avery eventually persuaded [involved coercion, lies, and threats it seems] Bryant to plead guilty. That guilty plea was entered in court on November 7, 1996. **[Note that this was not a trial.]**

On November 19, the first day of the court proceedings involving Bryant's sentencing, Avery stated to the court: "Your Honour nothing that I can say on behalf of my client can mitigate the outrageous nature of his conduct." At a subsequent speech delivered at the University of Tasmania law school, Avery stated: "I felt intensely that I had to do right by the community as well." [Australia's worst criminal lawyer John Avery abandoned his responsibility to defend his client.]

Here are just a few of the astonishing irregularities and discrepancies that, at the very least, **should have been pursued** by Bryant's lawyers:

■ **Eyewitnesses were not interviewed** when it became known that their stories would conflict with the government account.

■ A credible time-line that connects Bryant to the killing of the Martins at Seascope, and still allows him to arrive early enough at the Broad Arrow Café to buy and eat lunch before the carnage, **was never established**. If Bryant didn't kill the Martins, then **who did?**

■ **No forensic evidence** of Bryant's physical presence at the Broad Arrow Café was ever established. Because Bryant's face was plastered throughout Australia, all eyewitness identification **was contaminated**. Why didn't Avery pursue the discrepancies in the descriptions of clothing Bryant was reported to have worn at different stages during the carnage?

■ In **direct violation of the Australian constitution**, the Prime Minister John Howard suggested that a Coronial Inquest was not required, and called for the immediate demolition of the Broad Arrow Café. Although the survivors clamored for more information, Howard used the pretext that more information would be too painful for them to bear.

Bryant's financial resources* would have permitted his lawyers to hire as many private investigators and psychiatrists as necessary to defend him, yet they failed to do so. [* All his resources were later **looted** by the Tasmanian government, and **were never accounted for to the public.**]

On November 22, Bryant was sentenced to life in prison. Are all these discrepancies and unanswered questions just the result of coincidence and official ineptitude? Or, **were the lives of 35 innocent victims sacrificed for the sake of politics?** [Evidence strongly suggests that they were.]

While researching the Port Arthur shootings, the more we learned, the more questions we found without answers. One thing seems irrefutable: the Australian government was – and still is – **afraid of the truth**.

Joanne Eisen, Paul Gallant, Andrew S. MacGregor

A short-cut to Australia's civilian disarmament?

keepandbeararms.com

1 February 2013

(amended; added emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: Warren said this: "I remained at the Port Arthur Site in charge of investigations until **the following Monday** afternoon when advice was received that alleged offender may be in a position to be interviewed at the hospital." What a devious mongrel this cop is. He wrote the following Monday as if his attempt to coerce a confession out of Martin took place a week later (**the following Monday**) than it did. But in fact, Warren's intimidation went on the **very day** (29 April) that Martin was cuffed, hand and foot, then literally dragged off to a hospital in Hobart so physicians could attend to his third-degree burns. About six hours after confused Martin was attended to by those medics, and no doubt pumped full of painkillers and downers, this mongrel Warren was in his face with a video camera hoping to get some self-incriminating sound-bites. It was **not** the following Monday, **it was the same day that Martin on fire staggered out from Seascapes** after Tasmania Police set it alight.

According to his own words, this cop mongrel Warren was back at it the next day. Martin told him straight to his face: "I don't remember anything." But that did not stop Warren who kept at Martin – at him and at him. And when he could not get his helpless victim to say what he wanted, Warren had his little fit and said he arrested Martin for murder.

Note that something seems incorrect here. According to Jane Freeman (see Insert *BRYANT CHARGED WITH MURDER* in Part 5), Martin Bryant was charged with murder on 29 April 1996, which is the day he was taken to hospital. Thus Warren's claim of arresting Martin is **utter nonsense** – but coming from a cop this should not surprise us. At Seascapes, Martin had already been apprehended, arrested, cuffed, and hauled off to Hobart early on the morning of 29 April. Warren did not have to arrest Martin. At the hospital in Hobart, on the same day in the morning, according to Freeman, he was formally charged with the murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott. So why did this Warren make a statement about arresting Martin at the hospital on Tuesday, 30 April 1996. At that time, the media had already broadcast reports of Martin Bryant having been charged with murder and, according to Jane Freeman, it seems that charge was made the day before, Monday 29 April 1996.

As many readers will no doubt attest, after traumatic events it is not uncommon that those who experience them are unable to recall, either wholly or in part, what actually happened. After a significant negative personal event, it is not uncommon for the victim not to be able to recall details. So when Martin Bryant said he could not remember anything it is a reasonable and most likely to be a correct statement. But for unthinking people, those who hate blindly, it is interpreted as an evasive reply.

What happened to Martin is an example of appalling human behavior. From the time he staggered out of Seascapes on fire, to when he was arrested (29th April), until he was charged with murder (29th or 30th April), it seems State officials worked together in a concerted effort to cause him as much physical and mental pain as they could. Bewildered, burnt, and bereft of any protective adult, he was worked over. Without an iota of hard evidence to justify any charge,⁹⁴ with no thorough investigation, and without any serious thought and reason having been objectively applied to the whole incident, **Martin was demonized then set up for incarceration.**

⁹⁴ This high-profile hyped process of charging Martin Bryant with one murder so quickly after he was admitted to hospital with severe burns was straight political theatre. It was meant to appeal to the shocked and enraged mob. It is all understandable, but this did not make it right. There never was a real investigation, contrary to what idiot officials say. All crime investigation texts confirm this fact. (see *BIBLIOGRAPHY*) That the cop Hesman waved a passport around – how it got into his hands is **highly questionable** – means nothing. A passport proves nothing conclusive about any of the significant parts of the Port Arthur case. Yes, Martin Bryant had been at Seascapes. But that does not prove he perpetrated any of the crimes associated with that place. And as for what took place between Seascapes and the Port Arthur Historic Site, and back again, it's a dog's breakfast of accusations, assertions, blatant lies, conflicting statements, corrupt cops, false facts, unproved evidence, as well as a string of endless unanswered questions. The benefit of doubt has always gone to the State, and the legal maxim of being innocent until proven guilty has been disregarded. Martin was declared guilty then denied the possibility of defending himself. Confiscating his assets saw to it that he could not engage a proper lawyer – not a bloodsucker like Avery who was forced onto Martin, and who refused to defend his client, and who willingly aided the State to set up the **worst contrived injustice in the history of Australia.**

WITNESS: **WHITE**, Linda Marie

DATE: 27 May 1996 (**29 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Standing in front of the vehicle was a young male in faded blue jeans and a faded baggy long sleeved top which was blue in colour." & "The male had **shoulder length** hair which was wavy and unkempt." & "...all of a sudden the **windscreen shattered** (it did not fall in) and a hole appeared in the glass at my eye level." & "When the male first shot at us, he was close enough for me to clearly see his face. I could not give a distance." & "The top the male is wearing in the Photograph 5, is a top that is very similar to the top that the male who shot me was wearing. It could even be the same top."

COMMENT: This person could **not** have witnessed what she claims. Her travelling partner (see Wanders) stated they were driving along at highway speed and not paying great attention to anything when, 50 metres away, a man discharged a firearm. The windscreen of the vehicle White was driving was instantly shattered completely blocking her vision except for one hole in the glass at eye level. And White herself was hit by a bullet and seriously injured.

So for her to say she saw the gunman's face clearly has no credibility. The gunman was righthanded. Thus he was holding his firearm to his right shoulder and pressing his right cheek against the stock to sight the rifle. That put the rifle between his face and the vehicle which would have prevented White from seeing his face clearly. And no other witness described the gunman on the Arthur Highway near the Seascope turnoff as wearing a "faded baggy long sleeved top which was blue in colour." That is the clothing worn by Martin Bryant in the image illegally published in The Mercury newspaper. It seems this is the image that stayed in White's mind and which she transferred, a month after the incident, to her statement. Another witness also seems to have done this. (see VILLIERS, CEA)

WITNESS: **WHITTLE**, Garry Thomas (Tasmania Police)

DATE: not dated

CONCERNS: "...small white vehicle which was stationary on the forecourt of the Port Arthur shop." & "The female occupant of the vehicle was seated in the **driver seat of the vehicle.**" & "The drivers side window to the front door was broken." & "I checked this female for a pulse, but found none." & "Some of the projectiles which were discharged in our direction hit the bush and shrubbery some six to 12 feet above our positions, whilst others hit the ground and roadway directly in front of our position." & "P.J. Allen and I crawled for a distance of approximately 15 metres in the ditch drain." & "...we were advised by one of the SOG members that it was believed that gunman was looking in our direction using a **night viewing device.**" The following are from Whittle's notes (28 April 1996): "Notice parked at the shop a female in a small white car.... She was in the **passenger's side of the car**, the window was broken and she had no pulse." & "...saw a female running around the [Seascope] back yard naked. Yelling and screaming."⁹⁵

⁹⁵ This is an extremely significant true fact. It is corroborated in several other *Witness Statements* prepared by other Tasmania Police members. Yet, **this true fact was completely ignored by senior police, ignored by Bugg the director of public prosecutions, and ignored again by Cox the judge.** Martin was the patsy – **he was going to be found guilty** regardless of any of the evidence. The State did not want to deal with any evidence, this is why there was **no trial.** For all those smart people who like to make stupid snappy remarks, **there is no proof** Bryant killed poor Mrs. Martin. The State says she was shot, but it seems a post-mortem reveals she died from a murderous blow to the skull. Perhaps the ex-cop Michael *Mick/Rick* Charles Dyson might know some details of that death.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

COMMENT: This cop is not consistent with his alleged observations. In his *Witness Statement*, the dead woman was in the "driver seat," but in his notes made earlier he records the dead woman was on the front "passenger's side of the car." This inconsistency might or might not be significant and thus it should not be quickly dismissed.

One of the highly suspect things about the so-called SOG siege of Seascapes is the fact no cop was shot. Tasmania Police made a big issue of the alleged 200 or so shots which cops who were at Seascapes said were fired at them there. Whittle reveals the cops believed the gunman had a **night-viewing device**. And the cop witness Harwood said he had been told the gunman might have: "**night vision equipment** and that he had weapons possibly fitted with **laser targeting capability**."

But with all this high-tech stuff, and high-powered firearms, and "shit-loads of ammo," the gunman could only place his bullets "six to 12 feet" from the police. After shooting all those people at the Broad Arrow Café, and along Jetty Road, and at the tollbooth and at the general store, and along the highway, the gunman got to Seascapes but then couldn't hit a tin duck at a carnival – even with a night-viewing device and a laser targeting sight on one of the scores of firearms officials claim he had at Seascapes.

And to add to all this nonsense, at least one of the cops who were at Seascapes asked for permission to shoot the gunman who could be seen on a roof, but that **permission was denied**. So at Seascapes, there was a siege where a gunman couldn't hit the side of a barn and cops who liked to tell a dramatic yarn. We can call it – *the siege that never was*.

WITNESS: **WILLIAMS**, Colin John

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I observed a male person in his early twenties with blond **shoulder length** hair, he was of quite **tidy appearance**. I sat down with my wife at the table next to him."

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "He spoke with an Australian accent." & "He spoke to us in a **normal voice and appeared quite rational**." & "I am positive the vehicle was a Volvo sedan, I have an impression of the vehicle being fitted out with roof racks."

COMMENT: With his wife, this witness arrived by bus at the historic site. Though he must have had a good view looking down onto the cars from inside of his tour bus, he makes no mention of having seen a surfboard or surfboards on any yellow Volvo. So what happened to the surfboard(s) and was the Volvo this witness saw the same as other witnesses say they saw?

Like his wife, he described the male person who it is implied was the gunman as being quiet, tidy, and quite rational. Compare this with the statement of witness McKenna who says this: "He appeared 'dopey' looking, his eyes appeared to be blood-shot.... I noticed that **he appeared anxious**, constantly looking around in the direction of the car park and into the cafeteria area.... He appeared to be very uncomfortable, constantly looking around and fidgeting with his hands and not eating his food." And this (**cont.**)

Statement after statement confirms the nonfeasance of Tasmania Police – traumatised visitors and staff at Port Arthur Historic Site were ignored for six hours so a so-called siege would get media exposure.

is what the witness Beekman said about that quite rational gunman: "He started **talking to himself**.... Then he was **talking to himself**." So were witnesses Beekman, McKenna, and Williams referring to the same person?

Williams also said the young man he sat near was of "quite tidy appearance." Really? This is what witness Howard said: "**He looked slightly dishevelled, like someone would look at the end of the day rather than the beginning of the day**. He also appeared to me to be slightly dazed or perhaps slightly anxious." So were witnesses Howard, McKenna, and Williams referring to the same person? Or were they referring to two different people who, from a distance, had some similar physical characteristics?

WITNESS: **WILLIAMS**, Iris Emelia

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "At about 1:20 p.m. my husband and I were seated at an outside table and chairs, out the front of the kiosk at Port Arthur. [presumably the Broad Arrow Café] We sat opposite a young man I would describe as middle to late 20's, **shoulder length** blond hair, medium build. My attention was drawn to him as he was shoveling food, a type of hot dish into his mouth. It looked as though he was starving hungry. I don't remember what he was wearing, but **he looked neat and tidy**." & "He had a green (possibly yellow or white colouring) bag. It was a canvassy sportsbag approx. 2 feet long and he had it seated on the table near him." [**N.B.** Lines have been drawn through some of these words. Whether this was done by the witness or the police or the DPP is not clear to the editor.⁹⁶] & "I saw him open the boot of an older model yellow Volvo. I noted the registration number to be **CC 2835**."

DATE: 4 June 1996 – no time given (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "...he was seated at the same table but opposite us, facing us. The railing was directly behind us." & "...his hair was **natural blonde**, a nice coloured blonde which was attractive and noticeable. The style was straight down to his shoulders⁹⁷ with just a curl at the bottom. He did not have a fringe, he had a nice complexion, clear skin, no glasses, clean shaven...Australian accent."

DATE: 4 June 1996 – no time given (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I have been shown a photoboard by Det. Lyn Jones which consists of 30 males and I have been asked to identify the male I spoke to at Port Arthur on the 28 April 1996 & who I later saw armed with a rifle or an old yellow Volvo registration number **CC 904?**" (*sic*) & "I have certainly seen photos of the suspect on television and newspapers."

COMMENT: Like her husband Colin John Williams, this witness also gave three statements to the cops. On the same days too. Were they trying to be helpful, or did something else go on? The witness says this about the young man who sat near her and her husband: "My attention was drawn to him as he was **shoveling food**, a type of hot dish **into his mouth**. It looked as though he was (cont.)

⁹⁶ Drawing lines through words of a statement is **unacceptable**. If the witness freely changes her/his mind, or wishes to qualify a point in any statement, a new statement should be prepared. And as soon as a line is placed through a word or words of a statement, or a new statement is prepared, the possibility of coercion must always be considered. Officials are notorious for influencing what appears in statements. (see **eyewitness** at *FORETHOUGHTS*) That lines have been drawn through words in some of the statements mentioned here is unacceptable. And regardless of whether those lines and omissions have been initialed (any person can print/write initials on a document) this **does not confirm** the integrity of the altered document. NOTE Most cops do not date their *Witness Statements*. It is an old trick. If a cop needs to change his story later so it fits better with the official narrative, the fact he has not dated the statement gives her/him the opportunity to say the original statement was just a draft, or has been misplaced, or....

⁹⁷ Like other witnesses (see Laycock), Williams described the hair of the gunman as being **straight** down. She did not say it was curly, frizzy, permed, wavy, etc.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

starving hungry." Really? This is what witness McKenna said on this subject: "Although I noticed the food on his plate, I did not see him eat any of it." & "...not eating his food." So were these witnesses (McKenna, Williams) referring to the same person?

And how is it that two females who spoke with this male described his hair so differently. The witness Lynd who spoke with the man believed to be a/the gunman said that he had "long **bleached** blonde hair," but this witness Williams said "his hair was **natural** blonde." Was this just another difference of opinion, or were they describing the hair of two different men?

Then we have the registration number of a yellow Volvo – of two yellow Volkos it seems. At first, Williams says the number she saw is **CC 2835**. But later she changed that number to **CC 904?** (she was not sure of the last digit). So how could this be? And the witness Neader who saw a/the gunman drive away from the café said this about the registration number he saw on a mustard coloured sedan, which it seems was a yellow Volvo: "I tried to get the number plate, but could only managed to get the first two letters, **DC**." So these two witnesses described three different registration plates.

What is the real story about these three recollections?

Note that Iris and Colin Williams admitted that they had **seen images** of the alleged gunman on the television and in newspapers. Both these witnesses did not formally identify the alleged gunman until **37 days** had gone by after the incident. During this time, media channels were flooded with images of Martin Bryant and captions declaring him to be the gunman. For most people, such a media onslaught is impossible to withstand – doubts are subdued, conflicting facts are ignored. Official words are **mindlessly accepted** as the truth even though they can be blatant lies. Without any doubt, this is what happened in relation to the Port Arthur incident in 1996.

WITNESS: **WILLIAMS**, Sheryl Anne

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "I would describe the male person who got out of the BMW...He had white/blond, just **past shoulder length**, wavy hair." (*sic*) & "We locked ourselves in the store.... We remained there for about two (2) and a half (1/2) hours. We left the store while it was still light." & "While we were at the Kodak shop, I could see down near the tollbooth. I could **see a body** on the roadway, before the actual tollbooth structure. I couldn't see if it was a male or female – but it was an adult body. **I could not see any cars at the tollbooth area.**"

COMMENT: Here is another witness who describes the gunman as having hair **below his shoulders**. Williams was at both premises (Kodak shop & general store) and, as she makes clear, she looked at the tollbooth area from the Kodak shop just as the owner (James Clement Laycock) and his son-in-law (Yannis Kateros) had earlier. When Williams looked at the tollbooth area it was still daylight and she said she could see a body on the ground. (Where were the three other bodies?) But what Williams says next is staggering: She "**could not see any cars**" at the tollbooth: **no** yellow Volvo; **no** Red Commodore left behind by the Buckleys; **no** blue car as seen by Rabe; **no** green vehicle as seen by Prout. **NOTHING!**

*A trial jury
should have been
taken to every
crime scene
so jurors could see
all the distances
and angles for
themselves
– were witnesses
revealing
the truth,
or were they
repeating what
they had heard?*

If she could see something small like a dead body on the ground, then this witness would have been able to see any vehicle parked at the tollbooth. But Williams saw **no vehicles**.

WITNESS: **WILLIAMS**, Simon Roger

DATE: 29 April 1996 (**1 day** after incident)

CONCERNS: "As I approached Seascapes I was looking in that direction and I noticed a male person **wearing a red/dark coloured shirt** standing on the side of the road near the driveway of Seascapes." & "I heard what I thought was a gunshot and as I drew level with this male person I heard another gunshot which was very close." & "**I cannot recall what this person looked like** as my main priority was getting away."

COMMENT: This witness provides another colour for the clothing of the gunman. More significant is his statement about his action. It would be normal and most prudent to make getting away a priority. Williams did, though both he and his wife had been shot. Unlike other witnesses who claimed they identified Martin Bryant even though they were great distances from the gunman, and other witnesses who months later identified the gunman as Martin Bryant and said that they had not been influenced by the media images, this witness Williams who drove close by the gunman did not declare he could identify the gunman. And he didn't. Nor did his wife.

WITNESS: **WILLMOTT**, Petra Frances

DATE: 28 April 1996 (**same day** as incident)

CONCERNS: "My boyfriend's name is Martin BRYANT, he is 28 years old and lives at 30 Clare Street, New Town.... I often stay overnights at Martins. I have stayed there for the **last four nights**. Last night we went to his mother's house for tea [evening meal]." & "I left Martin's house at 8:00 a.m. the next morning, Sunday the 28th April 1996.... Martin was still at home when I left, he said he would **see me tomorrow at 11:00 a.m.** and we do something together." & "I have never seen Martin with any firearms of any type." & "...the only enemy I know he has is a **male called Tiger**.⁹⁸ This male calls Martin up. Martin doesn't like to answer the phone as he thinks it may be this **Tiger**. I don't know who **Tiger** is or why Martin doesn't like him." & "**He doesn't remember a lot of things that I say to him and he forgets what he's doing sometimes**. Martin has never been violent towards me or Carlene [*sic*]. He has never verbally abused me." & "Martin bought a bag, an **orange and blue/green** sportsbag.... I never saw the bag again."

DATE: 30 April 1996 (**2 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "We would often go to the [film] theatre. We went and saw *Casino*. In that they were torturing a man and they went to squash his fingers. Martin said it was too violent so we left." & "I have **never seen** any firearms or ammunition at Martin's place."

DATE: 8 May 1996 (**10 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Martin always picked up conversations with (cont.)

⁹⁸ This editor has not been able to find anything in the case-related literature, or in *Witness Statements*, or in any document, which qualifies who this **Tiger** was/is and why he had such a negative influence on Martin Bryant. A good defence lawyer would have insisted that Martin identify Tiger, but John Avery did no such thing. Avery did not want to know because his role in the Port Arthur case was **never to defend** Martin Bryant at a trial. No. Avery's job was to wear Martin down and **break him** so he would agree to anything to ensure there would be no trial.* And Avery did break this *boy-man*. That Martin Bryant, with his IQ of 66, accepted Avery's plea of guilty would be laughable in other circumstances. But in this case, it means the **murdering of Martin** – officially. (* No public statement was made against this shameful, unethical, criminal process by any member of the Law Society [solicitors] or Bar Association [barristers] in all of Australia. All those corrupt blood-sucking lawyers just **acquiesced** – let Martin be incarcerated for all his life; let his slow **murder by despair** begin; let him **die for a State lie**. "The cruelest lies are often told in silence." Robert Louis Stevenson)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

strangers." & "...we tried some of those chocolate coffee beans, we both agreed that they weren't as nice...and he said he would give them to the ladies sitting beside us because they were waiting a long time for their coffee." & "Martin gave me a watch that he fixed for me because I didn't have one."

DATE: 4 June 1996 (**37 days** after incident)

CONCERNS: "Martin paid the \$35.00 per person, and we went up in a helicopter for about a five to ten minute ride...."⁹⁹ I don't remember Martin saying anything to me while we were up in the air, but I remember him telling me later that the ride wasn't as exciting as he thought it would be." & "I have viewed a black and white photograph shown to me by the policewoman, the eyes look familiar, but the only guy I've met who looks this age, which is a friend of Martin's, is the guy that works at the photo-shop. I think Ash Besters in Elizabeth Street. I don't think this is a photograph of him though, as that has hair the same colour as Martin's and his hair is about shoulder length and was tied back in a pony tail, I don't think he has a beard either. To my knowledge Martin did not know that man outside Ash Besters." & "I left in my own car the mustard Toyota Corona Sedan AK 5917 on my own at about 8:00 a.m." & "**I have never seen handcuffs at Martin's house.**"¹⁰⁰

DATE: 31 July 1996 (**94 days** after Port Arthur incident)

CONCERNS: "Detective Sharee BOLT played about two minutes of an audio cassette to me." & "While I was listening to the cassette, the males said their names were Terry and Jamie, and I know that Martin BRYANT is the person who said his name was Jamie."

COMMENT: It seems as if the cops tried and tried to get something incriminating out of this witness. After giving five statements, they managed to get her to say "Martin BRYANT is the person who said his name was JAMIE." And this is all. But it is useless, as a voice on an audio tape does not prove Martin killed or wounded any person at or near Port Arthur. Those two minutes of tape – recall the accusations Cordwell made after he heard just 20 seconds of tape – could have been made at any time. And even if the voice was that of Martin Bryant, note that he could have been deceived, or under duress, or the effects of hypnosis, or the influence of a drug.

Petra had been with Martin for four days preceding the incident. She did not see any change in Martin's behaviour. **She had never seen any firearms, or ammunition, or handcuffs at his house.** She and Martin had done things together and were going to do things together. She described **a decent kind person.**

(statements end)

It is inconceivable that Martin with his **66 IQ** could have planned and arranged the medical and media conferences plus the staff seminar, ordered the 22-body refrigerated mortuary truck and the special embalming equipment, then went off and committed horrific mass murder at and near Port Arthur on 28 & 29 April 1996. If you believe that, then what you believe goes something like this:

99 Officials made a big issue of an allegation that Martin Bryant wanted to be flown out of Seascapes by helicopter. But what really prompted all this is unclear. What cops say about it has zero credibility. Petra Willmott points out that Martin (and her) had already been on a helicopter flight and Martin had not found it exciting. The whole matter of the alleged helicopter flight from Seascapes – an allegation was all it was – comes across as cops playing with Martin, offering him a chopper ride, appealing to his adolescent mind. It certainly does not come across as a serious step being negotiated with a man who had killed 35 people. All the cops had to do at Seascapes was hunker down and wait patiently. In a day or two the gunman would have fallen asleep, or got hungry, and the whole (contrived) episode would have ended mildly and sensibly. But it was not a real siege. The whole stupid thing was set up. (Never forget that the State was responsible for killing three people at Seascapes, as well as burning Martin.) To suit the official need for national media coverage, and to get medals for the SOGs, it had to be one big **blazing finale** with *Sturmtruppen* in black heroically advancing on the monster, putting their lives right on the line for their Queen and country. **Apocalypse Now:** "...assume attack formation.... My boys love it!" – fade-in Wagner's *Ride of the Valkyries*

100 You have probably heard about the handcuffs. Two sets. Martin had them. Used them to cuff-up Glenn Pears inside Seascapes cottage. *Lone-nut* gunmen do that sort of thing. Well, don't be too keen to believe what officials say. Officials lie. No handcuffs were found – anywhere. Like the mysterious Chris Iles, and the night-vision device, and the laser sight, and the handgun, – **they all just vanished.** Now if Glenn Pears had been cuffed to something inside Seascapes, those metal cuffs would have been found inside amongst all the ashes. But it seems his body was found in the trunk of the BMW. So as for the two pairs of handcuffs, they are another official allegation. Or, as it's said in the vernacular – **bull.**

101 Martin Bryant never denied he owned three firearms. He had no reason to deny this because he had **never done anything illegal** with them. He also admitted having gone into the bush to fire at small home-made targets. During an interrogation conducted at Risdon Prison on 4 July 1996, Martin said this:

- A.** I used to only go to one spot, between Dunalley and Eagle Hawk Neck, there's a turnoff there, just past Mundunna there on the left, there's a road, a couple of roads as you just go.
- Q.** So.
- A.** To shoot at trees, see if the guns like a...
- Q.** Just let me get this straight, you go through Dunalley?
- A.** Yes.
- Q.** Towards Eagle Hawk Neck?
- A.** Through Mundunna, so you go past Mundunna, between Mundunna and Eagle Hawk Neck there's a forestry place there.
- Q.** Ohh yeah.
- A.** A couple of roads.
- Q.** And just turn up to the left and.
- A.** Used to shoot a few tin cans.
- Q.** Ohh right. Bottles?
- A.** Bottles, no not bottles 'cos they break and they could injure animals and
- Q.** Did you ever make
- A.** I never used to shoot the animals.
- Q.** Sorry about that. Did you ever make your own targets to shoot?
- A.** I had a couple of targets on boards.
- Q.** Did you
- A.** Cardboard usually.
- Q.** And how many times would you have shot 'em?
- A.** Ohh four or five times, then I used to put the gun back in the car and used to leave and go home.

Many unproved stories about Martin being cruel to animals were circulated. They added to his demonization. His mother said this on the subject: "Martin **dearly loved animals**, he was never cruel to any animal and grew up with dogs and cats around the household. He loved animals on the farm." (Carleen Bryant. *My Story*; 2010: pp. 102-103.) Petra Willmott said Martin was troubled by an unrestrained cat in his neighbourhood. But there is no evidence Martin ever hurt that animal.

That Sunday morning after his nice girlfriend Petra Willmott left his home at 30 Clare Street, New Town, he took his 43 firearms plus "shit loads of ammo" out of his piano where the cops say he had been hiding it from her and his mother (where did he get it from?) and put it into his Volvo sedan (registration CC 2835, or CC 904?, CG 2835, or CS 2835, or DC????; it depends on who you believe), then he drove 22 kilometres to Midway Point (allegedly to buy a cigarette lighter – why?), then he drove just 4 kilometres to Sorell (allegedly to buy a bottle of tomato sauce – what for?; while taking a heavy sportsbag into the shop – why?), then he drove 7 kilometers to Forcett (to get a hot coffee), then he drove 53 kilometres to Taranna (to put petrol in the Volvo tank), then he went to see Roger Larnar to talk about buying cattle, then Martin said he would return later that afternoon to visit Larnar's wife to which Larnar agreed (even though the questionable Larnar claimed Martin made inappropriate telephone calls to her), then Martin drove to Roaring Beach near Nubeena to go surfing, then he drove to Seascape where he shot David & Sally Martin (why?), good local people who he had known for many years, then he unloaded his arsenal and all that ammo (note he might have done this before he saw Larnar; officials don't want you to know) and then he went off to Port Arthur, but before he reached there he bought some cannabis from 2 young women who were parked on the side of the highway with an engine problem which allegedly Martin, who is a mechanical klutz, saw and fixed in less time than it takes a cop to lie, why he bought cannabis we don't know because Martin did not smoke anything and did not use drugs of any type, then he reached the historic site with bloodshot druggie eyes, and was also dishevelled, nervous, and anxious, then he took his heavy sportsbag plus a black camera (visible in the police training video) and walked up to the Broad Arrow Café to get a meal which one witness sitting on the verandah said he shoveled down his gullet but another witness said that she did not see him eat because he was too busy mumbling to himself about Japs, parking places, and WASPS/wasps (Protestant or European?; it depends on who you believe), then after bumping his way back into the café and leaving a tray (with his fingerprints) plus a drink can (with his fingerprints) plus eating utensils (with his fingerprints) on a table – the cops ignored all these fingerprints – he took out firearms which discharged with thumps and cracks and killed and wounded many people as if it was no big deal, even though Martin had never shot at anything before other than a bit of cardboard in the bush,¹⁰¹ then he went back to the carpark (some witnesses say he ran others say he sauntered; it depends on who you believe) where he put a sportsbag in the boot of a yellow Volvo having left another sportsbag plus that big black camera inside the café so cops would find them and say, Hey! Martin Bryant of 30 Clare Street, New Town, was the gunman, before leaving he damaged buses and shot more people while some dubious American tourist called James Balasko from New Jersey allegedly made a video which suggestively he only recalled he made 3 months after the incident (sic), then it was back to that Volvo where he thought it would be good to smash a side window so he did, then he took off like a Formula-1 driver or drove away slowly (it depends on who you believe) tooting the horn, then he stopped on Jetty Road to shoot 3 more including children, then it was off to the tollbooth where 4 people were there waiting for him (why?)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

in a gold-coloured BMW which officials claim he carjacked,¹⁰² so after a pair of them walked over and sat in the Volvo and spoke with him (what about?) he gave them some lead, sweet and easy pointblank stuff, first the well-dressed men (his handlers?) right in their chests, then he dragged out the 2 women and did them, seems he didn't like what they said, then he moved his weapons – except that Daewoo shotgun which peppered Dennis Olsen and others with pellets; again the cops took no fingerprints – to that BMW from the Volvo which he abandoned so some cop could shout Hey! it contained the passport of Martin Bryant of 30 Clare Street, New Town, then, only being able to use an automatic transmission, Martin Bryant allegedly drove that BMW with its manual-change gearbox to the general store where he figured he should put a man in the boot (why?), and before leaving murder another person (why?), then he tear-arsed up the highway to shoot at more innocents driving down that road all the while standing near the BMW with long blond hair (wig?) down below his shoulders so everyone would say, Hey! it was Martin Bryant of 30 Clare Street, New Town, then it was down to Seascapes where allegedly he took his hostage(?) and with imaginary handcuffs allegedly fixed him to something imaginary inside the cottage before burning that BMW with imaginary fuel, then it was on with shooting hundreds of rounds into the trees (why?), then he smashed windows at Seascapes (what for?) after acting the role of Jamie (why?) and speaking with a cop's defacto wife (why?) plus making snacks for everyone and watching SOGs with a night-viewing device which vanished like the two pairs of handcuffs, laser sight and the pistol fired at Seascapes, plus the big camera from the café, he also flicked lights on and off in the night like a signal to Pavlovian dogs (SOGs; Sons of God who killed Gilewicz and Wilkinson) who were out there all creepy in their black Ninja suits like comic-book heroes, then it was time for the official arson so cops stopped firefighters extinguishing the blaze which resulted in evidence of a set-up at the cottage being incinerated except – and Reader, this is truly amazing – 2 firearms which corrupt officials needed to incite the anti-gun lobby to scream, Hey! Martin Bryant of 30 Clare Street, New Town was the gunman, chief cook, bottle washer, and buyer of that tomato sauce at Sorell, later with no evidence Gerard Dutton (Mr. Bullistic) claimed those firearms were used to kill 35 and wound 23 when they were not as an ex-cop, and a gunsmith, and a former gun shop proprietor proved (lawyer John Avery tried to set him up), and as for Tiger who frightened Martin, the cops let him escape too like the killer(s) – Benjamin and/or Warren Overbeeke? – on Monday, SOGs arrested Martin whose back was badly burnt but ex-premier Ray Groom was pleased Bryant was strapped down on his 3rd degree burns to make him feel more pain, and unethical lawyer Debra Rigby ensured Martin's rights were ignored as were the 2nd sportsbag, the specially-made 22-body morgue truck and embalming equipment, the red Commodore which disappeared from the tollbooth, the screaming naked woman running at Seascapes, the pair who sat inside the Volvo with the gunman, plus that cop Michael "main man" Dyson a planner passionate about violence who presented a deceptive statement 139 days after the incident, then Avery coerced not-fully-informed Martin to accept Avery's plea of guilty and with no trial no truth no jury no justice, the egregiously corrupt lawyer (Avery), prosecutor (Bugg), and judge (Cox) sent an innocent boy-man to prison – **FOREVER!**

PART 7 The Witnesses

102 Martin Bryant admitted taking a BMW sedan. (The same one?) But this part of the case is not at all clear. The following dialogue is from the transcript of the Risdon Prison interrogation (4 July 1996) audio tape:

- A.** ...I stopped the car on the corner, there was a nice-looking BMW and I asked them to get out of the car but the ...
- Q.** How many people were in it?
- A.** **There was a child in there**, in the back and a lady and the man. The man, I got him out the car, I had my gun with me and I said I want to take your car, so I took his car. I got, then his wife or girlfriend got into the Volvo with the child and I left, I drove off.
- Q.** So you drove away in the BMW?
- A.** Yes.
-
- Q.** And where did this take place Martin sorry?
- A.** At the **Fortescue Bay turnoff**, just, ohh about three or four minutes away from the Martin's farm.
- Q.** To which side of ...
- A.** That was.
- Q.** ...The Seascapes is Fortescue Bay turnoff?
- A.** Ahh, before you go to Seascapes on the way to, on the way to Hobart.
- Q.** So it's on the Hobart side of Seascapes?
- A.** Mmm.
- Q.** Right. And where did you drive then?
- A.** I drove full speed, it was about, I was going about 140 Ks up the road and went into Seascapes. Just drove **down there in the BMW.**

Martin says he took the BMW at Fortescue Bay turnoff **north of Seascapes**, and when he did there was a child in the back of the BMW. But the PAHS tollbooth from where the BMW was taken by the gunman is **south of Seascapes**, and there was **no child in that vehicle**. Why did Martin make up a story that could so easily be disproved? Investigators who have studied the case have concluded **Martin was confabulating** and/or he had been induced to say what he did. (see Daniel Baxter. *Was Martin Bryant Framed?*; Part 5) Note the description of the gunman at the tollbooth does not match that of Martin. Also note Martin could only drive a vehicle with automatic gears – the BMW had a manual gearbox.

*In the
Port Arthur case,
the State
stopped
all witnesses
from giving
testimony
in a trial.*

POINTS TO PONDER

Martin Bryant is alleged to have done all the things mentioned above with his **grade six** schoolboy level of competence. Petra Willmott who knew him intimately tells us, he couldn't remember a lot of things and would at times forget what he was supposed to be doing. It is preposterous. The incident perpetrated at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, in April 1996, was **mass murder** premeditated, planned, and perpetrated by State officials to **terrorize the public, to induce trauma, and to create a climate of fear** all to ensure the passage of ready-to-go gun-control legislation throughout the nation.

Here, you are again asked to ponder the words of James Sinnamon (see *FORETHOUGHTS* at Part 6): "[T]he monstrosity of this crime is precisely what prevents many people from rationally considering the evidence, for even to do so one risks being judged as excusing the crime. The evidence directly implicating Martin Bryant is **non-existent**, so, instead the case against Bryant (which was never formally put because **there was no trial**) largely centres on **supposed facts.**" (added emphasis)

Of course no one should, and no thinking person could, excuse the crime or the criminals who perpetrated it. But just as Sinnamon has stated so well, there is **no evidence implicating Martin Bryant in any foul play**. Yes, he was at Seascope. But, his presence there does not prove he was responsible for what happened at that cottage in Tasmania, or at the Port Arthur Historic Site, or on the route between those places. Detailed studies of the facts, by objective investigators who had no professional or personal involvement in the incident at the time, confirm Martin Bryant has been made the patsy. He was **set up by corrupt officials**, blamed, then incarcerated for a psychopolitical crime it was impossible for him to have conducted.

Most witnesses are people who are members of some community, or population, or society. And thus, these witnesses generally reflect the attitudes, beliefs, values, *etc.* held by the other members of the group to which these witnesses belong. People tend to adhere to the norms of *their* own group. People in groups can hold contrary opinions, even opposing views, but such people usually are the minority.

With regard to the witnesses in the Port Arthur incident, sustained reflection on their recollections is necessary. Given the case involves seven crime scenes, it is not a typical case. And given 35 people were killed and 23 were injured, it is a case far larger than the typical single-death slaying. There are witnesses who were at the historic site and who have recollections of significant facts. And, there are others we can describe as eyewitnesses whose close proximity to the murderous actions has provided us with details only eyewitnesses could possibly know.

Note that without any eyewitness testimony, it still is reasonable to conclude some things occurred. That fear and terror swept people who were inside the Broad Arrow Café does not require evidence to be proved. What people who were inside the café felt, for example, is something all sane people can imagine and comprehend. However,

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

it is most unlikely we will ever understand the severity of the trauma experienced by those who were inside that café. But any sane thinking person can understand that fear and terror were present for those who were there on that Sunday, 28 April 1996.

But that premises was only one of the seven crime scenes. There are **no witnesses who know what happened at all those scenes**. At each, criminal acts were perpetrated. Witnesses tell us this and so do known facts. But there is no witness who had experiences at all seven scenes. Officially, there was only one gunman. According to the State, the same perpetrator who commenced the shooting at the café, concluded the whole incident at the cottage called Seascap. But note however, there is evidence suggesting this might not be the truth.

One of the problems associated with witnesses is that their recollections relate to only one of the crime scenes but they infer their recollection is adequate proof for the entire incident. Put another way, if they saw the gunman killing people at the Broad Arrow Café, then it was the same perpetrator at Seascap. But this was never proved with hard evidence during a trial. It is an assertion which has never been weighed by a properly empanelled jury.

One of the things which this editor experienced during his conversations with witnesses is the certainty with which some of them hold their beliefs. This must not be interpreted to mean this editor believes those witnesses are wrong. What it means is that witnesses, who are more certain than the sun rising tomorrow, are unable to reflect on anything which is not what they believe. It is as if their refusal to think means they already know the total and absolute truth about some part of the incident for which they were witnesses – and thus, they know all the truths of the entire case.

Witnesses have asked this editor what he believes, and have asked him if he is trying to say Martin Bryant is innocent. To such questions, this editor has always raised the fact that there are witnesses, some of them eyewitnesses who have declared, directly or indirectly in their *Witness Statements*, that Martin Bryant was not the gunman. So what do we do with their statements? Ignore them as the State has done? No. That is an immoral and criminal act, one which cannot be tolerated. We must not be selective (cherry pick) what we like and ignore what we don't. This is exactly what has happened in the Port Arthur case, and many (most?) witnesses ignore or refuse to acknowledge this fact. There is example after example of witnesses going along with the official narrative and describing Martin Bryant and identifying photograph 5, even though **they could have never seen what they claim to have seen**.

One witness whose so-called recollections appear above, even said he thought he could see a fin on a surfboard (on the yellow Volvo of course) at a distance of **150 to 200 metres**. It is totally ridiculous. There are other witnesses who saw the gunman and who described him wearing the same clothing as they saw on the image which was published illegally on the front pages of newspapers in Australia.

*Silencing
witnesses
is a symptom
of a diseased
legal system.*

But the preponderance of eyewitnesses said the gunman wore a dark coloured three-quarter length coat/jacket; that he was not wearing a floppy blue pullover. Witness after witness just described what they thought they saw, or what they thought the cops would like to know, or what they thought other witnesses had said. The word was deliberately put out by officials – AS WELL AS THE MEDIA – that it was Martin Bryant of 30 Clare Street, New Town. And this resulted in recollections which identified him being given to the cops.

Another problem for some witnesses is being rattled as happens when they are asked questions about their recollections. It seems that given they were there, many (most?) witnesses believe that what they have stated is the total truth. Confabulated memories, fallible memories, suggested memories are beyond the understanding of many (most?) people. Some witnesses interpret any form of questioning as a denial of what they saw, when that is not what is being done. There is considerable research literature on the ways witnesses can be and are influenced to have recollections out of line with what they actually saw. What a witness recollects and details on paper is not necessarily what he/she saw yesterday, last week, or as some of the witnesses in the Port Arthur incident did, several months later. Memories are malleable things – they are not permanent, not always totally accurate, and not always the truth.

More friction arises with some witnesses who become defensive and ask (some demand) to know who perpetrated all the murders at Port Arthur if it was not Martin Bryant. To these witnesses, it is as if they will continue believing Martin Bryant was the gunman until a better culprit is identified. Referring these witnesses to evidence contrary to their own does not usually help. They are **so convinced of the truth being associated with their beliefs**, any other beliefs are dismissed. And when told it is not a necessity for any investigator to present an alternate theory with evidential proof, this is interpreted to mean investigators cannot, so the official narrative must be true.

Another matter in relation to witnesses is the fact that their beliefs become part of their dealing with the heinous incident which took place at Port Arthur. Devious witnesses can believe something and espouse another. But generally speaking, this editor believes that certainly what the majority of the witnesses declared in their statements they do believe themselves. And it is these beliefs which help witnesses come to terms with that terrible incident.

So when any investigator or writer raises issues or possibilities which are in conflict with accepted beliefs, it creates a dissonance which many (most?) witnesses dislike intensely. For them to understand what the investigator or writer has stated, requires witnesses to abandon their adopted narrative and this can be impossible for some witnesses. Because once their narrative is abandoned, witnesses no longer have the assurance they know what happened during the incident, and what their role in the incident was, and what their role afterwards should be. The rug of assurance is pulled right out from beneath their feet.¹⁰³ This can be very disconcerting for them.

¹⁰³ In her article *People believe a 'fact' that fits their views even if it's clearly false*; online.wsj.com; 4 February 2005, journalist Sharon Begley cites a scientific paper and quotes the principal author*: "People build mental models." And: "By the time they receive a retraction [correction], the original misinformation has already become an integral part of that mental model, or world view, and disregarding it would leave the world view a shambles." (* Stephan Lewandowsky *et al. Memory for fact, fiction, and misinformation*; Psychological Science; March 2005: pp. 190-195.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Perhaps the most important thing for all witnesses (and in our lives this means all of us) is to **stop insisting that we know anything**. All our observations and beliefs are biased, momentary, and subject to decay. The concept of completeness and certainty are dangerous steps toward hubristic states of being. The truth is we do not know everything. We do not see and/or hear everything. And our interpretation of any related facts can be pathetically poor. One of the tragedies of the societies in which we live is that which arises from our educational systems. These systems sow the stupidity that knowing something puts people on some elevated level, and that knowing something with certainty is highly commendable. It isn't, because whatever is known is biased, momentary, and subject to decay.

With regard to the Port Arthur case, this editor encourages readers to open up their minds to the recollections of those witnesses who have stated things contrary to the official narrative. And secondly, readers are urged not to compare these contrary facts with those in the official narrative as if what the State has declared is the gold standard for all comparisons. It isn't.

The official narrative is what officials have concocted to close the case with Martin Bryant being blamed for every conceivable bit of premeditation, planning, and perpetration. But witness after witness has raised doubt after doubt. There was **no trial** which means not one single official assertion has been proved with hard evidence. Common sense tells us that the official narrative is utter nonsense. **There is so much obvious doubt.**

This editor has not reviewed the total number of statements submitted by Port Arthur incident witnesses. There is no way any member of the public can determine the exact number of statements submitted by witnesses, or the number which have been withheld by the State, or, as has happened in this incident, the number of statements *reworked* (means corrupted) by officials.

Finally, this editor asks each witness to give serious thought to what has been done to you by the State. Many of you declared in your statements that you wanted legal action to be taken against the gunman. This is your right. Many of you declared your desire of having your statement used within that legal action. And others of you said clearly in writing that you would willingly participate in a trial. All of this is your right and this editor supports you. But what happened?

Well, imagine the accused was someone you knew. A neighbour, a relative, even your 11-year-old son. Imagine that. Then you found out that three lawyers (Avery, Bugg, Cox) decided that there was not going to be a trial and that all the witness statements including the ones **confirming innocence** are going to be disregarded and never presented to a jury. Then they slammed that 11-year old into a cage from which he will never be released. Whose rights have been respected? Certainly not yours. Or those of the bewildered accused. The State has not told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth – **Witness Statements confirm this true fact**. The evil State has killed and injured, then blamed a patsy – Martin Bryant.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴ But the Port Arthur case did not go away. In fact, since 1996 it has grown. An increasing number of people around the world are now following this incident/case.

MAJOR CONCERNS, REASONABLE DOUBTS
Port Arthur, Tasmania – 28 & 29 April 1996

WITNESS ¹	MAJOR CONCERNS and/or REASONABLE DOUBTS ²	WARNING ³	EXCULPATORY ⁴
ALLEN PJ.	Sunday (6 pm) yelling & screaming at Seascope	high	yes; extreme
BAKER MH.	phone call to who at Seascope, Sunday 3:50 p.m.		
BALASKO J.	video not mentioned 28-29 April; video corrupted	high	yes; extreme
BALL GG.	questionable description of Bryant apprehension		
BARNETT GK.	did not see any vehicles; saw only three bodies	high	
BEAVIS LS.	long distance Bryant ID impossible; ASIO?	high	
BEEKMAN MD.	colour of gunman's jacket; wore Nike sandals		
BROOM G.	gunman wore sling but not described		
BROWNING HG.	dark clothing, handgun fired; heard three explosions	high	yes; extreme
BUCKLEY DJ.	identity of Greek?; abandoned vehicle; descriptions	high	
BUCKLEY TM.	abandoned vehicle; long hair flowing onto chest	high	yes; extreme
CARTER AM.	long distance vehicle ID impossible		
CHAN T.	statement corrupted	high	
CHEOK F.	gunman & people in Volvo; below shoulders hair	high	yes; extreme
CHEOK NE.	gunman & people in Volvo; below shoulders hair	high	yes; extreme
CHIN AJ.	long distance clothing ID impossible		
COLE JG.	gunman with second bag; statement corrupted	high	yes; extreme
COLLIER FH.	statement not identified officially or signed	high	
COLLIER VJ.	statement not identified officially or signed	high	
COLLYER GD.	below shoulders hair ; complexion	high	yes; extreme
COOK BA.	statement credible		
COOPER PA.	saw 2 Volvos & 2 surfboards ; body descriptions	high	yes; extreme
COOPER R.	statement credible	high	
COPPING MW.	Volvo ID; cream/yellow cover on surfboard	high	yes; extreme
CORDWELL MJ.	alleged Bryant voice ID; biased witness		
CRAIG ML.	phone times and message communications		
CRANWELL WI.	shoulder-length hair ; statement corrupted	high	yes
CROMER DH.	two surfboards on yellow vehicle	high	yes; extreme
CROSSWELL PD.	Volvo no surfboard(s) ; 63 day ID of gunman		
DAVISS BG.	saw gunman put sportsbag in yellow Volvo boot	high	yes; extreme
DAVISS BJ.	shoulder-length straight hair ; no surfboard(s)	high	yes; extreme
DIAMANTIS S.	sold tomato sauce (marker) to gunman; 50-day ID	high	
DUTTON JD.	yellow Volvo with surfboards	high	yes; extreme
DUTTON JH.	below shoulders hair ; right handed		
DYSON MC.	seems to have planted evidence in Bryant's home; submitted 139 days after incident; not credible	high	yes; extreme

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS ¹	MAJOR CONCERNS and/or REASONABLE DOUBTS ²	WARNING ³	EXCULPATORY ⁴
EDWARD JM.	shoulder-length hair ; drove two Buckleys away	high	
EDWARDS CV.	surfing (marker); straight shoulder-length hair	yes	yes; extreme
EDWARDS RC.	video given to local cops <i>disappeared</i>	high	
FOGARTY AM.	presence of and time at Seascapes questionable	high	
FRANCIS GH.	weak details of sighting; 36 day ID not credible		
FRANCIS JA.	blond shoulder-length hair ; two surfboards	high	yes; extreme
GIBSON SM.	seven minutes café shooting; gunman wore hat		
GODFREY J.	stated image in newspapers not gunman; saw gunman put sportsbag in yellow Volvo boot	high	yes; extreme
GONINON SR.	handgun used at Seascapes; black clothed gunman	high	yes; extreme
GOODWIN LA.	Sunday (6:30 p.m.) heard three shots near Clougha	high	
GUNN DC.	saw no weapons cache or ammo at Seascapes	high	yes; extreme
HAMMOND CF.	statement credible; fuel into Volvo fuel tank	high	yes; extreme
HARWOOD C.	night vision equipment ; laser targeting capability; handgun fired; gunman wearing black clothes	high	yes; extreme
HESMAN P.	no statement taken/presented from this Tasmania Police member it seems		
HORNE D.	questionable facts; unable to ID gunman		
HORROCKS LE.	statement corrupted	high	yes; extreme
HOWARD SJ.	Volvo driver dishevelled (drugged?) entering PAHS	high	yes; extreme
HYLAND PB.	saw naked black-haired person at Seascapes	high	yes; extreme
JAMES TM.	black clothed gunman; handgun fired at Seascapes	high	yes; extreme
KATEROS Y.	shoulder-length straight blond hair ; suggested statement from M. Titterman not taken/presented	high	yes; extreme
KESSARIOS A.	sold lighter (marker) to gunman in lace-up boots	high	yes; extreme
KING GJ.	sold coffee drink to Bryant at Forcett; times	high	yes; extreme
KINGSTON AA.	vehicle driver uncertainty; statement corrupted	high	
KINGSTON IG.	surfboards; IDed Bryant but with differences	high	yes; extreme
LARNER RM.	stated times preclude Bryant as gunman	high	yes; extreme
LAW AJ.	describes second yellow Volvo	high	yes; extreme
LAYCOCK JC.	gunman was not Martin Bryant who Laycock knew	high	yes; extreme
LEVER CH.	statement credible		
LOUGHTON CA.	use of ID photoboard on Monday 29 April	high	
LYND G.	long bleached blond hair ; possible drug odour	high	yes; extreme
MALONEY JA.	long blond hair flowing in breeze	high	yes; extreme

(cont.)

WITNESS ¹	MAJOR CONCERNS and/or REASONABLE DOUBTS ²	WARNING ³	EXCULPATORY ⁴
MARSHALL EB.	yellow car and roof racks but no surfboard(s)	high	
MASON JA.	questionable recollections; statement 31 days after	high	
McCUTCHEON D.	statement credible; shooting seemingly at Seascapes on Sunday (10-11 a.m.) before Bryant was there	high	yes; extreme
McELWEE IR.	gunman wore sandshoes; silver cover on surfboard	high	yes; extreme
McKENNA RK.	gunman bloodshot eyes; complexion; sandshoes; drink can, utensils, tray all had gunman's fingerprints	high	yes; extreme
MOORS JM.	saw Hans Overbeeke handling a body in café	high	
NEANDER RF.	gunman's car registration no.: DC????	high	yes; extreme
NEWITT KG.	statement not credible; 500 yards from gunman		
NICHOLS JC.	statement credible; vehicle arrival time at Seascapes	high	
NIXON SK.	names suspicious people; describes clothing	high	
<i>NOBLE JM.</i>	suspect statement from suspect person	high	
OLSEN ML.	statement credible; no statement from husband		
OVERBEEKE H.	no statement from this highly suspect person	high	
PARKER CM.	shoulder-length hair ; heard Volvo glass breaking	high	yes; extreme
PEARCE KJ.	shoulder-length hair ; yellow vehicle was utility	high	yes; extreme
POPA MN.	described clothing no other witness did	high	
PRITCHARD RG.	gunman had key for a yellow Volvo		
PROUT CF.	shoulder-length hair ; only 2 bodies at tollbooth	high	yes; extreme
QUINN NJ.	recollection changed 81 days after incident		
RABE DL.	below shoulders hair; Blundstone-type boots ; well groomed gunman; no surfboard on blue vehicle	high	yes; extreme
RICHARDS FE.	recollection changed 31 days after incident		
RICHARDS LA.	admits being influenced by media images of Bryant		
RIVIERE JM.	shoulder-length hair ; saw video camera		
ROBERTS PE.	statement credible		
ROBERTS RM.	statement credible		
ROGANOVICH D.	statement credible		
ROGANOVICH M.	acknowledged he had seen media images of Bryant		
ROOKE JD.	gunman had short mousey hair and full-faced beard	high	yes; extreme
SARGENT MR.	below shoulders hair ; identified sports bag; saw video camera on café table after shooting	high	yes; extreme
<i>SCOTT MJ.</i>	uncorroborated words about Bryant seeking a lawyer		
SCURR W.	(see Part 4)		

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

WITNESS ¹	MAJOR CONCERNS and/or REASONABLE DOUBTS ²	WARNING ³	EXCULPATORY ⁴
SHARP MJ.	statement credible; saw second sportsbag in café	high	yes; extreme
SHILKIN HR.	confirms success of psycho-political terror incident		
SHILKIN NM.	shoulder-length hair ; another clothing description	high	yes; extreme
SIMMONS AD.	statement credible; shooting seemingly at Seascape on Sunday (prior 11 a.m.) before Bryant was there	high	yes; extreme
SLOAN TJ.	below shoulders hair ; shotgun sounds in café	high	yes; extreme
SPRUCE K.	not asked to ID gunman; different clothing described	high	
STAINTHORPE P.	saw gunman place sportsbag in yellow Volvo boot	high	yes; extreme
SULLIVAN CE.	details gunman's <i>words</i> ; statement corrupted	high	
TRIFFETT CA.	brief strained sighting of gunman's face	high	
VALLANCE PA.	statement not credible as distance was too great		
VANDERPEER SE.	statement credible; describes reloading in café		
VIALLS J.	no statement from this highly suspect person	high	
VILLIERS CEA.	shoulder-length hair ; scruffy gunman	high	yes; extreme
WANDERS MG.	distance and vehicle speed too great for credible ID		
WARDLE AE.	facts as described suggest dubious ID of gunman		
WARREN JA.	dubious; says he arrested Bryant at Hobart hospital	high	
WHITE LM.	distance and vehicle speed too great for credible ID		
WHITTLE GT.	night-viewing device; saw a female running around Seascape backyard naked, yelling, screaming	high	yes; extreme
WILLIAMS CJ.	shoulder-length hair ; neat appearance gunman; roofracks but no surfboards(s) on car mentioned		
WILLIAMS IE.	shoulder-length hair ; neat tidy appearance; gunman's car registration no.: CC 2835 & CC 904?	high	yes; extreme
WILLIAMS SA.	below shoulders hair ; saw body at tollbooth but did not see any vehicles there	high	yes; extreme
WILLIAMS SR.	statement credible; clothing description dubious		
WILLMOTT PF.	describes intimidating Tiger; says Martin Bryant is kind, gentle; saw no weapons, ammo, handcuffs	high	yes; extreme
ZAHORCAK C.	coached statement given 95 days after incident	high	yes; extreme

1 Italicized witness is/was a State official.
2 Based on *Witness Statement(s)* reviewed. Note none of the statements reviewed by the editor (Noble) are signed. Many from police are not dated. There is formatting evidence suggesting statements are corrupted. Other evidence of corruption exists.
3 A high degree of caution is required. Statement not factually correct, corrupted, etc. Identified statement needs to be studied and further investigations need to be openly conducted. Does not necessarily mean witness has erred intentionally or unintentionally.
4 What is declared within the statement is exculpatory for Martin Bryant or strongly suggestive of being exculpatory for him.

ENDING

IN Tasmania, in fact in all of Australia, the **rot of the court** par excellence is the Port Arthur case. To bring about this rot, the corrupt criminal lawyer **John Avery** coerced his client, who Avery was supposed to defend, into accepting Avery's guilty plea. Then, a corrupt prosecutor by the name of **Damian Bugg** prepared documents which contain demonstrably false assertions, assertions which were not assessed by a trial jury and in which all doubt went to the State – not, as it should, to the accused person. This mentally-handicapped person, Martin Bryant, was declared guilty before it was proved at a trial, and the State ensured there never was a trial. Then, a supreme court judge by the name of **William Cox** went along with the whole corrupt and perverted matter, sentencing a helpless 66-IQ *boy-man* to be caged for the remainder of his life – **never to be released**.

All the people who have suffered from the Port Arthur incident are expected to accept this as justice being served. Without hearing the words of any of the witnesses in court, mongrel lawyers caged a person because it covers up State crimes. The laws are the people's laws. The courts are the people's courts. But in the Port Arthur case, the State kept/keeps witnesses well away from what is rightly theirs.

As would have been revealed at a trial, Martin Bryant could not have carjacked a BMW at the tollbooth – or anywhere else – because he could not drive any vehicle with a manual gearbox. This means the gunman who drove from the Broad Arrow Café to the tollbooth in a yellow Volvo (automatic) was not Martin. This means Martin did not shoot anyone at the tollbooth, nor did he shoot Mrs. Mikac and her daughters on Jetty Road, nor did he shoot anyone at or near the café. And it means the shooter who killed people at the tollbooth and at the general store, and who took Glenn Pears with him, and who shot and wounded people along the highway **was not Martin Bryant**.

Galling to the extreme is the fact **all the witnesses** who provided written statements were deliberately shut out of the legal process in which they **should have played a major role**. Witnesses who were at Port Arthur during the incident. Witnesses who did their civil and honest best to write statements after experiencing the horrors there. Witnesses who expected justice to be served and who wanted to give testimony in a trial. But all together, witnesses the State wilfully palmed-off, ignored, did away with – all because **three evil lawyers** acted as judge, jury, and executioner. Do not be dismissive about the State killing of Martin Bryant. His killing is now in progress – slowly. He will be the 36th person officially killed in the Port Arthur incident. So of course those *judicial* mongrels of the murderous State did not and do not want Australians or anyone else to read the words of the witnesses who have recorded the gunman was not Martin Bryant.

Witnesses saw things, heard things. They raise many concerns, but all of them were shut out. Their statements were discarded, and the principle of beyond reasonable doubt was never applied as it should have been. The *judicial* process in the Port Arthur case is foul – in no way is it justice. And the State continues to ignore an increasing number of disturbing facts confirming **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!** ■

STATE CORRUPTION

8



CONCERN

Documented analyses of actions, alleged evidence, and official conclusions related to the Port Arthur case confirm the argument presented by the State against innocent Martin Bryant is corrupt nonsense.

CONTENTS		PAGE
■	FORETHOUGHTS	501
■	INTRODUCTION	503
■	DECEIT AND TERRORISM....	MacGregor 505
	IAN SALE	Image
	PAUL MULLEN	Image
	KILLING WHILE DRUGGED	
	FIRES USED IN COVER-UP	Images
	LETTER (CORRUPT DPP) TO....	
■	PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE UPDATE	Schulze 539
	DAEWOO SHOTGUN DENIED	
	EMAILS RECEIVED BY EDITOR....	
■	THE TELLING TOLLBOOTH	Noble 545
	PAHS TOLLBOOTH	Image
	ROBERT SALZMANN(?)....	Image
	RUSSELL POLLARD(?)....	Image
■	THAT BLOODY DOOR	MacGregor 563
	TIMELINE TO APRIL 1996 MASSACRE	
	TOO HOT TO HANDLE	
	DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE	Image
	LETTER – JACKSONS SECURITY	
■	ENDING	582

COUNTS

Images 8, Inserts 12, Notes 81, Pages 84

FORETHOUGHTS

■ “Was the hostage [Glenn Pears] in fact ever removed from the boot of the BMW, **before it was burned?** Why was the wreck removed from the scene with such indecent haste? Why did it take the coroner’s team so long to locate the third body? Why did the coroner not report the exact location at which the third body was found?” (added emphasis)

Stewart K. Beattie

A Gunsmith’s Notebook on Port Arthur
2006: p. 241

■ “There is a **very large criminal element within Tasmania** and the police play a major part. No-one is safe from their unethical behaviour. **They have too many powers and are nothing more than thugs in uniforms.**”¹ (added emphasis)

Valerie Blake

The voice for justice
facebook.com
10 March 2010

■ “I saw misuse of public money, theft of public money and property, and ordinary Tasmanians being treated with **appalling cruelty** and disdain by bureaucrats and the Government.” (added emphasis)

Nigel Burch²

The Mercury
19 October 2008

■ “The unfortunate truth is that **entrenched corruption** within ...Australia exists. This corruption also extends to the legal system itself, and is **supported by a compliant media.** (added emphasis)

Graeme Campbell

in *Victoria Police Corruption – 2* (R. Hoser)
1999: p. x

■ “Corruption is endemic within Australia’s police agencies.... It also embraces crime commissions and other institutions charged with responsibility for police governance on behalf of the public.”

Expendable Project

expendable.tv/2011/09/australian-police-corruption.html
29 October 2012

■ “What investigators find, cannot be accepted as the truth until it has been subjected to testing which may reveal it as true or false; and even then, if evidence comes up to proof, then it retains an element of provisionality, because investigators themselves may have hidden motives which cause them to falsify the testing of evidence. Suspects, investigators, lawyers, judges, and jury members may all distort and falsify reality.... [E]ven when evidence, and all the authentication which accompanies it, is shown to be false, it nevertheless **retains an imprint or trace** of the original presence of a crime or guilt or innocence of a suspect.”³ (added emphasis)

Andrew Green

Power, Resistance, Knowledge
2008: p. 104

¹ On 16 November 2012, smh.com.au reported this in relation to the killing of Roberto Laudisio Curti in central Sydney on 18 March 2012: “The five [NSW] police officers whose **‘thuggish’** actions caused the death of a young Brazilian student will not have any of their duties taken away.” These cops: “fired their tasers 14 times, sprayed him with three cans of capsicum [pepper] spray and restrained him using a baton, handcuffs, and ‘half a tonne’ of body weight.” Daniel Barling, tasered Mr Curti “five times while he was handcuffed on the ground.” The coroner said that cop: “used his taser in a manner that was ‘quite unreasonably violent.’” Yet, this killer: “was promoted from probationary constable after the incident and is still working on the streets in the city central local area command.” And as can be expected in all these death cases, the police union championed the killers: “[The] head of the police association, Scott Weber, said he stood by the five officers.... Police officers should not be criticised or punished for doing what they honestly believe is necessary to calm a situation when arresting a criminal.” So reader, if the NSW cops decide you’re guilty, then they can do anything they like to you, including killing you, according to this Weber. Note his telling words – “when arresting a criminal.” No cop or police association apologist can legally declare any person a criminal. That is the responsibility of a jury or a judge. Police in Australia are at war with the populace, so any violence is possible and officials will take no decisive corrective action. Visitors to that country are warned they can be **killed** there, in any state or territory, by police thugs.

² Nigel Burch is a whistleblower. He was once advisor to an attorney-general (Steven Kons) in Tasmania.

³ This applies to the Port Arthur incident. Even when the official assertions of guilt are shown to be without substance and evidential proof, those corrupt assertions are retained in the minds of many (most?) people. In their chapter *On the horns of a narrative* (in *Criminal Investigative Failures*: 2009: pp. 99-140), David & Nelson Stubbins say: “Research suggests that we use information even after it has been discredited.” (p. 109)

■ "The families should be calling for inquests into each murder, i think the victims at port arthur are the only murder victims in aus-sie history that were denied inquests...." (*sic*)

Dan Kruger

in *Massacre victims' families outraged over mum's book*.⁴

perthnow.com.au

5 December 2010

■ "Martin Bryant was **totally betrayed** by the Tasmanian judicial system." (added emphasis)

Andrew S. MacGregor

statement

in *A Question of Guilt* – DVD Video⁵

Sunrise A.V. Productions

nannews@burcom.com.au

September 2008

■ "Corruption – adopting ethically dubious practices and breaching a position of trust, usually for money or personal advantage – has been **a feature of Tasmanian life from the convict period through to the present**. Police corruption appeared after Lt.-Governor Arthur formed a police system in 1828. His largely convict police accepted bribes, arrested people who had done nothing wrong, prosecuted crimes where conviction gained them part of the fine, and planted incriminating evidence on innocent people. **Police corruption has continued.**" (added emphasis)

Stefan Petrow

in *The Companion to Tasmanian History*

utas.edu.au

2006

■ "I've said it before and I'll say it again; the government is not our buddy. It is not our ally or friend. It is not a 'part of us.' It is now a **separate and dangerous entity**. A **parasite feeding off the masses**. It has become a **clear threat to the freedoms of average [Australians]**. It is time for the public to grow up, snap out of its childish delusion and accept that there is **no solace or justice to be found anymore in [Hobart TAS or Canberra ACT].**" (added emphasis; with apologies)

Brandon Smith

infowars.com

15 February 2013

■ "The Executive Producer of A Current Affair, the Host, the Reporting Staff and Office Staff have been asked to please explain why they lied on TV and helped to set Martin Bryant up as the patsy/stooge for this *False Flag Terrorist Attack*. To date Channel 9, A Current Affair have refused to answer these questions.... Here are two videos to watch, they blow the Official story out the door."⁶

Lloyd T. Vance, Steven Johnson

The doctored video on channel 9

in *The Truth About Port Arthur Massacre*

scribd.com

10 February 2013

⁴ Kruger refers to the following: Carleen Bryant. *My Story*; 2010. (see *BIBLIOGRAPHY*)

⁵ This video has been produced in the public interest by survivors of the Port Arthur massacre and sympathetic investigators. Sixty shocking minutes about everything the **State does not want you to know**. Available: Sunrise A.V. Productions, P.O. Box 642, Nanango, Queensland 4615, Australia.

⁶ Vance and Johnson refer to the following:

i. *A Picnic at Port Arthur – The Port Arthur Massacre Part 1* youtube.com/watch?v=rB6HXcr8ffU &

ii. *A Picnic at Port Arthur – The Port Arthur Massacre Part 2* youtube.com/watch?v=JVZhyubmp0

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

THE State is an unnatural entity which if not maintained by force will wither. To sustain itself, to maintain its very existence, the exertion of control is paramount to every State. It is this ever ongoing exercise of exerting control over all components of a State which lead to friction within and without of a nation. And it is this ongoing process of exerting control which entices and engages other entities to support the State in order to maximize their own advantages. Such **entities** can range from individual people to internationally incorporated conglomerates.⁷

But an oft unacknowledged fact about the State is that the very thing upon which it purports and it is generally believed to represent, can be neglected and in some places be penalized for the benefit of the State and those who manipulate the State's controlling levers. It is neither possible for nor desired by a State for it to relate directly with each citizen, but rather the State deals with *its*⁸ citizens as a mass to be manipulated with the purpose of maintaining and exerting the power amassed by the State. No State willingly concedes its arrogated authority, or power – even though all the costs of this authority and power are funded by *its* citizens.

It is around these two things, authority and power, that opportunities for human corruption come into play. And this corruption does not just involve those engaged (employed) by a State, but also involves those associated with any State. Relationships not all of which have integrity and moral foundations can be established between the State and parties (ranges from the individual to conglomerate) if these relationships are mutually beneficial. Again, the citizenry of a State can be neglected, even penalized, because of such relationships. But to a State, and its relational partner(s), such exploitation and/or inconvenience to the public is of no great concern.

In the Port Arthur case, the State entered into relationships with a number of *entities*. These relationships were perceived, by the State, as being beneficial to the State. But there was absolutely no way they were beneficial to the residents of Tasmania. The undeniable fact is that **12** Tasmanians died⁹ – were murdered – so the State and those who manipulate its controlling levers would benefit in some way. And the entities involved with the **mass murder** also had their benefits.

Given the evidence that has been collected and studied since 1996, the State of the smallest state in Australia believed it was advantageous to allow a shooting incident to take place on the island in order to help assist the passing of gun-control legislation. Articles on the Internet suggest that this legislation had roots going back to earlier shooting incidents at Melbourne in 1987. Of course this does not mean every person engaged by the State of Tasmania dating back to that year was fully informed about the incident which occurred at Port Arthur in 1996. But during those interim years, essential things must have been raised, discussed, and finalized, if not in Tasmania then on the mainland and/or elsewhere. Related decisions had to have been passed on to key State personnel in Tasmania, as needs arose all with limitations and secrecy.¹⁰

⁷ Such relationships blur the identity of a State. A classic State was *the supreme public power within a political entity*. But now, the meaning of State has become more diffuse because of symbiotic relationships.* At the time of the Port Arthur incident, the State was in a relationship with the media. This relationship was mutually beneficial. There were also relationships with other mainland and most probably international entities. At times prior and during the Port Arthur incident, whether the State or some other entity had control and over what were undoubtedly issues. There is no evidence confirming or even suggesting the incident was the exclusive work of Tasmanian officials. At some time, senior Tasmanian officials either willingly got involved, or were coerced into getting involved. Their participation might not have been willing, but regardless they got involved. They have also covered up their involvement plus the extent of the incident and what other persons and entities were involved directly or indirectly. (* Brandon Smith. *Big government: An unnecessary evil that should be abolished*; prisonplanet.com; 31 March 2013: "The truth is, big governments are always operated by very small and exclusive clubs of root beneficiaries out of the sight of the population.")

⁸ A State has a citizenry. Those born within geographic boundaries of a nation are considered citizens of that nation and are subject to a State's power. Citizens do not have a choice, according to the State. Secession, or any other form of dissociation, is an act which can prompt States to take violent reactions.

⁹ Deaths by origin are as follows: **21** mainland Australia; **12** Tasmania; and, **2** S-E Asia (allegedly Malaysia). It has been said there were other deaths not acknowledged publicly. State statistics are suspect.

¹⁰ Secrecy is essential to every State – but with secrecy comes corruption. In politics, find one and there will be the other. States go into great nonsense over matters of confidentiality and secrecy. The State uses taxpayers' money to keep information from taxpayers, information obtained at the expense of taxpayers.

That such behaviours of the Tasmanian State and its relational partners were and still are corrupt is abundantly clear. Any State that participates, in whatever way and to whatever degree, in the killing of its citizens is corrupt. And had there been a proper **probing** inquiry into the Port Arthur incident, the history of the incident would have been exposed and all those involved revealed as the criminals they are. This of course is why there never has been an inquiry beyond the incomplete investigation conducted by some corrupt cops.

In this part of the book writers examine post-incident behaviours of the State. Terry Schulze looks at a number of pieces of evidence which have not been fully investigated with the findings being made public – findings which should have been presented to a jury during the trial of Martin Bryant. Schulze shows us that there have been no proper investigations with standard procedures. Tests have been ignored, discounted, and considered unnecessary¹¹ – even though **35 people were murdered**. Reasonable people would, this editor contends, have expected the State to **go beyond minimum requirements**. In fact, the State should have taken every conceivable step to investigate how the incident was planned and executed – who was involved with the planning and the perpetration.

Morality should have trumped any and all excuses about money. Objectivity should not have been overridden by an exaggerated concern for subjectivity. The law, which is well documented in gold-embossed books in Tasmanian law libraries, should have been applied **not denied**. But none of this happened in 1996 (or since). No. The State sacrificed the patsy Martin Bryant to a mentally-maimed mob¹² clammering for his death by bullet, acid bath, or a rope. Tasmania's apple was bitter and tart then. For some, it still is today.

¹¹ The Internet contains numerous articles which reveal that after gun-control legislation was passed, the sum of \$500 million of public money was budgeted to buy firearms held by the public. Yet, as Terry Schulze reveals in his paper (see following) a lack of money was **the lie** used by the State to explain why basic but essential forensic tests costing a few dollars were **not** conducted: “[T]he firearm forensic specialist [Dutton] stated that because of **budgetary considerations** there was **no test** of the powder residue in the AR-15.” Of course officials did not want to do anything that would reveal **Martin Bryant was innocent**. So the test was not done. That way, they could always suggest the test result would be positive, which is far better than doing the test and getting a negative result. Regardless, Martin was doomed before the first victim (**William Moh Yee Ng**) was shot inside the Broad Arrow Café.

¹² See quoted words of Ned Wood at *FORETHOUGHTS* to Part 5.

Next, Andrew MacGregor details the door. That inoperative emergency door at the Broad Arrow Café – an open and shut example of State corruption at its very worst. Possibly up to seven victims died on Sunday the 28th April because of that inoperative door. So of course the State lied again, which **MacGregor excels at exposing**. These lies keep piling up, each one confirming the State has not told the truth to the people. And this raises the big blunt question: **Why?** Along every avenue investigators have travelled they have found evidence of falsehoods, deliberate denials, disinformation, and so on. All with the purpose of stopping anyone (this includes you) from knowing the truth, the whole truth. **Why?**

In this part of the book there is an Insert related to Dunblane. By linking that terrible incident in Scotland, which took place before the one at Port Arthur, officials hoped for a guilt-by-association effect. Dunblane was a case of mass murder. There was the (alleged) perpetrator with firearms, the same as there was at Port Arthur. It was said Martin Bryant was encouraged by the incident at Dunblane. People no doubt believed this. But as for proof, there is none.

They outsmarted Martin Bryant, and the unthinking people. But they can't outsmart the truth. It just won't go away. More and more every day – publicly and loudly – **the truth cries out to be told**. – ed.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

NOTE Readers are encouraged to question all of the opinions which Sale and Mullen express in the following two articles. The medical specialty of psychiatry has an appalling, painful, and long record of cockups and cruelties. That some person is a psychiatrist does not guarantee her/his opinion on anything has one mote of merit. – ed.

DECEIT AND TERRORISM – PORT ARTHUR

Andrew S. MacGregor
2001-4

*Psychiatry is arguably
the least science-based
of the medical specialties.*¹³

IAN SALE



questionable psychiatrist; Hobart

THE ENIGMATIC IAN SALE¹⁴

IF there is one enigma regarding the Port Arthur massacre, then it must be the Tasmanian government forensic psychiatrist Dr Ian Sale. It has been discovered that Dr Sale became directly involved with the Port Arthur massacre as part of the police negotiation team which had talks with *Jamie* [one of them] during the afternoon of the 28th April 1996. We knew that the police negotiation team had the police psychologist Mike Ryan on the team. But on the 28th April, Ian Sale was a *guest* on the team.

Now this is significant, as the negotiation team is a highly organised team of police personnel, so why would a government forensic psychiatrist be invited to join them, and at what time was he requested to attend? The police negotiation team is also part of the SAC-PAV organization, which also suggests that if Dr Sale was invited to participate, then he would also have either had some influence within that structure, or he was part of the structure, be it SAC-PAV or PSSC or some similar body.

¹³ Stated by a retired family physician and former US air force flight surgeon; sciencebasedmedicine.org; 27 January 2009. Harriet Hall says: “I write about medicine, so-called complementary and alternative medicine, science, quackery, and critical thinking.” (skepdoc.info)

¹⁴ On themercury.com.au website of 12 October 2012, an article titled *Psychiatric help sought* appeared. In it, this appears: “Director of Public Prosecutions Tim Ellis SC said Dr Sale was **not** a treating psychiatrist, and accused Ms Neill-Fraser of visiting him for the purpose of the trial.” (added emphasis) Very interesting. So what does it mean? Well this editor did some Internet searching to see what is there about this non-treating psychiatrist. It seems Sale has an office at 33 Salamanca Place in Hobart – an address on the better side of the tracks to be sure. Then the editor found a list of psychiatrists in Hobart, but Sale is not on that list of seven prepared by the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists. Interesting. Then, a find-a-psychiatrist search with the same college was run and the name Ian Sale did not appear: “Your search found 0 matches.” Three additional searches revealed these: **i.** “Dr Ian Sale Doctor (GP) Hobart.” – healthshare.com.au; **ii.** “Sale, Ian Ph.D.” – zoominfo.com; and, **iii.** “He completed undergraduate training in Tasmania, and specialist training in South Australia.” – (Douglas LPT legal training firm, Melbourne. VIC) A check with the Australian Medical Association confirmed the following qualifications of Ian Sale: “• MB BS TASMANIA, 1971 • FRANZCP 1971, • MBBSTASMANIA, 1971 • FRANZCP, 1977” (sic) No Ph.D. was listed, nor was any “specialist training in South Australia.” This editor asked Sale by letter (7 April 2013), but no reply was received. Thus, what academic qualifications and experiences Ian Sale actually had in April 1996 has not been confirmed by this editor.

It appears that Dr Sale was in attendance from the outset of the negotiation team on the afternoon of the 28th April. And again, if that is correct then the next question to be asked was did Dr Sale have any previous experience in working with that team? We must also ask the question **who authorised his inclusion**. And again, why? Then we have the telling point – Sale became the negotiation team’s spokesman. **It was Sale who was interviewed** by all the various media in regard to Martin Bryant’s behaviour, competence and ability.¹⁵

At 9:37 p.m. on the Sunday, the police negotiation team was cut off from communicating with *Jamie*. On Monday morning, we are told by the assistant commissioner Richard McCreddie that the telephone line was continuously busy.

We are also told that the negotiation team continued until 2:00 a.m. on the Monday morning (29th) to try and regain contact with *Jamie*. We are also aware that the negotiator’s vehicle was driven to Taranna and arrived there late at night. But, we are also told that the negotiation team was maintained in Hobart, instead of being deployed at Taranna, which again was not the normal procedure.

Now the norm in any negotiation situation is for the police negotiation team to stay together and then they would have continued to try and resolve the siege at Seascope, but this did not happen. At 10:30 that night (28th) as inspector Ross Paine led his band of detectives into Martin Bryant’s Clare Street residence, the police were accompanied by some media and Dr Ian Sale. In other words, Sale was also part of Inspector Paine’s criminal investigation team.

So more questions arise. The negotiation team was placed in isolation so as not to be disturbed. They have a very important role to play, and do not need interruptions from other sources. So how did Sale find out about the visit to 30 Clare Street, and who invited him to attend that function? Police normally do not appreciate having an outsider tagging along. But Dr Sale was there, and again informed all Australians about what was found inside that home when he was interviewed by Judy Tierney, on ABC **Stateline** in Hobart. Mind you, what Sale stated was found inside that Clare Street residence did not conform with later media and police reports about videos, magazines or firearms, which were [allegedly] found on the 2nd May.

Also, it must be noted that the police who conducted the initial search would **not have been permitted** to be interviewed in the way Sale was, nor would the police be permitted to pass on their opinions, the way that Dr Sale **passed on his opinions**. The police search at Clare Street would have taken up to at least two hours, which means that Sale should have remained at those premises until at least 12:30 a.m. [00:30 hours] Monday.

It is now time to consider Superintendent Bob Fielding, who took over at the PFCP at Taranna at 3:00 a.m. on Monday morning, and his resources when the Seascope cottage was reported as being on fire. Mike Bingham wrote this in his book: “A psychiatrist who had been

¹⁵ It is very clear that Ian Sale had accepted the official narrative that Martin Bryant was the Port Arthur gunman. His presence and, as the author MacGregor points out, his direct involvement with the media immediately added to the *lone-nut* theory. One of the many questions **not answered** is: How involved with the case was Ian Sale before the first shot was fired?

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

helping police since the previous afternoon told Fielding that he thought it possible the hostages were still alive. 'You've got to send the SOG in.' 'Make your mind up! You told me ten minutes ago that you were satisfied they were dead. Well, **are they or aren't they?** What's your best estimate of it?' Fielding snapped back."¹⁶

In an article published in the Police Journal of the Police Association of South Australia, we are given this information regarding superintendent Bob Fielding: "At 7:45 a.m. the first sign of fire was seen from the house. That gave us some more difficult decisions. I had further discussions with the SOG liaison officer, the psychiatrist Dr Sale and with the head of the negotiation unit, inspector Tom Tully."¹⁷

So what we now know is that the Tasmanian government forensic psychiatrist, Dr Ian Sale, is again at the scene of the next stage of action in relation to the siege. Bear in mind that it takes approximately 90 minutes to drive from Hobart to Port Arthur, and it becomes apparent that Sale would have been up most of the night assisting police in a variety of fields. In fact, almost every field.

The next involvement of Sale regarding Martin Bryant becomes extremely interesting. At Seascapes cottage, Martin Bryant was arrested on Monday the 29th April, and conveyed [by road ambulance] to the Royal Hobart Hospital. On Monday the 29th April, inspector John Warren tried to interview Martin Bryant but was unsuccessful.

According to Sale in his interview by Judy Tierney of the ABC, Sale was present with Warren at this attempted police interview. Now remember this, Martin Bryant has been arrested, and whilst in the Royal Hobart Hospital was treated for up to six different third degree burns he received on his back and buttocks which required specialist treatment in the Royal Hobart Hospital unit for burns. This treatment **included sedation**.

Bryant is still under arrest and is guarded supposedly by the Tasmania Police. According to Warren's police statement, the police initially endeavoured to interview Bryant on the 29th April, at approximately 6:30 p.m. whilst **he would still have been under the effects of the sedation** required for the treatment of his injuries. This is how Dr Ian Sale described his role with the police regarding Martin Bryant at the Royal Hobart Hospital:

"Later when the siege ended and he was in the Royal Hobart Hospital, I had some initial contact during that first day when there were some difficulties in determining when Bryant was fit to be interviewed by police."; "At the hospital he'd been sedated because of his burns and I suspect also because of some anxiety on the hospital's staff part as to the situation they faced."; and, "The problem arose as to when he would be alert enough to be interviewed by the police. The police asked me to assist in determining this in liaison with hospital staff. That was eventually possible late on the Monday afternoon, but even then there was a feeling that Bryant was probably feigning a degree of stupor."

¹⁶ Mike Bingham. *Suddenly One Sunday*; 1996: pp. 120-121.

¹⁷ Jenny Fleming. *Forward command at Port Arthur*; Police Journal; March 1997.

There are at least two questions to be asked here. Why would the Tasmania Police require a forensic psychiatrist to determine when Martin Bryant was fit to be interviewed? That is the discretion of the hospital doctor, as Bryant was at that time a hospital patient and under the control of the hospital. Which member of Tasmania Police requested Sale's assistance relating to this matter? Please remember that Sale has been continuously involved with the police since about 2:30 p.m. on the Sunday, and there is no suggestion at any time that he himself had any chance to rest or sleep. Indeed, Dr Sale **must have been the busiest man of the whole police operation regarding the Port Arthur Massacre.**

There was no other attempt made by police to interview Bryant until the 4th July, over eight weeks later. Normally police would seek to interview their offender as soon as possible after the event. But what we are informed by Blair Saville, the *custody officer* from Risdon Prison, is that on Wednesday the 1st May 1996, and again on Friday the 3rd May 1996, Martin Bryant was visited by a doctor, and it can only be Ian Sale. On Saturday the 4th May, professor Paul Mullen¹⁸ attends and interviews Martin Bryant.

The interesting things here are that the police did not lodge Martin Bryant into prison custody until six days after the incident, that is Sunday the 5th May. Thus there would be **no proper procedure** for Martin Bryant to be under control of a Risdon Prison *custody officer*.

Blair Saville tells us that whilst on duty at the Royal Hobart Hospital: "I was working with John RADCLIFFE. We started shift at 6:30 a.m. and was with BRYANT until 2:30 p.m. On this day BRYANT was visited by a doctor who had a conversation with him in my presence, I made notes of this conversation. I later handed these notes to Detective Don O'GAREY." Part of Saville's statement recounting the doctor's visit stated:

Dr: What day is it?
MB: Monday yeh Monday
Dr: What month is it?
MB: April or May
Dr: What ever you say to us may be used against you in court.
 Do you understand what I said?
MB: If I say something court could hear about it ...

Now there is no mention of any police presence in relation to this interview, and yet Dr Sale is stated to have given Martin Bryant a **caution**, something that normally only the police do at the beginning of an interview of a suspect. **Why, according to the Risdon Prison officer's statement is Ian Sale behaving like a policeman?**

However Dr Sale differs in his recollections of that meeting with Martin Bryant which was raised in his interview with Judy Tierney. Dr Sale was asked by Tierney at the conclusion of his recounting of his experiences with Martin Bryant at the Royal Hobart Hospital on the evening of the 29th April 1996:

¹⁸ See following article: PAUL MULLEN.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

JT: "Your next contact with him?"
Dr: "Would have been some weeks later when I interviewed him at the prison. I interviewed him on two occasions at the prison hospital at the request of the director of public prosecutions. He knew I was there not on his behalf but on the behalf of the prosecutor and that was very clear that he was bearing that in mind. There was a certain amount of game playing, not just with me but with the prison officers at the back of the room during the interview."

What Dr Ian Sale is stating quite emphatically is that **Blair Saville's corroboration of his visits is incorrect in the time and place.** This then must cast doubt on the rest of Saville's evidence. Furthermore, the Risdon Prison psychiatrist, Dr Wilf Lopes corroborates the fact that Sale visited Martin Bryant at Risdon prison on two occasions. That being the case, then there definitely would have been prison officers accompanying Bryant for that interview, but not being part of the interview. Then we have Paul Mullen's report on Martin Bryant, which in part was based upon Sale's work. The Mullen report begins with the following introduction:

"I have prepared this report at the request of Mr Bryant's legal representative, Mr John Avery. It is based on interview conducted on the 4 May 1996 at the Royal Hobart Hospital, lasting in total some 3½ hours. In addition I had access to extensive documentation which included:

1. Records of Mr Bryant's previous medical and psychiatric assessments and treatment including Royal Hobart Hospital case records, a copy of the report prepared by Dr Cunningham-Dax in February 1984, reports by Dr Bernard Mather and Dr Terence Craven prepared in October 1993 and additional material reproduced in the profile of Martin Bryant prepared by the Tasmanian Police;
2. The profile of Martin Bryant prepared by the Tasmanian Police dated 6 August 1996;
3. The report by Dr Bill Lucas based on his examination of Mr Bryant in May this year;
4. The extensive reports and results of psychological testing prepared by Mr Ian Joblin in June 1996.
5. The two reports of Dr Ian Sale, dated 7 July 1996 and 6 August 1996;
6. A transcript of the police interviews with Mr Bryant;
7. Hearing the recordings of the interactions between Mr Bryant and the police negotiator on 28 April. This report is intended to clarify for the court why an insanity plea was not considered appropriate and to at least outline some of the factors which contributed to the dreadful actions of Mr Bryant."

What we can see at this point is that the two forensic psychiatrists Sale and Mullen worked together. There may have been slight differences of opinion such as Sale's opinion that Martin Bryant suffered from Asperger's Syndrome, which Mullen **disagreed** with. Mullen said he himself was an expert on Asperger's as he was one of the authors on a paper detailing Asperger's Syndrome.¹⁹

¹⁹ J.B. Barry-Walsh & P.E. Mullen. *Forensic aspects of Asperger's Syndrome*. Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology 15(1); 2004: pp. 96-107.

All these psychiatrists and all these police telling the public about Martin Bryant – who he was, what he did, why he did it – but Martin was never allowed to speak to the public, or to the media, or to an ethical lawyer.

Later in 1997, Dr Sale associated the various *Lone-Nut Gunman* form of massacre with that of the Malayan Peninsula behaviour called *Amok*, which **Prof Mullen refuted in another paper**, but without clarifying just why these massacres erupted so spontaneously. Now, as mentioned earlier, Dr Sale was the government psychiatrist. All the victims had to be examined by the government psychiatrist, and all claims had to be **approved by this office**. Furthermore, every claimant in relation to the Port Arthur Massacre was required to be interviewed by Dr Sale in regard to all claims. These duties though seem to conflict with the previous duties Sale had in relation to the assisting of police and the various interviews with the suspect Bryant. However there was an even more interesting role played by Dr Sale.

Colleen Parker was a waitress from the Broad Arrow Café at the Port Arthur Historic Site. Colleen Parker witnessed the shooting of the Malaysian couple, William Ng and Sou Leng Chung, as well as Kate Scott, and was the main witness in the initial charge of one count of murder, that of Kate Scott, which Martin Bryant was charged with on the 30th April 1996 by inspector John Warren. **Colleen Parker's personal psychiatrist was Dr Ian Sale.**

Now let us consider Martin Bryant and some of his more peculiar statements. On his emergence from the burning Seascape cottage, Martin Bryant was arrested, handcuffed and placed in an ambulance and conveyed to the Royal Hobart Hospital. It was while he was in the ambulance that Bryant asked the policeman guarding him: "Did my girlfriend get out?" To which the policeman replied, "Was she with you?" Martin Bryant answered, "Yes, we go everywhere together." **From this conversation we can presume that Martin Bryant was aware that he had just left a burning building.**

Then we look again at the Risdon Prison officer Blair Saville's statement in relation to Martin Bryant's [alleged] conversation with Petra Willmott (PW) his girlfriend. This statement was recorded as being taken at 11:20 a.m. on the 15th May 1996 at Risdon Prison.

MB: I drove to this house you know that house we went to that Sunday.

PW: Yeah.

MB: I got pretty burned and woke up in hospital.

Then shortly after that, there was this question put by Martin Bryant to his girlfriend, Petra Willmott.

MB: Is my house OK is it still standing or has it burned down?

PW: No it's OK.

From all the witness statements made by Petra Willmott, there is no mention of Martin Bryant and Petra Willmott travelling to the Tasman Peninsula, or visiting Seascape cottage, so there is something wrong with this particular statement by Saville in regard to Martin Bryant's comments. However, if we consider that statement in conjunction with the statement made by Bryant to his police guard in the ambulance, then it raises even more concerns.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

We are aware that Martin Bryant was awake and aware when he exited from the burning cottage, and he was still conscious whilst being conveyed to the Royal Hobart Hospital by ambulance whilst under guard by police SOG members. So what we can gather from this snippet of conversation is that Bryant is aware that he visited a house, not his own property, and it was there he received his burns.

However there appears to be some confusion with Martin Bryant as he then asks if his house at Clare Street has burned down? What we can gather from this is that at that stage Martin Bryant is still aware that he was involved in a situation where a house was burnt to the ground. It is during the police interview on the 4th of July 1996 where things become rather bizarre.

It is during this interview that we learn that Martin Bryant states that after kidnapping the hostage Glenn Pears, and placing him in the boot of the BMW, Martin Bryant then drove to Seascope cottage for a *Devonshire tea*. After arriving there, he knocked at the front door of Seascope, and when nobody appeared, he then went to the back door of the cottage, and it was at that stage that the BMW exploded, with the hostage still apparently in the boot. It was this fire that Martin Bryant believed caused his burns.

The BMW was destroyed by fire at approximately 2:15 p.m. on Sunday the 28th April, and it appears that Martin Bryant has lost that part of his memory concerning over 18 hours during his presence at Seascope. **There is no medical reason for this loss of memory, so we must ask just how did it occur?**²⁰

But then we also get the exact opposite in relation to the BMW. We are all aware that the BMW was stolen after the [four people who had been travelling in it] were murdered outside the tollbooth at the Port Arthur Historic Site. We are also aware that the hostage Glenn Pears was kidnapped outside the Port Arthur General Store, opposite the Kodak Print shop owned by Jim Laycock. And that Pears' companion, Zoe Hall was murdered after Pears had been forced into the boot of the stolen BMW.

When examining all the various photographs taken at Seascope cottage, we can see the tracks made by the stolen BMW it had left from the front door of the main house, where it had been parked with the boot closest to the front door, off the concreted area, over the ditch and bogged in a very spongy area at the bottom of a line of poplar trees. The photographs taken of the BMW indicate just how deep the tracks made by the BMW were, and the fact that this vehicle would not have been extricated without being towed out of the area.

Mind you, Martin Bryant does not mention that he parked the BMW out of the way at the bottom of the poplar trees. He simply tells the police interviewers that he parked outside Seascope and knocked on the front door, and when he did not receive a reply he then went to the back door and that is when the BMW exploded. So let us examine Martin's statements regarding the stolen BMW.

²⁰ This finding that Martin Bryant had lost all or most of his memory in relation to Seascope cottage is highly significant. It is just more evidence which the so-called defence lawyers could have and should have focused on. That they (Gunson & Avery) did not, confirms there was no desire to prove anything exculpatory for their client. Given the facts we now know, the process of **setting up the patsy Martin Bryant** commenced long before the Port Arthur incident.

First we have the Prison Officer, Blair Saville's statement of the 18th June 1996 concerning the second visit to Martin Bryant by Ian Sale (IS) on Friday the 3rd May, 1996:

IS: When you stole the BMW did you get scared?
MB: No I liked the BMW it was an automatic a late model one it went very fast about 130ks it was fun.
IS: What does ks mean.
MB: Kilometres an hour.
IS: What is one kilometer?
MB: I don't know.
IS: We have just had a bomb scare.
MB: I didn't cause it did I?
IS: I don't know Martin did you?

Then again on the 15th May 1996, with Petra Willmott, Blair Saville noted:

MB: I highjacked this BMW and put a guy in the boot and drove at 160ks it was great.
MB: I drove to this house you know that house we went that Sunday.

And then again on the 3rd August, after the Police interview on the 4th July:

BS: Where did you get the BMW?
MB: I got it at the Fortescue Bay turnoff.²¹
BS: I thought you got it at the service station.
MB: No I got it at the turnoff.
BS: What happened to the guy?
MB: I put him in the boot.
BS: Did he die?
MB: I don't know he was in the boot when it exploded.
BS: There's a pretty good chance he's dead then.
MB: Yeah I think so.

And again, in the police interview, Martin Bryant stuck to this story, but it creates a conundrum. If Martin was knowingly telling lies regarding this episode of the massacre, then why tell such a dreadful lie. But more importantly, he appeared to be doing his best to assist the police. Neither detective inspector Paine or Warren, nor the two female detectives Jones and Bolt, were able to break Martin Bryant from his story. In other words, it appears that Martin was telling them what he believed was the truth. If that is the case, then **where did these figments of imagination come from?**

Again when we consider what the Risdon Prison psychiatrist Dr Wilf Lopes said about Martin Bryant, "He's not as dumb as people make out – he's got a good knowledge, a good memory."

Then we must consider how **he lost 18 hours of his memory**, and also believed a figment of absolute nonsense to be perfectly normal and the truth. It was the *good* Dr Ian Sale though who did much

²¹ Martin Bryant said he carjacked the BMW. Whether he did or whether he was programmed to say what he did, we do not know.* But regardless, if Martin had said this during a trial it could have created insurmountable problems for the prosecution. So it was better to have **no trial** and to keep telling the public that Bryant took the BMW from the tollbooth and in that process he killed four people there, as well as another at the nearby store – even though there are witnesses whose statements confirm, directly and indirectly, the gunman was **not Martin Bryant**. (* Investigations have revealed that the BMW had a 4-on-the-floor manual gearbox. Martin Bryant could only drive vehicles with automatic gearboxes – this has been revealed by his mother in her book *My Story*. Anything Martin said about carjacking a BMW at Fortescue Bay seem to be confabulation. [Was the BMW that Martin was alleged to have carjacked, the same BMW that was carjacked at the PAHS tollbooth?] Like so much of the case, it was not proved that Martin Bryant drove any BMW, and all the available evidence says he **could not drive** any vehicle with a manual-change gearbox. That some idiot official might say it was Martin who drove the BMW from the PAHS tollbooth to Seascope is just more **unproved nonsense**. It is not a question of identity. It is the fact that Martin Bryant was incapable of driving the Nixon-BMW as it did not have automatic transmission.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

of the verbalising about Martin Bryant. Not just on the ABC with Judy Tierney, but also on the **A Current Affair** program with Ray Martin, a former member of the National Committee on Violence, the body that prepared the firearm laws that were instigated after the Port Arthur Massacre. Sale's descriptions of Martin Bryant do raise some questions. For example, in describing Martin, Dr Sale said the following:

"He is callow. He is able to do these things without any feeling of guilt, regret, horror, anxiety, he is able to continue slaughtering people and it doesn't have an emotional impact upon him."

But a major anomaly within the Port Arthur massacre was that the gunman was able to **murder 35 persons and injure another 23**, but when the police arrived at Seascope cottage, **not one** of them was injured. Dr Sale says that Martin Bryant was callow, which is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as: unfledged, raw, inexperienced. (unfledged means undeveloped.) This may describe Martin Bryant, but it does not fit the gunman at Port Arthur who displayed great experience in the use of firearms, and in controlled firepower as in the first 17 shots in 15 seconds, and only four shots in the next 10 seconds, as per the two video-tapes. If a person says he/she has not committed some crime, then it cannot be expected that person will feel guilt for that particular crime.

As for the statement "*it doesn't have an emotional impact upon him,*" there is evidence, in both the police interview and the police negotiator tapes, that **there was an emotional impact on Bryant** in relation to the people murdered at Port Arthur. In regard to Martin's schooldays, Sale said: "His biggest problem throughout his schooling was his social behaviour." But of course, Dr Sale never asked Bryant's primary school teacher, Miss Brown, about her experiences with Martin. This schoolteacher simply said Martin was the most uncoordinated student she ever had. There was no mention or recollection about Martin Bryant having any emotional inability at school, from his schoolteacher.

Dr Sale also stated: "I believe he was often regarded as something of a simpleton and nicknamed *Simple Marty*." **There is no evidence to support this statement by Dr Sale**, and even if there was, it is no crime to be a simpleton, in fact some say that the present president of the United States is a simpleton.²²

Dr Sale also made two other statements involving Martin Bryant and relationships. Sale said: "He most probably never had a real friendship"; and, "I don't think he had any normal intimate relationships at all." We do know though that Martin Bryant had two different relationships with young ladies, the second lass being Petra Willmott, who says of Martin Bryant: "**He was kind, gentle and would look after me.**" There was also the friendship between Martin Bryant and Miss Harvey, which was a platonic relationship. Martin also had another friend with whom he used to sell vegetables door to door, and their customers included the wife of John Avery the solicitor. Martin remembered her because she drove a white Mercedes.

²² The author MacGregor is referring to George W. Bush (president 2001-09), who is also a war criminal.

Dr Sale also stated: "The Martins may also have been less than welcoming to him in some of his more recent visits." The problem here is that we are aware that Martin Bryant had **not** visited the Martins **for years**. And, he had **not** visited his old friend Roger Lerner for **over two years**. The evidence to demonstrate the relationship between them and Martin Bryant came from their son Glenn Martin who **stated quite emphatically** that Martin Bryant had **not** visited his parents in years, and from Roger Lerner's police statement, and also from the book, *Suddenly on Sunday*.

Dr Sale's statement is neither factual nor truthful.

Sale's personal description of Martin Bryant is rather odd. He says: **"I see Bryant as one of nature's very bad mistakes, I mean circumstances conspired to allow Bryant to commit mayhem."** There is nothing in this statement to explain to the Australian public why and how Martin Bryant was able to commit those crimes for which he was sentenced: why and how if he had developed the supposed criminal intent; and, why and how he was to hide all of this from his girlfriend and mother, as well as from his other associates.

The last statement made by Sale in relation to Martin Bryant is: **"He is able to tell lies, this man, and why should he tell the truth, we may never know."**

Doctor Ian Sale has behaved in the same manner as that which he has accused Martin Bryant, that is of telling lies. One would wonder **why the good doctor is unable to tell us the truth**, as he desires of Martin Bryant, the truth being perhaps far more intricate than many Australians would believe anyway.

Ian Sale, the Tasmanian government psychiatrist, was involved in the Port Arthur massacre from its inception that Sunday afternoon, the 28th April 1996. It is interesting to note that the roles Dr Sale did play on that day have never been repeated: guest on a Police negotiating team; guest on a police search of a residential home; advisor to the Tasmania Police SOG (Special Operations Group), at a Police Forward Command Post; police liaison officer at the Royal Hobart Hospital; police interviewer at the Royal Hobart Hospital (as per claims made by prison officer Blair Saville), and at the Risdon Prison hospital (as per the statement by Dr Wilf Lopes); interviewer of all claimants regarding a major incident involving deaths; and, personal psychiatrist to some of the victims of an incident including the prime witness to a charge of murder laid by police (that witness being Miss Colleen Parker).

As I first said: If there is one enigma regarding the Port Arthur massacre, then it must be Dr Ian Sale, the Tasmanian government forensic²³ psychiatrist. ■

(amended; added emphasis)

²³ This editor has not been able to find evidence of Sale having any academic qualifications, obtained from a reputable educational institution, in forensic psychiatry. Note that Sale might have some such qualifications, and that in Tasmania such qualifications might not be required before a person identifies he/she is a forensic psychiatrist. Surely two basic qualifications in medicine and surgery conferred in 1971 would not be sufficient in Tasmania for anyone to be a forensic psychiatrist 25 years later?

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

PAUL MULLEN



questionable psychiatrist; Melbourne

PAUL MULLEN

PROFESSOR Paul Mullen interviewed Martin Bryant on the 4th May 1996, five days after Bryant was arrested and conveyed to the Royal Hobart Hospital. This interview lasted for approximately 3½ hours. From this original interview, and various other information²⁴ Mullen was given access to including the Police interview, Mullen completed his report for the solicitor John Avery on the 12th November 1996, five days after Bryant pleaded guilty to all charges, and seven days prior to the actual date set down for the sentencing of Bryant. This was the only document that Avery used in his *defence* of Bryant.

This report is intended to clarify for the court why an insanity plea was not considered appropriate and to at least outline some of the factors which contributed to the [alleged] dreadful actions of Bryant. It is then proper to query these sources, to ascertain the propriety of these documents in relation to a psychiatric report, as it would seem that only one 3½ hour consultation of Martin Bryant would be **insufficient** to cover the various aspects required, and it is a concern that this Prof Mullen **never returned** to Martin Bryant for any clarification.

The first item consists of the medical history of Martin Bryant, and, as they would have been written at the time of reference, must be considered an accurate assessment for that period prior to the Port Arthur massacre.

The second item is the profile of Bryant prepared by Tasmania Police. Now this becomes interesting. Prior to the massacre, Bryant was not known to traffic police in Hobart. He had been issued with a traffic infringement notice by another authority for unlicensed driving of the unregistered and uninsured blue Honda sedan, but there is no record of any police involvement in that or subsequent matters. What this means is that the Tasmania Police would have had to resource their information from outside their authority, and there is no known check as to the absolute reliability of that information. If we consider the original source of police information that Martin Bryant was mentally-handicapped and suffered from schizophrenia

²⁴ Note that Martin Bryant's mother Carleen Bryant reveals in her book *My Story*; 2010: p. 154, that his medical records held in Risdon Prison disappeared "around the time the prison psychiatrist, Doctor Lopes, had left the prison." Whether Mullen saw the records is not known by this editor. It is doubted, because if there was anything positive in them they would have been disposed of long before.

*The case was
flowing over with
big bags of bullets,
an armoury of
assault rifles,
and psychiatric
opinions
– it was truth
that was in
short supply.*

as stated during and immediately after the massacre, and as we are now aware that this information was apparently incorrect, then there must be concerns raised by any further utilisation of information from such sources.

There should be no problems in utilising the reports of Dr Bill Lucas, nor should there be problems with the reports by Mr Ian Joblin, but apparently there are. Risdon Prison psychiatrist, Dr Wilf Lopes apparently **believed Joblin's tests were flawed**. It should be remembered that Mullen is referring to Joblin's report when he says: "He functions in the borderline range between intellectual disability and the dull normal individual."

The reports of Dr Ian Sale though are of a different proposition. Dr Sale was an original member of the police negotiation team that communicated with the person known as *Jamie* at Seascope cottage. Sale also informs us via the ABC interview with Judy Tierney of his visit to the Clare Street residence of Martin Bryant on the evening of the 28th April 1996. This makes Ian Sale personally involved with Bryant, and thus **permits the possibility of bias** in his reports. There were statements made to Judy Tierney which also **question Dr Sale's ability to be completely impartial** in matters relating to the Bryant trial.

The police transcripts used by Prof Mullen were the severely censored versions, and as such must raise concerns as to just what was **hidden by the censors**. The use of the recordings between the police negotiator and a person calling himself *Jamie* does not assist until it has been **properly verified** that the person named as *Jamie* was in actual fact Martin Bryant. It can be seen that there are a number of points relating to the material used by Prof Paul Mullen into his report on Martin Bryant, which can appear to be less than perfect, and these imperfections raise themselves inside the report. Mullen initiates his report with:

"In my interview with Mr Bryant, although he was initially anxious and somewhat reticent, he gradually relaxed as the interview progressed. He was receiving medication for pain but this did not produce any disorientation or obvious disorganisation in his state of mind. He gave the impression of attempting within his capacities to respond to my enquiries. As will be noted later in the report he initially denied memories of the offences but subsequently gave a fuller account."

But in fact, **there never was any "fuller account"** by Martin Bryant for the actions of which he was charged with. The various profiles and reports on Bryant were prepared between May and August 1996. But at the date of his committal in September 1996, Martin Bryant was still pleading "Not Guilty." Mullen's next paragraph states: "Mr Bryant gives the initial impression of being a normal young man. Superficially his conversation is coherent, though his vocabulary is limited. It is only when you attempt to test Mr Bryant's comprehension skills and numeracy that the extent of his intellectual limitation becomes clear. He functions in the borderline range between intellectual disability and the dull normal individual."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

If we read this statement clearly, then what it states is that Martin Bryant appears to be a normal, but dull individual, because that is exactly what he is. Dr Wilf Lopes, Risdon Prison's forensic psychiatrist has stated of Martin Bryant, "He's not as dumb as people make out – he's got a good knowledge, a good memory."²⁵ In Dr Wilf Lopes' statement, if we replace people with say Prof. Mullen, Dr Sale, and others, it appears there is disagreement between these persons.

Mind you, Dr Lopes has been caring for Martin Bryant for almost three years now, and thus it would be expected that his knowledge would be superior to that of Mullen who only spoke to Bryant for 3½ hours. Dr Lopes also questioned the tests by Dr Joblin, stating IQ tests "have their limitations. They use proverbs...who uses or teaches people proverbs these days? They don't take into consideration those other things that can make a person what he is." According to the Australian journalist Garry Linnell, "Lopes will not reveal some of the conversations he had with Bryant, but says he *made progress* with him."

Thus it appears that the extent of Martin Bryant's intellectual limitations are in the comprehension and numeracy skills area, accompanied with a limited vocabulary. This is what Mullen's report states. (author's note: After this article was published, Dr Lopes was replaced as the psychiatrist at Risdon Prison.)

On page two and onto page three of his report, Prof Mullen states: "In February 1984 Mr Bryant was assessed by a very experienced clinical psychiatrist, Dr Cunningham-Dax. This assessment was initiated to consider Mr Bryant's eligibility for a disability pension. Dr Cunningham-Dax said that Mr Bryant was intellectually handicapped and personality disordered. He also raised the possibility that Bryant might be developing an illness of a **schizophrenic type**.

On the basis of this report and subsequent assessments which relied upon it, Martin Bryant was granted a disability pension. There are subsequent references to him having a **schizophrenic illness**, and of being a **paranoid schizophrenic** in the records of, respectively Dr Bernard Mather (Dec 1991) and Dr P.M. McCartney (Dec 1991).

These diagnostic formulations, it transpired, were not the results of the doctors' own conclusions, but based on the report of Mr Bryant's mother that he had been diagnosed by Dr Cunningham-Dax as suffering from this illness." That statement by Mullen is libellous, and denigrates the professional approach of Drs Mather and McCartney. The 1984 assessment by Dr Cunningham-Dax was for a Department of Social Security (DSS) invalid pension. The pension was granted. After five years, the pension was reviewed.

The 1991 assessments of Drs Mather and McCartney were to simply review the continuation of the report by Dr Cunningham-Dax and that was all that was required of them by the DSS. Never forget that Dr Mather was Martin Bryant's normal doctor, and as such would have been well aware of Martin Bryant's full medical and mental history.

²⁵ Quoted by the journalist Garry Linnell. The Bulletin; 3 May 1999. (not confirmed by this editor)

*With his assets
taken from him
so he could not
engage an
ethical lawyer,
the State had
Martin helpless –
and with those
scum lawyers
Rigby, Gunson,
then Avery, who
failed to defend
their client,
poor Martin was
truly doomed.*

On page 4 of his report, Mullen says: "In November 1993 Mr Bryant was made subject to a guardianship order which placed the management of his money and property in the hands of the Perpetual Trustees, Tasmania Limited. This order was made on the application of his mother and on the recommendation of Dr Terence Craven and Dr Bernard Mather who both expressed themselves of the opinion that Mr Bryant was mentally-impaired as the result of a low level of intelligence which rendered him incapable of managing his own affairs and property."

This information comes from the reports by Dr Bernard Mather and Dr Terence Craven prepared in October 1993. Now consider that Dr Mather as Martin Bryant's normal doctor, just what information could he have given to the Court in this matter. It could only have been the same as he diagnosed in December 1991, that is, that Martin Bryant was suffering from a **schizophrenic illness**.

What is interesting is that Mrs Bryant denies all knowledge of this guardianship order, which she states would have been handled by her late husband, Maurice Bryant. The problem is that Maurice died in August 1993. Furthermore, such guardianships are made through a Court, and require the presence of the person making the application. The Herald Sun newspaper in Melbourne stated this application was made through the Hobart supreme court in a private hearing on 22nd April 1994. The report also says **Martin Bryant could not manage his own affairs** due to a **serious mental disability**, and that he needed continuing medical treatment.

The newspaper reported: "The court put Bryant's assets under the control of a trustee firm because of concerns by health authorities that he would squander the fortune inherited from Tattersalls' heir."; "It is understood the application to the Tasmanian Supreme Court that Bryant was incapable of handling his affairs was made under the Mental Health Act."; and, "The solicitor who acted on behalf of Bryant during the closed Supreme Court hearing, Peter Griffiths of Hobart firm *Griffiths & Jackson*, also refused to comment about the court hearing or about Bryant's mental state."

It is interesting to note that "Perpetual Trustees" is a Tasmanian government enterprise. It can be stated quite emphatically that Martin Bryant did not attend the court hearing. He was in London at that time, as stated by Mr Damian Bugg QC on page 319 of the court document.

If we consider this newspaper report, in conjunction with Bryant's actual situation, then a significant question arises. Who prompted the health authorities to raise concerns regarding Martin Bryant's supposed extravagances? It was not his father as he was dead. His mother flatly denies any knowledge of the court action. So again – **who did raise this matter?** Who engaged the services of the lawyer Peter Griffiths to act for Bryant in this supreme court hearing? (author's note: There are witnesses in Hobart who will testify that when Martin Bryant was questioned in relation to having a shooter's licence, he replied that his lawyer got it for him.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

There is a further matter raised by Mullen on page 4 in relation to Martin Bryant's inheritance. "Mr Bryant said that he was surprised after Miss Harvey's death to learn that she had left him her money. He is still uncertain as to the extent of his various inheritances having only the vaguest notions of his financial situation." This vaguest of notions of his financial situation is well demonstrated during the uncensored parts of his police interviews, especially to the parts relating to credit cards, of which **Bryant never had**.

However the opposite is stated during part of the conversations with the police negotiators during the siege at Seascope when *Jamie*, in relation to helicopters, said: "First of all, I missed out on one about 4 years ago, I was going to buy one for \$95,000. It was advertised in The Mercury. I missed out on that, I'm very upset about that." "You can buy a helicopter. I've got the money. Don't you understand? I've got the money! I've got all the wealth I want, right. What's the time now?" What we have in this telephone conversation is a person very much aware of just how much money he supposedly has. It is interesting to note that about 4 years ago leans to April 1992, **well before** Martin Bryant ever inherited any money.²⁶ It also **conflicts with most other evidence** in relation to time where Martin Bryant always refers to times as "about twelve months ago" or "about a year ago."

In fact, Bryant informs the police that his travels around the world had stopped because he had been spending too much money, as noted in one of the police interviews:

PAINÉ

- Q: Do you handle your money carefully?
A: Pretty carefully, goes pretty quickly. I like spending money.
Q: Do you?
A: Mmm. I'd rather spend it than keep it.
Q: You've certainly spent it on those overseas trips.
A: Yeah, spent a little bit. Unfortunately I couldn't go on any more otherwise I would've gone away in May. I was informed nicely that I wasn't able to go away for a long time, for about twelve months, which upset me greatly.²⁷

WARREN

- Q: Why's that?
A: 'Cos maybe once or twice a year because I only have to accumulate and, and just couldn't go away on any more trips for a while, but that upset me a lot, yeah.

PAINÉ

- Q: Martin, if you'd excuse me, I'd just like to leave the room for a second.
A: Alright.
Q: If that's okay with you, Mr Warren will be here with you and I'll ... (inaudible)

(inspector Paine leaves the room)

WARREN

- Q: When you say it upset you, what umm
A: Mmm, just threw me back 'cos I didn't have anything to do.

26 A friend of Martin Bryant, Helen Harvey died from a vehicle accident on 20 October 1992. They had been driving in a small vehicle, with three dogs. Without any proof, some cruel people tried to blame the accident on Martin. Ms. Harvey was wealthy (Tattersalls Lottery fortune heiress) and she had willed **all** her wealth to Martin Bryant. Two related things are disturbing: **i**. The exact amount of this fortune given to Martin does not seem to be on the Internet. This editor has seen a sum of \$1 million in addition to the house at 30 Clare Street in Hobart. But the Tattersalls Lottery fortune far exceeded that paltry amount. On wikipedia.org, \$26 million is stated, but it too seems incorrect. This is another part of the case for which **the truth has been hidden**. Investigators who know how to follow money trails will probably find a **big fat criminal rip-off** if they do some work. What a story that will be; & **ii**. What little money Martin received from Ms. Harvey was plundered by the Tasmanian government which actually passed legislation to give its theft a veneer of respectability. But grand larceny is grand larceny, no matter what a politician calls it. This editor has been told Martin's assets were liquidated and the money was then used to pay off families of the victims – pay them to shut up and not raise any troubling concerns. Whether it is true, this editor does not know. He has also been told **no accounting** of all Martin's money has ever been made public. Good investigators should be able to identify those criminals who decided to help themselves. If you know anything, please email the editor.

27 This has been suggested as a contributing factor toward the Port Arthur incident. There is **no proof**, it is pure speculation. We also have **no proof** Martin actually said this. It is on the transcript, but copies of the interview audio tapes were not made available. Never forget, cops lie. The overall attempt was made by officials to present Martin Bryant as someone who had experienced a series of events in his life which he perceived negatively, and which ultimately led him to commit **mass murder**. But the more officials attempted to do this, the more obvious it has become that **Martin was being set up**.

- Q: Mmm. Right. Who, who actually told you that?
A: I wasn't able to go on a trip probably for six months and that was ohh, the people, Perpetual Trustees, a lady that looks after my money.
Q: Right. Did you have a regular contact with her?
A: Yeah, we phone up whenever I, I needed something to talk about. Ohh, here's me court case is it?

Prof Mullen is very correct when he states that Bryant only has the vaguest of notions of his financial situation, but the gunman is very strong on his supposed wealth. There is a **major conflict** between these two statements, which must raise concern, if there are beliefs that the gunman on the telephone was Martin Bryant.

This situation raises **another anomaly** within Mullen's report. Again on page 4, Mullen states: "He described his various attempts at national and international travel as disappointing. He said he usually undertook these trips because "I wanted to meet up with normal people," but apparently "it didn't work."

This raises a question. If the international travel was disappointing for Bryant at the time of his interview with Mullen in May, then why the disappointment shown in the police interview when Bryant found his travelling had been curtailed for a year or so? Again in the uncensored copy of the police interview, this statement by Mullen is refuted.

In the same paragraph, Mullen describes the so-called pleasures Bryant got from his travels. "Mr Bryant stated that the best part of his international trips was the long plane journey. It transpired that the long aeroplane journey was that he could speak to the people seated next to him, who presumably being strapped to their seats had no choice but to at least appear friendly."

However there is this report of the interaction between Martin Bryant and a female passenger, which appeared in The Bulletin:

"Hadn't he taken flights around the world sometimes just to have a captive audience next to him? But then Martin, stupid Martin, would blow it as usual. Like the flight out of Los Angeles back to Australia on 17th July 1995. Beverley Love finds him in the seat next to her. He is wearing avocado-striped trousers, white shirt, leather hat, and a long coat. If that wasn't enough, he keeps ordering cups of tea, growing agitated at the amount of time it takes to be served. They talk about family. He tells her he doesn't have a girlfriend. Tells her he was supposed to be in the States for three weeks, but it's so hot he's going home two weeks early. She starts thinking he's just a poor lonely guy. Then Martin has to say something stupid and stuff things up. The flight attendant is serving ice cream and Bryant leans over and pats Beverley on the stomach. Tells her: 'You shouldn't eat ice creams, you've got a bit too much weight there.' She moves seats."²⁸

²⁸ Quoted by Garry Linnell. The Bulletin; 3 May 1999. (not confirmed by this editor)

So much for people presumably being strapped to their seats. Despite the **biased** reporting, it is noticeable that the behaviour is

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

correct for a 'dull normal individual.' What is intriguing here is that this particular witness after 10 months can still recall the exact clothing Martin Bryant was wearing when she met him. Strange, but ask yourself this: What was the person you met once, ten months ago wearing? However, according to the court evidence, Martin Bryant didn't travel from Los Angeles to Australia, but rather from Los Angeles to Tokyo and then two days later from Tokyo to Melbourne. Mind you in his record of interview, Martin Bryant makes two statements being: **i**) that he has never been to Japan; and, **ii**) that he likes the Japanese as they are courteous and always talked to him.

The next question to arise is: How does this evidence relate to the Port Arthur massacre? In many ways, **it doesn't**. But Prof Mullen is trying to demonstrate a progression by Martin Bryant into a state where he becomes capable of committing the Port Arthur massacre. During his 3½ hour interview with Martin, Prof Mullen wouldn't have been prepared to ask questions in detail, of this type, of Bryant, and it becomes obvious that he is relying on the Police profile on Martin Bryant for this information.

For travelling and meeting people that are described as, "it didn't work," Mullen contradicts himself because he then says, "Mr Bryant became quite animated in describing some of what he regarded as the more successful interactions with fellow travellers on the journeys to and from Europe and the United States of America. This account is confirmed by statements obtained by the police from passengers who found themselves seated next to Mr Bryant." It obviously did work, and Martin Bryant did have some good memories, which caused him to become quite animated, and these memories were corroborated by evidence obtained by the police.

If Mullen wishes to use this as evidence that Bryant was becoming depressed, then **he is incorrect**. Bryant enjoyed his trips, and was not depressed by any intimated failures. On page 5 of his report, Prof Mullen writes about Bryant's sexual life. It is remarkably normal. Mullen ends his paragraph with: "The relationship was a sexual one and he claimed they had intercourse on a regular basis, the last being on the Friday night prior to the offences. Mr Bryant firmly rejected any suggestion that his relationship with Ms Willmott was becoming strained or in danger of ending at the time of the offences."

What this reinforces is that **there were no suicidal tendencies or depression in Martin Bryant's life**, which could have caused him to create the Port Arthur massacre. Please remember, that if Martin Bryant was becoming so depressed, then it would have an effect upon those around him, and his relationships would have been brittle. Try having sex when depressed, it just doesn't stand up. Furthermore, Bryant would not have been concerned if the relationship was titting, as it would have been the norm if Bryant was depressed, as depicted by Mullen.²⁹

Mullen then states on page 5, "Mr Bryant described his pleasure in life as watching the television, music and drinking. The music that he most favoured was the sound track of the Lion King and records

²⁹ The opinions of psychiatrists were used against Martin. But opinions **do not prove with legal certainty** that he was the gunman. The case is a legal one. It needed qualified, experienced, and **ethical** investigators to present **hard evidence** to a jury. But it was not. An opinion is just an opinion, **not proof** – but that is how officials pushed opinions of psychiatrists who were **paid by the State**. Ask yourself where the interest of a psychiatrist would be: **i**. Maintaining a nice fat income?: or, **ii**. Defending an (alleged) *lone-nut* gunman?

made by Cliff Richard. On direct questioning he acknowledged that he spent a considerable amount of time watching videos and going to the pictures. He listed as his favourite film *Babe*, and as his favourite videos the Steven Segal movie *Under Siege*, and a film called the *Protector*, which he claimed to have watched at least a dozen times. These latter two videos are of the violent action variety. Mr Bryant was also in the habit of purchasing both erotic magazines and military type magazines about weapons, military tactics, survivalist activities etc.”

We have already been told via Dr Joblin’s tests that Bryant’s deficiencies were mainly in the areas of comprehension and numeracy. Naturally, such a person would rather watch television or a video than concentrate on working out π to the n th degree. It is however the comments relating to magazines that are worth disseminating. Martin Bryant enjoyed erotic magazines. These magazines are known more for their pictorial content rather than the written word. Such magazines would suit a person with comprehension disabilities.

However military type magazines, which also have photographs to enforce their written content, are a lot more difficult for a person with comprehension disabilities to digest. To suggest that Bryant learnt shooting and military skills simply from these magazines alone is absolutely ludicrous. Bryant would have required help from a person or persons to properly comprehend any of the information presented in any of these magazines. So who were Martin Bryant’s friends? We are not privy to that information, but **they were there.**

There are other questions that should have been considered in relation to these various magazines. How many of them were there? Where were they purchased, and by whom? Over what period of time had this collection of magazines been acquired? What actual evidence was there that Martin Bryant had actually read, or gained information from these magazines? **Without proper information to expand on these references, they are inferences only, and thus have no actual value.**

30 Martin admitted owning a semi-automatic shotgun (Daewoo). But he also said he had never fired it as it frightened him. This is what the author means when he writes the shotgun “was never used by him.” Martin Bryant had no idea about what firearms were discharged at and near Port Arthur as he did not discharge any. Evidence strongly suggests a shotgun was fired inside the Broad Arrow Café, but officials denied this. They had to because although they helped themselves to the Daewoo shotgun belonging to Martin, there were other fingerprints on it. Fingerprints of the real gunman it is reasonable to conclude. In addition, the State did not want to focus solely on shotgun use and ownership. The big focus was on semi-automatic rifles.

Mullen then goes on to state in the next paragraph: “He has acquired a number of guns by private purchase. He apparently had no difficulty obtaining ammunition for these weapons. He has never acquired a gun licence, partly because he was afraid of difficulty answering questions about safe gun usage.”

In the police interviews, Martin Bryant admitted owning a shotgun that was [allegedly found] in the boot of his Volvo sedan, but was never used by him.³⁰ He said that he owned a Colt AR-10 that was left with Terry Hill for repairs, and a Colt AR-15, but there was never any attempt made to positively confirm that that particular Colt AR-15 of which thousands have been produced, was his. There were two firearms used by the gunman at Port Arthur. Martin Bryant, however, denied completely any knowledge of the second firearm the Belgium-made FN. Please also note that there is absolutely no mention of the firearm [allegedly] found hidden in the piano inside the premises at Clare Street, New Town. Bryant said that he owned

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

three firearms only, and he named them. He never mentioned anything about firearms at Clare Street, and the police interviewers, Warren and Paine also never broached this subject. **Why?**

PAINE

Q: How many guns do you own?

A: I own umm, a shotgun and a semi automatic and another semi automatic. Three altogether.

Q: This is a Daewoo 12-gauge shotgun.

A: Ohh sorry, yeah I bought that one off umm, Hill, do you know Terry Hill?

Q: Yeah very. How long ago did you buy it?

A: I never, the funny thing is, I never umm, got round to using it. Even though I bought it, but it scared me the thought of it not working, and probably ricocheting out.

Q: Thank you. You're right, it's certainly a big and ahh, strange looking thing isn't it?

A: She's burnt that one.

Q: Now this is a ahh, point two two three Remington.

A: It's a mess isn't it.

Q: Or a Colt AR-15.

A: Yeah, Colt. Been burnt.

Q: So that scope that's on it now was on it when you purchased it?

A: Yes. But it was a different colour, it was darker.

WARREN

Q: Is that a ahh, special scope?

A: Has it been burnt, must've been burnt, yeah.

Q: Yeah. Alright, the next one we'll look at is a ahh, a three 0 eight ahh, calibre, FN weapon.

A: Mmm.

Q: Do you remember where?

A: I've never seen that one before. Never. That's not one of mine.

Q: You sure?

A: No definitely not, never seen that in my life. It's nice though

Q: Have you ever had a three 0 eight?

A: Three 0 eight, yes. Had a three 0 eight.

Q: Mmm.

A: That was one Terry Hill was repairing.

(NOTE These questions and answers from the police interviews have been extracted from the main document. As such, they are not a complete copy of that portion of the interview, but rather sections relevant to the possession of these firearms.)

In reference to the obtaining of ammunition, it has been recorded by police that Bryant did obtain shotgun cartridges from Terry Hill and produced an appropriate shooter's licence to make the purchase. The legal requirement for the purchasing of ammunition was for the seller to sight a shooter's licence, but there was never any legal requirement to record the data on that licence. Again in one of the two police interviews, Bryant states that he did in fact possess a shooter's licence.

*Martin Bryant answered questions put to him by interrogators openly and without being evasive as he had nothing to hide – it is **the State** that is **hiding things** from the people.*

PAINE

Q: Just getting back to Terry Hill, where, did you think it was strange that he didn't ask you for a gun licence?

A: Yeah, he never got round to asking me for one, I was going to let him know though.

Q: Did you think flashing the cash in front of him?

A: Ohh yeah, I was gonna let him know I had one if he asked.

This of course raises all sorts of problems as to how did Martin Bryant gain possession of a shooter's licence that he could pass off as his, when in fact it was not his? This demonstrates yet another **inaccuracy within Mullen's report on Bryant**. Mullen then says: "He acknowledged a fascination with weapons and demonstrated an extensive knowledge of guns. This interest in guns has been more intense in the last year or so. His access to large amounts of cash enabled him to purchase automatic and semi automatic weapons designed for military use."

That Martin Bryant had a fascination in firearms is not unusual, as many men do. But he has never demonstrated any real knowledge of firearms. In relation to the Belgium FN, Bryant was able to state emphatically that it was not his. However, he never identified this make of rifle which was the backbone of the Australian Military Forces for over 30 years. He was also frightened of the Daewoo shotgun, believing that shotgun cartridges could ricochet out, which are not the comments of a person with an extensive knowledge of firearms.

Mullen also puts in a time frame of "in the last year or so." If we refer back to page 2 of his report where he states, "Mr Bryant, like many intellectually limited people, has problems with the temporal relationships and the sequencing of events. Thus he brings together occurrences which in fact were separated by considerable lengths of time and he will alter the order of events without being aware of the distortion." The difficulty here is how can the time frame be ascertained from Bryant alone, if Bryant has problems with the temporal relationships and the sequencing of events? Where is the corroboration to justify this time frame of, "in the last year or so"?

31 Australia is a nation of alcohol drinkers. So is Austria. So is the Czech Republic. So is England. So is Germany. So is New Zealand. So what? Drinking alcohol on a regular basis has never been identified as a precursor of mass murder, which is what Mullen suggests. This psychiatrist wants people to believe that Martin was drinking because he was depressed – a *lone-nut* seething with the urge to kill. But like many other people, Martin probably had not too much else to do and maybe he just liked the feeling being intoxicated. Mullen's diagnosis or observation or whatever he thinks it was is meaningless. He seems to be a prig and would probably benefit from a few good doubles.

Under the heading **Alcohol and Drug History**, Prof Mullen states: "Mr Bryant drank alcohol occasionally until the last year or so. During the twelve months prior to the offences his alcohol consumption rapidly increased. He reports that in the six months prior to the tragedy he typically drank every day."**31**

Again, we have the time frame. And again there is no corroboration to support this statement. So how serious was this inferred alcoholic consumption. "Mr Bryant reported disturbed sleep in association with his alcohol consumption and an occasional intense sense of dehydration. He did not however, describe early morning shakes, marked amnesia for the previous day's drinking or particularly intrusive hangovers. He did not report any gastrointestinal disturbances of the kind often found in alcohol abusers. He said that he drank to fill in the time and to relieve his loneliness. Mr Bryant was not intoxicated at the time of the killings."

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

On the matter of drugs, Mullen is very clear: "Mr Bryant reports no use of illicit drugs, specifically denying using cannabis, opiates and amphetamines." On pages 67 and 68 of the court document, Mr Bugg refers to two people whose vehicle had stopped just outside Seascope, and whom the gunman spoke with. Mr Bugg fails to mention the cannabis bought by the gunman from these people, but Richard McCreddie, the police commissioner in his EMA report on page 5 of the Seminar Papers does mention the purchase, and in Mike Bingham's book *Suddenly One Sunday* the amount paid for the cannabis is stated at \$50.

*Again and again,
objective
investigators
have exposed the
nonsense
pushed by the State
in the
official narrative.*

KILLING WHILE DRUGGED

IN the literature on the Port Arthur case, there seems to be no details about any drugs (prescription and non-prescription) that Martin Bryant was taking. He said he did not ingest, inhale, or inject illicit drugs – and, **no one has ever disproved this**. That a gunman purchased some marijuana from Gaye Lynd near the Port Arthur Historic Site, on 28 April 1996, only proves the undeniable truth that **Martin Bryant was being set up**. Within all the official documents related to the case, there is no evidence of drugs being prescribed for Martin. Petra Willmott said this in her statement (8 May 1996): "To my knowledge Martin was not taking any medication. I saw a prescription on his table once, the medication started with an E or an I. I couldn't pronounce it. I don't know whether it was Martin's prescription." Officials have not revealed what the prescription was, if there was one belonging to Martin, nor has the medical person who prescribed it been named. In the mass-shooting literature, there are articles detailing how dangerous mind-altering drugs prescribed by psychiatrists and physicians – **the real drug pushers** – are leading to killings: "Despite 22 international drug regulatory warnings on psychiatric drugs citing effects of mania, hostility, violence and even homicidal ideation, and dozens of high profile shootings/killings tied to psychiatric drug use, there has yet to be a federal investigation on the link between psychiatric drugs and acts of senseless violence." (Citizens Commission on Human Rights International; 20 July 2012) What cannot be ignored is that in written statements, eyewitnesses have described the Port Arthur gunman in a way which suggests he was drugged to act in the unrestrained and brutal manner he did on 28 April 1996. There is **no evidence** whatsoever that this applies to innocent Martin Bryant. – ed.

Again there is no corroborating evidence to support the argument one way or the other. Under the heading of **Mental State**, Mullen says: "Mr Bryant's use of language showed the limitations in vocabulary one would expect from someone of low intelligence, but nonetheless there was a reasonable degree of fluency and on most occasions, a clarity in his use of language." The key words here are "someone of low intelligence". This is not a person who is mentally-handicapped, but rather a dull normal individual.

Prof Mullen also says: "There were occasional sudden switches in the direction of Mr Bryant's discourse, but again, I suspect these reflect

*Directly and indirectly,
psychiatrists have killed
a lot of people
– see Internet:
Psychiatry an
Industry of Death
Museum
– Citizens
Commission on
Human Rights
International.*

the changeability of someone of limited intellect who is easily distracted by irrelevant or chance circumstance.” Again, limited intelligence but not handicapped, and who is easily distracted. That is one thing the gunman at the Broad Arrow Café was not, nor was *Jamie* at Seascap cottage easily distracted.

Prof Mullen also says this: “Mr Bryant’s mood was predominantly anxious and on occasion, frankly distressed. The changes in his mood were appropriate on most occasions to the content of the conversation. The occasional apparent emotional incongruity, I suspect, reflected the shallowness of Mr Bryant’s understanding and capacity for sympathy.” Six days in hospital suffering from 3rd degree burns to the back and buttocks, and being **shackled to the hospital bed**, and unable to communicate with friends, it is understandable why Martin Bryant was anxious and distressed.

The apparent emotional incongruity arises possibly due to the fact that Mullen is aware of what occurred at Port Arthur, while Martin Bryant has always maintained that he was not aware of the Port Arthur tragedy. Mullen then states that: “Mr Bryant initially denied that he suffers from any depression or lowered mood. He attempted to portray himself prior to the incident as a cheerful individual whose pleasure in life was only frustrated by the unfriendliness and unsociability of his fellow humans.” What is being said here is that Bryant believed one thing, but the professor knew better. There is again the time frame in this paragraph. “He has become more caught up in these thoughts about past indignities over the last year.”

Mullen ends this paragraph with the following: “This culminated in the months before the tragedy in a sense that there was no future for him, that he would always remain lonely and rejected and that he would be better off dead.” This however runs contrary to the earlier evidence in relation to Bryant’s relationship with his girlfriend, Miss Willmott.

It also clashes with parts of the next paragraph where Mullen says: “He does not however report any decrease in his libido. The picture that emerges was not suggestive of a depressive illness.” It is supposedly depression that drives people to suicide, but Mullen now tells us that **Martin Bryant was not depressed**.

Mullen describes Martin Bryant as: “It was a pattern more reminiscent of an angry and distressed man having increasing difficulties coping with his social isolation and his various disappointments.” Again though, **there is no actual evidence of any pent-up anger** within Martin Bryant. There was certainly none seen by his girlfriend, Miss Willmott, and none shown toward his neighbours the Kuipers, who he was still friendly with, especially the children. So again, **where does Mullen draw the conclusion in relation to anger?**

Mullen then proceeds along this path when he states: “Nevertheless in this context Mr Bryant came to the conclusion that life for him was not worth living. He began to consider suicide for the first time about a year ago. He said, ‘about twelve months ago I decided I’d

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

had enough.' The thoughts of suicide became more prominent in recent months." Again we have the time frame of twelve months. Also, **there is no actual evidence of any suicidal tendencies.**

Mullen informs us of the haunted house. He says: "Mr Bryant has believed for a number of years that the house he occupies is haunted. His main evidence for this haunting is, what he describes as, 'the vibes in the house.' He has also, on occasion, heard various noises, particularly at night, which he has interpreted as the ghosts moving around. These on the face of it appear to be the kind of bumps and bangs to which large empty houses are prone. Mr Bryant believes that the ghosts are the ghosts of two women, one of whom he suspects is Miss Harvey. He does not necessarily believe that these ghosts intend him any harm, but he is nevertheless frightened when alone in the house and these thoughts occur to him. Mr Bryant describes, on rare occasions, hearing what he believes to be the voices of two women which he presumes are the ghosts speaking. These are brief episodes when he hears the voices saying short phrases such as 'come on' or 'here.' This he believes has occurred two or three times in the last six months. It usually occurs when he is in bed or alone in the house at night. It arises in the context of his fear of ghosts."

There has been no other person inside the house who has witnessed these events. But this raises some conjecture when compared with the report³² of Richard McCreadie in which he states: "At 07:30 on 29 April, several SOG members heard the offender shout from the Seascope cottage, 'Come on, come on,' or 'Come in, come in.'" Could there be a connection? There is also a time frame: "This he believes has occurred two or three times in the last six months." Mullen ends this part of his report with: "Bryant's general level of intellectual functioning is low. There was at the time I examined him nothing to suggest that he was disoriented or that his consciousness was in any way disturbed." Again the level of intelligence is low. It is not impaired, but suggests more of the dull normal being.

Mullen then starts a chapter called: **The Offences.** Here, he states: "Mr Bryant in the early parts of the interview referred to the tragic events at Port Arthur as 'the accident.' He claimed to have no memory of these events nor to have any memory for what may have led up to the shootings. The only account he provided was of waylaying the occupants of a BMW and then claiming to have driven this car at high speed." The difficulty that arises from Bryant's claims in relation to the BMW is that they are completely different to facts that are known to be correct.

Bryant had no recollection of Glenn Pears being removed from the BMW to inside Seascope cottage. And according to his police interview, he believes Pears must have still been in the boot when the car was set alight. Mullen then states: "Later in the interview, perhaps as a result of becoming more trustful, he provided an account which at least in part may be relevant to the events. This account provided to me on 4 May has later been confirmed and expanded in Mr Bryant's statements." **This in fact tells us nothing.** What is meant by "in part may be relevant to the events"?

³² Richard McCreadie. *Port Arthur – An Overview of the police response.* Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: pp. 4-18.

There are other problems. All of the documentation that Prof Mullen uses to assist him in the writing of this report was compiled prior to September 1996. On the 30th September 1996, at his committal hearing, Martin Bryant pleaded "Not Guilty" to all charges. None of the authors of these reports were hired or instructed by Bryant's legal representative, David Gunson, to prepare these reports, therefore **they could only have been prepared by the government for the prosecution.** Mullen cites Bryant regarding his negative memories from the time when Miss Harvey died. The report then moves towards firearms, with Mullen reporting: "Mr Bryant said, 'I thought guns would be better, the more power the better.' Mr Bryant at this point began to talk about his various guns, in particular a machine gun which he took to be repaired in March or February. I asked him whether he had intended to use this weapon, but he informed me that this type of gun is 'too unstable.' He happily discussed the virtues of various semi-automatic versus fully automatic guns."

What is obvious here is that the professor is completely ignorant about firearms? The so-called machine gun is in fact the Colt AR-10, which was the American equivalent to our SLR, which is also known by its correct name as the Belgium FAL-FN. It is a semi-automatic firearm. When Bryant is cited as stating the Colt AR-10 is "too unstable" Bryant demonstrates his own ignorance in relation to these firearms.

Just what does Mullen mean by the statement: "He happily discussed the virtues of various semi-automatic versus fully automatic guns"? According to sergeant Gerard Dutton in the Australian Police Journal: "Interestingly enough, the trigger and selector lever mechanisms in both rifles displayed alterations that indicated an attempt had been made at some time in the past to convert to, or function the rifles on, fully automatic operation. However, I doubt that this was Bryant's doing as he would not have the ability."³³

This is interesting because Bryant claimed the Colt AR-15, but refused any knowledge of the Belgium FN. We are aware that he claimed to own three firearms, the Colt AR-10, which he says was too unstable, the Colt AR-15, and the Daewoo shotgun of which he said in one of his police interviews: "I never, the funny thing is, I never umm, got round to using it. Even though I bought it, but it scared me the thought of it not working, and probably ricocheting out."

We now have Martin Bryant being frightened of two of the three firearms that he owned. Bryant also shows a high degree of ignorance in relation to firearms. Mullen then starts the next paragraph with: "He stated that about a year ago he decided he had 'had enough.' There is that [very imprecise] time frame again. Mullen then states: "He said that he thought the plan first occurred to him a few weeks prior to the tragic events. When pressed he thought it might be either 4 or as long as 12 weeks ago that this first occurred. When asked why he selected Port Arthur he responded: "a lot of violence has happened there. It must be the most violent place in Australia; it seemed the right place."

³³ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal, December 1998: p. 219.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

This part of the 3½ hour interview must have occurred as the Prison Officer guarding Martin Bryant at the time, Blair Saville, has recorded this specific part of that interview, and Saville's statement reads:

1504 4/5/96

PM: What was the most powerful weapon you had?
MB: Armourlite AR-10
PM: When it all started at the café what was your thoughts?
MB: I was tense, angry
PM: Why did you choose Port Arthur?
MB: It is a nice place there has been a lot of violence there probably the most violent place in Australia
PM: A few weeks ago you decided to do it
MB: Yeah a few weeks ago.
PM: How careful had you planned it?
MB: Pretty good.

C.O. Saville, Blair (signed)

This statement by the Risdon prison officer Blair Saville must raise an **enormous number of questions**, not only about his participation, but also about Mullen. How could *such a learned person ask a patient* such leading questions, of which **many of the answers are not supported by any other witness, or interview?** Why was only this minute portion of Mullen's interview noted by Saville, and what of the rest of Mullen's interview? There is just one other aspect and that is the supposed confidentiality between a doctor and patient.

The difficult part here is that Mullen interviewed Bryant on the 4th May 1996. The police interview by inspectors Paine and Warren took place on 4 July 1996, and **Bryant was adamant that he knew nothing in relation to the Port Arthur massacre**. Had this statement been made to Mullen at his interview, then the police would have been aware of what was said, and would have put it to Bryant. There is the same problem with the next paragraph where Mullen states: "Mr Bryant spoke of his longstanding resentment against Mr and Mrs Martin. He described them as 'very mean people' and as 'the worst people in my life'." This is not information obtained by Mullen during his interview with Bryant on the 4th May 1996. This comes from the *Jamie* tapes during the siege at Seascope, which runs contrary to what Bryant states in the police interview.

In the next paragraph, Mullen says: "Mr Bryant assumed that when he began shooting at Port Arthur he would himself be shot down. He stated in one interview: "my power, so powerful and the guns and these magazines filled with bullets." However, Brigid Cook was just one of the survivors who noticed the care taken by the gunman to ensure that he was not snuck up on.

"He stated in one interview." This confirms there was more than one interview. We are aware that Mullen only conducted one interview. There was one police interview, but this information was not on the police interview. The reports by Dr Lucas were not concerned about this aspect of Bryant, nor were the psychological tests by Dr Joblin.

*Martin Bryant
was injured,
arrested, charged,
and under guard,
he was
experiencing pain
and in a confused
mental state
exacerbated by
a very low IQ,
yet there was
Mullen conducting
an interview as if
his conclusions
would be
the outcome of
serious science
– what nonsense.*

*Be assured
the psychiatrists
Mullen and Sale
did not ask
Martin Bryant
about the special
**embalming
equipment**
which was ordered
and manufactured
in Victoria
especially for the
incident at
Port Arthur.*

This leaves only Dr Ian Sale, who interviewed Bryant on the 1st and 3rd May 1996 at the Royal Hobart Hospital, as the provider of this information, which forms a major part of Mullen's report. There is one final statement to consider in this paragraph. Mullen states these words: "This plan to kill Mr and Mrs Martin and then proceed to Port Arthur appears initially to have been elaborated following the break-up of Mr Bryant's relationship with Ms Hoani at a time when he was particularly despondent about his situation and his future."

This is an attempt to apportion blame on someone else. What this suggests is that if Ms Hoani had not broken up with Martin Bryant, then perhaps the massacre may not have occurred. Again, if the Martins had not refused to sell Seascope cottage to Maurice Bryant 15 years prior, then perhaps the massacre may not have occurred. Dr Ian Sale in his interview with Judy Tierney had as his parting words apportions blame onto the person who sold Martin Bryant the firearms. For any credence to be placed on these views, there should be some form of corroboration on these words supposedly uttered by Martin Bryant to Dr Ian Sale. **There is none.**

In fact, these comments run contrary to the Police interviews, which were initiated during the same period of time. To close this chapter in his report, Mullen says: "I did not pursue with Mr Bryant any account of the actual killings as these can sadly be all too readily reconstructed from eyewitnesses and police investigations". In fact like all the other interviewers, **Mullen was unable to obtain any account of the actual killings from Martin Bryant, who has been unable to give such an account.**

Mullen then begins the final chapter of his report, being his opinion. In the first paragraph, Mullen says: "Mr Bryant is of limited intellectual ability, his measured IQ lying in the borderline intellectually disabled range." Mullen also says: "He had a clear notion that there are rights and wrongs. In my opinion therefore, this man is fit to plead, though he may require a little more assistance and a little more time in coping with the legal process than would a more intellectually able accused." Mullen is correct in what he states in this paragraph, and there doesn't appear to be any fault in his reasoning. Martin Bryant demonstrated this *clear notion* by deliberately pleading **Not Guilty** at the 30th September hearing, after he had been instructed to plead **Guilty** by his counsel.

But in the second paragraph, there are problems. Mullen states: "He became so unhappy in the last year or so as to begin contemplating suicide." Here we have the [imprecise] time frame again. Mullen though goes further when he says: "This possibility in Mr Bryant's case must be taken particularly seriously given the family history of such disorders. The description that Mr Bryant provides, however, of his state of mind and of his behaviour does not support a depressive illness. His appetite and libido were not disturbed. He was not constantly despondent, but only intermittently unhappy." **Only intermittently unhappy.** Mullen ends his paragraph with this: "In my opinion this was an angry, lonely and despondent man who came to contemplate suicide not one suffering from a depressive illness."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

After spending three years inside Risdon prison, where suicides are occurring more and more frequently, Martin Bryant is still alive. There never was any anger, or suicidal inclination, nor was there any depressive illness. Mullen spends three more paragraphs citing reasons why Bryant should not be considered as suffering from a mental illness. Mullen then endeavours to explain how the massacre was conceived and then carried out. Mullen states the following:

"Mr Joblin, in his interviews with Mr Bryant, uncovered a number of childhood memories of being, in Mr Bryant's eyes, humiliated by staff at Port Arthur. These trivial events in combination with the long-standing resentment of Mr and Mrs Martin may have been enough to give the specific direction to Mr Bryant's explosion of resentment against the world. The specific plan to kill the Martins and to proceed to Port Arthur to engage in a general slaughter appears to have emerged some months prior to its terrible realisation. At the time Mr Bryant was isolated and despairing. The improvement in his life situation and the establishing of the new relationship with Ms Willmott, one would have expected to have deflected him from this dreadful plan. In the event it appears that it is the rigidity in Mr Bryant's character which led to the activity of his plans hatched when despairing but carried out when his actual circumstances had greatly improved. Mr Bryant stated in one of his interviews that "It was set in my mind, it was just set that Sunday.... I wasn't worried about losing my property or never seeing my girlfriend again. It was just in my mind to go down and kill the Martins and kill a lot of people."³⁴

This statement runs **completely opposite** to the police interviews. Had Martin Bryant been prepared to state this to a government psychiatrist, then he would have also been prepared to state it to the police. There is absolutely **no corroborating evidence** to support Mullen's allegations. So in which interview did Martin Bryant make these statements? It was not in the one interview Paul Mullen had with Bryant, nor was it in the police interviews. The remaining possibility is Dr Ian Sale.

There is one major consistency that runs throughout Paul Mullen's report on Martin Bryant, and that is the time frame of about a year prior to the massacre. Bryant's fascination with firearms, his indulgence in alcohol, his depression and suicidal impulses all appear to be focused from that one-year period. Considering this, it is worthwhile reading pages 319 to 321 of the court document. This is what is reported in the court documents regarding this period of time in Martin Bryant's life. (The dialogue is between William Cox the judge and Damian Bugg the prosecutor.)

- WC: Some reference in the record of interview as I recall it of trips overseas, were they reality?
DB: They were reality, your Honour. If I could just take you to that.
WC: When did they occur in this time frame?
DB: They certainly occurred at about this time. What happened was prior to this incident the extent to which he was able

³⁴ This is another allegation about what Martin Bryant said. And again the author MacGregor demolishes it. Never forget these highly significant things about the Port Arthur case: **i.** Martin Bryant had no one defending him. He was completely isolated, manipulated, and without any legal person fighting for him. All three of his assigned lawyers (the State even controlled who would be his lawyer) did nothing of substance to defend him. Martin's assigned lawyer John Avery refused to defend his client and kept insisting that Martin plead guilty; and, **ii.** After Avery's plea of guilty was accepted by the corrupt legal system, any judge, any lawyer, any cop, in fact any person on earth could say whatever he/she wanted to about poor Martin. And what they said could have been said with conviction, sincerity, even in-your-face anger, but not one word of it had to be or ever was proved in a jury trial – not one word of their hate-inspired allegations. The whole matter sank to an appalling level where this defenceless mentally-handicapped *boy-man* was said to have copulated with a pig. (reference withheld) The dogs of depravity were let loose on him. If you missed it, this editor encourages you to read and reflect on the Insert *Demonizing Words About Martin Bryant* by a Damian Palmer in Part 5. The editor is not a scholar or a student of mass psychology. But in relation to Martin Bryant, almost the entire population of the Australian nation seems to have taken leave of its senses in April 1996. Today, the initial shock of that terrible incident has passed. People are beginning to acknowledge their faulty thinking – but there is still a long way to go. One journalist who saw things differently was Ben Hills. He wrote the following for The Sydney Morning Herald (21 May 1996) under the heading *Can Bryant get a fair go?*: "**Bryant will never receive a fair trial** in the normal sense of the phrase, because his case has been **prejudiced** in the minds of many potential jurors by **saturation media coverage**, including The Australian newspaper **publishing a doctored [manipulated] photograph** of him under the banner headline *Face of a Killer.*" (added emphasis)

FIRES USED IN COVER-UP

ONE highly suggestive fact related to the fire at Seascope cottage is that the firetrucks were prevented from putting out the fire. The cops let that cottage burn to the ground.

Why this is highly suggestive is because when Martin Bryant was apprehended outside Seascope (**unarmed, badly burnt, dazed**), that cottage was not a pile of ashes and there were possibly up to **three hostages** inside. Surely in such circumstances the cops would have sent the firefighters in as fast as they could to try and save the hostages inside. If the firefighters had been sent in, it is reasonable to believe that hostages might have been saved, and some of the cottage might have also been saved. But no, police kept the firetrucks away from the cottage.

Police acted as if they knew all the hostages were dead. One cop in particular – Bob Fielding – spoke as if he did not care 35 people had died in the incident and he made a crude joke about Martin Bryant’s penis – *his mutton gun*.³⁵ (see *SUBJECT INDEX*; penis)

There are related unanswered questions. Who gave the order that stopped the firetrucks and the firefighters from doing their work? Why would Bryant burn Seascope knowing he was surrounded and the fire would force him outside to be captured or shot by police? If the firetrucks were at the Fox & Hounds hotel, as some have said, who gave the order for those trucks not to be close to Seascope where the likelihood of them being required there (not at the Fox & Hounds) was high? Police witnesses present said the fire began at 8:00 a.m. that morning (Monday 29 April 1996) as if an incendiary bomb had gone off. But how could Martin Bryant have started this fire if he left the alleged petrol in containers in his yellow Volvo when it was abandoned at the PAHS tollbooth?

Bugg the DPP claims Martin brought the petrol and used it to set fire to the BMW then Seascope. This assertion by the DPP was never proved. **On examination it is ludicrous.** There is no hard evidence Martin Bryant had any petrol or other flammable liquid with him on Sunday 29 April 1996. And on Monday, he did not leave the cottage except when he was apprehended. It is said Martin Bryant (whether it was him or the person who looked like him we don’t know) bought fuel at Taranna on Sunday. But it was pumped into the fueltank of a yellow Volvo, **not into a container.** Officials claimed to have photographs of fuel in a container located inside a yellow Volvo at the tollbooth. But it seems the container was positioned on the right rear seat (driver’s side), which is the seat that Robert Salzmann sat on when he spoke with the gunman inside the yellow Volvo parked at the tollbooth.

Stopping the firefighters from extinguishing the fire at Seascope confirmed the purpose of the official fire there was to destroy evidence and, it seems, to kill Martin Bryant. That the cops were not interested in saving the hostages, tells us the cops knew or suspected David & Sally Martin and Glenn Pears were already dead. Now how did they learn about those three deaths? **(cont.)**

³⁵ “I said ‘the only thing he’s got is his **mutton gun*** and that’s not going to penetrate any ballistic shield, so go and get him!’.” (added emphasis; * Australian slang for penis) in Jenny Fleming, *Forward command at Port Arthur*, Police Journal (SA); March 1997.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

There is no evidence Martin Bryant had any flammable liquid with him at any time during the incident. And that he would burn the BMW which was his only means of escape from Seascapes, and that he would burn that cottage and drive himself into the waiting police cordon is illogical nonsense. Witness statements, and known facts strongly suggest that vehicle and the cottage were deliberately incinerated, by some officials, with the primary intention of destroying evidence which would have been exculpatory for Martin.

REMAINS OF SEASCAPE



COPS in attendance stopped firefighters from extinguishing the fire at Seascapes. Good firefighters would have known ammunition in the cottage did not pose a hazard. Left of centre, the remains of Seascapes can be seen around the arrowed chimney. Note the adjacent two-level undamaged building. Using this undamaged building as a shield, SOG members could have advanced very close to Seascapes. But they did not.³⁶ Why? This building could have also hidden the person(s) directing the staging of the whole siege.

Recall we had Bryant as one of the *Jamies* telling the negotiator that everyone in the cottage was being cared for with food and drink which Bryant prepared for them. But idiot cops want you to believe that he had a change of heart on the Sunday morning – maybe he didn't sleep well – and decided he would burn the cottage down and burn everyone in it to death, including himself.

So he lit a fire on the top floor, which generated a whole lot of white phosphorus-like smoke, then went downstairs and waited while all the hostages burnt to death one by one – no screams were heard – then he laid down on the floor and let the clothes on his back really burn, then staggered outside to trick the police. Afterwards, officials said David and Sally Martin died on Sunday, but that Monday morning when the fire took place, the officials would not have known that. But it seems they did, as the cops at Seascapes never tried to save the hostages. (cont.)

36 It is inconceivable that the highly trained SOG of Tasmania Police could not have stormed Seascapes and taken the gunman – alive or dead. These SOGs had the firepower, the manpower, and with no doubt the will power. But they were stopped. For 18 hours, dozens of these crack cops were kept at bay, allegedly by one retarded gunman. Everything points to the undeniable fact, **the cops did not want the siege to end.** It was a good media spectacle to be promoted internationally as part of the gun-control exercise. **The real truth is, the whole siege was unnecessary.** All that had to be done was for the electricity to be turned off to the cottage then wait. Without electricity, there would have been no lights, no cooking, no flushing toilet (probably flushed by an electric water-pump), and in a few days the gunman would have given up or suicided. More realistically, he would have fallen asleep that Monday and the SOGs could have picked him up like a baby. But it had to be a **big media show** with hundreds of rounds being fired into the trees. Yet with all his scopes and assault rifles, the gunman did **not** hit one cop. Think about that. No additional evidence is required to prove the whole siege at Seascapes was staged for political purposes. The fire was just *le grand finale* for all the international TV cameras that had been jostled into the best filming positions nearby. It was also a great diversionary tactic for those inside the cottage, not including Martin Bryant who was left behind to burn to death. This editor hopes ex-SOGs who were there will reveal how they were misused and what really went on that Monday morning (29 April 1996) at Seascapes cottage. **Thanks:** murder.research@gmail.com

According to the article by Whinnett Ellen, *Fifty-seven calls to a calm, contradictory killer the man on the phone*; The Mercury (26 November 1996), the police negotiator said this: "...Bryant talked as if he was following a movie script, says the policeman who negotiated with him on the day of the massacre, Sergeant Terry McCarthy. 'I later described it as though he was reading from some sort of script,' said Sgt McCarthy, 36. 'There was no emotion in his voice at all, it was very calm, an almost effeminate voice and nothing in it hinted that he was remorseful or angry or anything.' McCarthy...is one of the 10 nationally accredited negotiators in Tasmania and one of the most experienced.... [H]e spent more than 2½ hours negotiating with Bryant...."

REMAINS OF BMW SEDAN



THIS formerly gold-coloured BMW sedan was co-owned by Sidney Kenneth and Mary Rose Nixon. It is alleged that the gunman drove it to the location where it was burnt, a location c.25 metres from Seascape. There is no hard evidence that Martin Bryant was the gunman and none he drove this vehicle to Seascape. Note the open driver's door. An incendiary device could have been shot into the BMW.

37 Some alleged details of the dialogue between the police negotiator and Martin Bryant, who was one of the *Jamies*, is available on the Internet. But the whole picture of what was negotiated is unclear, and what exactly was being negotiated is not declared. What Martin Bryant was to get for a helicopter ride is also not stated. The public has not been told what was being negotiated and what each side was prepared to give. The talk about a helicopter ride is highly suspect as according to one cop, the air was filled with choppers flying back and forth but Martin Bryant strangely **seemed oblivious** to their whooping rotors. And his girlfriend Petra Willmott said that she and Martin had been up in a helicopter and that Martin was not impressed. It seems the whole helicopter matter as part of the negotiation is really part of the whole deceitful set-up. Why were all the audiotapes of all the telephone calls not released to the public? Not transcripts, which cops can fake all too easily, but the audiotapes which audio and sound experts can scientifically analyse and prepare written reports on.

And during all those **telephone calls which stretched out over two and a half hours**, there is no dialogue between Bryant and McCarthy which the cops have released which suggests Bryant incinerated the BMW and later Seascape cottage. No dialogue of McCarthy asking Bryant why the BMW was burnt. No dialogue or statement from Bryant in which he threatens to burn Seascape. No words like arson, burn, fire, petrol, etc. were spoken.³⁷ As this experienced negotiator McCarthy publicly confirmed with his own statement, Martin Bryant was acting out a script – the **patsy** playing some role which someone else was directing. That Martin burnt the BMW is what officials want you to believe but they have never proved it. That some idiot cop says it and the devious DPP says it, does not prove Martin did anything. The same thing goes for beautiful Seascape. It seems officials torched the cottage and the vehicle to destroy the evidence therein. – **ed.**

(based on Shooters Party USA article, undated; added emphasis)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

to travel was severely curtailed by the people controlling his finances because he was just stepping onto planes and travelling with no concern for where the funds were coming from. If I could just take your Honour to that. The travel internationally in recent years shall we say since the death of Miss Harvey, in December '93 he flew from Melbourne to Singapore and returned three days later. In April '94 he flew to Melbourne to Bangkok to London, that is on the 19th April. On the 25th April he flew from London to Sweden. On the 30th April he flew from Sweden to the United Kingdom. On the 3rd May he flew from the U.K. to Los Angeles. On the 7th May he flew from Los Angeles to Melbourne. That's in May. In July '94, he went from Sydney to Frankfurt on the 10th. He then went from Vienna to Frankfurt to Copenhagen on the 17th July. On the 22nd July, he flew from Frankfurt to Sydney. Then three and a half months later he flew from Melbourne to Bangkok to London, he then flew from London on the 11th November out of Heathrow, destination unknown. On the 28th November he returned to the United Kingdom and flew back to Australia on the 30th November. In '95 in early February, he flew from Melbourne to Auckland, he then flew four days later to Los Angeles, six days later from Miami he flew to Frankfurt, six days later he flew from Frankfurt to Miami, five days later he flew from Los Angeles to Auckland and Melbourne. Two and a half months later he flew from Melbourne to Sydney to Bangkok to London. Five days after that he arrived in Germany, based upon a passport stamp. Five days later he was in Poland – one day later he was back in Germany, two days later he flew from London to Bangkok to Sydney Your Honour, in 1995 – in June, that is, only one fortnight later, he flew from Hobart to Melbourne then Melbourne, Bangkok, Frankfurt and then two weeks later he flew Frankfurt to Singapore to Sydney. Then three weeks later he flew Hobart, Sydney, Los Angeles, six days later he flew Los Angeles, Tokyo and two days later, Tokyo to Melbourne. Then a month later he flew Hobart, Melbourne to Kuala Lumpur where he lasted two days and flew from there to Bangkok and then flew back to Sydney. And obviously by '96 there were some constraints being imposed but five months after that last Bangkok trip in late January he flew Melbourne, Sydney, Bangkok, London and stayed in London six days and flew back to Melbourne. That is excluding his interstate travel and there are four pages of details of interstate travel over the period of time – sorry, three pages, your Honour, over the period of time after Miss Harvey's death. [None of the alleged travel was proved.]

And then in February 1996, Martin Bryant advertised in the Hobart Mercury for a gardener, and met Miss Willmott. In all the various parts of Mullen's report where there is the time frame of about a year, there must be vast problems. In the one year prior to the Port Arthur massacre, Martin Bryant travelled overseas on five separate occasions, the last being in January 1996. It is quite obvious that at

All these allegations about what Martin Bryant did, and what Martin Bryant said, but not one word to a jury from Martin himself was ever spoken – because there never was a jury.

this particular stage in his life, the major interest that Martin Bryant focused on was travel. The increasing indulgence in alcohol, the depression, the suicidal tendencies, the love and knowledge of firearms **must be disputed** due to this continuing travel. In 1993, after he came under the guardianship of Perpetual Trustees, Martin Bryant made one overseas trip. In 1994 he made three overseas trips. In 1995 he made five overseas trips, and in 1996 he made his last overseas trip in January.

There is one last glaring omission by Prof Mullen. On the 13th March 1996, just 46 days prior to Port Arthur, there was the massacre at Dunblane [in Scotland]. There is no mention of this occurrence in Mullen's report, and there should have been, for if anything could have triggered the Port Arthur massacre, it might have been the Dunblane massacre. [see Part 8 Insert, *DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE*]

Mullen's report had two main functions. In his function to demonstrate to the supreme court that Martin Bryant was not the intellectually handicapped person, nor was he suffering any schizophrenic illness, as has been reported in the news and other media, Mullen must be considered successful. This however, must be considered part of the prosecution duties. It was in the function of demonstrating that Martin Bryant was not only competent of committing, but did in fact commit the crimes known as the Port Arthur massacre, that **Mullen fails**. His report **contradicts itself in areas, and lacks corroboration both in and outside his report**.

In the year 2000, Paul Mullen together with another psychiatrist, Christopher Cantor of the Australian Institute for Suicide Research & Prevention, and Philip Alpers a gun-policy researcher in New Zealand, wrote a paper³⁸ on mass homicide in the context of possible media influences. They highlight seven *Lone-Nut Gunman* type incidents:

1. KNIGHT, Julian	Melbourne, Australia	1987
2. RYAN, Michael	Hungerford, England	1987
3. VITKOVIC, Frank	Melbourne, Australia	1987
4. GRAY, David	Aramoana, New Zealand	1990
5. FRANKUM, Wade	Strathfield, Australia	1991
6. HAMILTON, Thomas	Dunblane, Scotland	1996
7. BRYANT, Martin	Port Arthur, Australia	1996

The preamble of this article states: "Seven cases of mass homicide in Australia, New Zealand, and Britain between 1987 and 1996 are presented. These cases add to the world literature on these rare crimes and balance previous, mostly North American reports. These acts were committed by socially unsuccessful, self-absorbed, and resentful individuals. Lengthy fantasy comprising identification, modeling, and rehearsal preceding the incidents, even where the final acts had impulsive elements. Most had a long-standing fascination with firearms fueling their fantasies and providing the means for mass killing. Their targets were mostly unprotected strangers. Overt suicidal intent or a preparedness to die while committing the homicides was invariable. Ethological theories of status acquisition may provide a useful understanding of mass homicide."

³⁸ Christopher Cantor, Paul Mullen, Philip Alpers. *Mass homicide: The civil massacre*. Journal of American Academy of Psychiatry & the Law (vol 28); 2000: pp. 55-63.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

These seven cases mentioned are virtually all the known cases in the West outside of America and Canada, but what is interesting is that the persons who committed these crimes had **all been under psychiatric care at some time prior to the massacres.**

LETTER (CORRUPT DPP) TO WENDY SCURR

ON 15 October 1996, a letter was sent from the DPP to Ms Scurr. In it, Damian Bugg and Nick Perks declare the following: "We have examined files of witnesses statements (almost 800 *sic*) and concluded that your evidence, contained in your statement taken by Police, whilst helpful in the investigation and the consideration of issues in this matter will not be necessary in the trial of Martin Bryant." So why was Wendy Scurr not wanted? Well it is simple. She was not going to say what the DPP needed to nail poor Martin Bryant. There are many credible eyewitnesses in the Port Arthur case who have said he was not the gunman. Wendy Scurr is one of them. That there was going to be a trial was a sham. If there was so much hard evidence against Martin Bryant, a jury trial would have confirmed his guilt. But there is no hard evidence, so Martin was coerced until he accepted Avery's plea of guilty. – **ed.**

The fact that Mullen had interviewed the only survivors of these massacres, being Julian Knight and Martin Bryant, must be viewed as coincidental, but other factors are not. The fact that neither Julian Knight nor Martin Bryant are or were suicidal destroys a large part of this particular article. However there are other useful pieces of information such as that just as Maurice Bryant supposedly committed suicide in 1993, by jumping into a farm dam [reservoir] with a [weighted] dive belt wrapped around his neck. Wade Frankum's mother committed suicide in 1990. Again this article states that Frankum used handcuffs, which when we consider the two sets of handcuffs allegedly used at Seascapes must make the Australian *lone-nut* gunman massacres unique due to the fact that these massacres are the only ones where handcuffs are mentioned.

So in case 7, which relates to Martin Bryant, there are a number of inconsistencies, which should be considered. The first inconsistency being: "The killings began with the murder of an elderly couple against whom Bryant's family held a long-standing grudge and whom he believed had contributed to the suicide of his father." **This is not correct.** Firstly, both Martin Bryant and his mother totally deny any such grudge, as does Glenn Martin [son of David and Sally Martin]. Furthermore, there was never any suggestion that linked Maurice Bryant's suicide with the Martins, and Prof Mullen's report places that suicide as being due to a mental illness being depression.

Then we have: "This incident occurred only six weeks after Dunblane. There have also been suggestions that M.B. may have been influenced by the two Melbourne incidents (Cases 1 & 3)." The absence of any reference to the Dunblane massacre³⁹ has already been noted in Mullen's report. This report never mentioned any aspect of the other two cases, being Julian Knight and Frank Vitkovic.

³⁹ See the following Insert *DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE.*

*It seems
Mullen & Sale
declared
everything negative
they could think of
in their efforts
to condemn
Martin Bryant.*

"A number of psychological assessments over the years failed to reach agreement as to diagnosis." Dr Cunningham-Dax stated this in his 1984 report on Martin Bryant, when he was 17 years old, he may be developing a schizophrenic illness. Bryant's childhood psychiatrist, Dr Rushton, stated that Martin Bryant was **schizophrenic**. Drs Mather and McCartney stated in December 1991 that Martin Bryant was **schizophrenic**.

Then in November 1993, Drs Craven and Mather again declared that Martin Bryant was **schizophrenic**, which was stated to the Hobart supreme court. Please remember that Dr Mather had already diagnosed Martin Bryant as **schizophrenic** in December 1991. He cannot appear before the supreme court with any other diagnosis. The only ones to say Bryant was not schizophrenic were Dr Ian Sale, and Professor Mullen, and only after the Port Arthur massacre – **both these doctors were representing the government**.

"In the twelve months prior to the mass killing incident, his alcohol consumption rapidly increased to drinking daily, commencing in the morning, and drinking more heavily as the day wore on." This argument has already been attended to in this chapter. It is noticeable with Petra Willmott that she never had any real problems with Martin and his alcoholic intake.

"Weeks before the event, he elaborated the fantasy of committing a massacre and then being killed by police. This fantasy would have emerged at the time of the Dunblane massacre, and although M.B. denied being influenced by Hamilton, he had detailed information about prior massacres, and was later aware that he held the record for the largest number of victims." What do the phrases, "although M.B. denied being influenced by Hamilton, he had detailed information about prior massacres" and "was later aware that he held the record for the largest number of victims" mean? Does this purport that knowledge of some prior act is sufficient to make M.B. guilty of the Port Arthur massacre?

Again, it must be noted that Mullen interviewed Martin Bryant on the 4th May 1996, and there must be doubts about whether or not Bryant was aware at that time of just what he had supposedly committed. In Mullen's report to the supreme court, there is no mention of Dunblane, nor was there mention of Thomas Hamilton, or the prior massacres. Of the fantasy, there was never any corroborating evidence to support this notion, in fact **the opposite comes across** in the police interview on the 4th July 1996.

There are telling inconsistencies between the report handed to the Hobart supreme court, and the article written by Cantor, Mullen, and Alpers. This would suggest these papers deal with more of a political ideology rather than **the search for truth**. There must be grave doubts about what Prof Mullen or the other authors of this article, inform us of in relation to all the various *Lone-Nut Gunman* style massacres in Australia. ■

(amended; added emphasis)

PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE UPDATE

Terry Schulze⁴⁰

itwillpass.com; 3 October 2012

Any person accused of a crime has the right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty, pursuant to the law and in an open trial in which all the guarantees necessary for the defence have been protected.⁴¹

INTEREST in the *JFK and Port Arthur* article prompted me to do a bit of a follow-up to explain the most probable scenario (based on current information⁴²) for some of the unusual facts arising out of the Port Arthur Massacre (PAM). For example, why was a hot load⁴³ used in Bryant's AR-15 or why was the BMW torched.⁴⁴ I might not have it right, but I'm sure I am closer to the truth and am more informed than the people that have never looked at the available evidence.

I spent two days reading the witness statements that were available, also looked at some of the forensic evidence and listened to the tapes. The photo ID board has not been made available – and it is apparent why. At least one witness identified Bryant though the jumper he was wearing in the picture. Of course, the shooter wasn't wearing a jumper – it appears that the picture was from the same lot of pictures that was seen **in all the newspapers and on TV**. Obviously a tainted ID, so why do it? Well...although the shooter had eaten lunch and drank from a Solo can prior to the shooting, there were never any fingerprints or DNA links to Bryant. The information about the shooter taking his tray back into the café was taken in a statement on the day of the shooting, so it was likely that some physical evidence might have been available.

After no physical evidence linked Bryant, the prosecution decided to go with the photo ID – in June! That's right, the massacre was in April, but the photo ID was done in June after Bryant's picture was plastered all over the place. However, some of the statements flatly deny that Bryant was the shooter! One fellow, a Viet Nam vet that got shot said that **the person that shot him was not the same person that was in the media**. And then, of course, there is Jim Laycock's statement.

The firearm evidence is very interesting. It has been thought that the firearm in the café was actually a shortened military version called the M4. It has a shorter barrel and a telescopic stock. The Mossad, the US Special Forces and our SAS use it. It would make more sense to use such a firearm in the closed space of the café.

⁴⁰ Terry Schulze, retired barrister.

⁴¹ Incorporated into **Article 11** of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Martin Bryant never had a defence lawyer – John Avery was paid by the State, worked for the State, and **badgered** and **browbeat** his own client until Martin broke and conceded to Avery's plea of guilty.

⁴² This paper by Terry Schulze was released several years before he sent a copy to this editor. Since it was first released additional case-related information has been detected by investigators. Thus, this paper might not be up-to-date with respect to every fact presented therein.

⁴³ See Note 2 at Part 6.

⁴⁴ See Insert *WHO TORCHED THE BMW & SEASCAPE – AND WHY?* in Part 5.

(Bryant was left-handed, the shooter shot with his right hand.⁴⁵) Of course, the spent brass⁴⁶ that fell on the floor would have to match Bryant's firearm. No problem – after the shooter got back to Seascope he would swap the bolt from the M4 into Bryant's AR-15. The bolt face, firing pin mark and the extractor mark would link to the brass in the café.

However, there is the other problem of "fire-forming" the brass. Each chamber has its own dimensions and a fired brass in one rifle may not fit into another chamber – that's why the *hot load* was used – to give plausible deniability to any variation in the chamber dimensions.

Let's talk money; investigative teams were sent out all over the world to track down anyone who was present during the massacre. Allegedly it was to take statements – but it appears it was actually to find out who saw what and whether any damage control was needed. Although a huge sum of money was spent sending agents all over the world, the firearm forensic specialist stated that because of budgetary considerations there was no test of the powder residue in the AR-15. What codswallop!

They couldn't find the money for the test of one of the most significant issues surrounding the firearms? That simple test could have determined if the powder was the same type from the standard ammunition.

In other words, was it a made up hot load, or was it a defective round using the same components as the factory ammunition? We'll never know as the test allegedly wasn't done. Also, no projectiles were recovered from the "AR-15"; it appears that the Norinco ammunition was chosen because of its very thin walls which ensured that the projectile disintegrated upon impact.

The amount of intelligence resources that were utilized at Port Arthur was considerable. It appears they even brought in a relay station so that there would be no communication hic-ups. Also, there were extra helicopter pilots that were available that weekend. Further, the Royal Hobart Hospital had a seminar on trauma from terrorist activities that ended on that Sunday. It appears that the doctors were brought in from around the country so the whole thing wouldn't be just a local tragedy, but would incorporate doctors from all states. The doctors actually thought that the call from Port Arthur was just another exercise from the seminar.

And then there was the provision of the largest mortuary vehicle in Australia (for little Tasmania?) which proved invaluable for carting around the bodies. Also the media gave extensive coverage of the massacre, but then that should be expected as someone had thoughtfully booked 700 journalists into Hobart for a media conference that was to start the following day. Those pre-arranged buses sure proved their worth in transporting all the media personnel around on the media tour of the Port Arthur site (Iraq wasn't the first use of "embedded journalists").

⁴⁵ Martin Bryant is right-handed. However, he fired his firearms from his left shoulder.

⁴⁶ A firearm cartridge is a small closed tube containing a primer then a chemical substance (*cordite, gunpowder, powder, etc.*). A bullet/projectile is inserted and fixed into the open end of the cartridge, and it is this bullet/projectile which is discharged after the primer is struck by the firing pin in the firearm, which in turn ignites the chemical substance. It is the ignition of this extremely quick-burning substance which generates a sudden large volume of gas which propels the bullet/projectile from the firearm with great speed. Cartridges are usually made of brass, "spent brass" being cartridges that have been discharged/fired/used.* Most shotgun shells have a larger diameter and are made of plastic** with a small brass band around the shell to protect the primer. (* Cartridges are also manufactured from plastic – see *polymer-cased ammo* on Internet. ** Replaced cardboard which was used earlier.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Speaking of media, there was only one media crew that was on station that day (Sunday) it was a skeleton crew from the ABC. When they saw the Police vehicles race by they knew something was up so they hustled over to the Media Centre – they were never called, they did it on their own volition. When they arrived they were surprised to find Roland Browne from the Coalition for Gun Control already there. He remained in the Centre and pushed the gun control agenda. Of course, the Police couldn't be seen to push that agenda, after all they were handling a hostage crisis – so the Coalition for Gun Control was the *arms-length* organisation to handle the gun control agenda. They stayed with the media the entire time (and long after).

Bryant was not a violent person, no history of fighting or assaults. He states in his record of interview that he only shot some targets and tin cans and he never shot animals. Take that personal history and juxtapose it against what the shooter did at PA. After the shooter planted Bryant's Volvo at the tollgate, he shot the people from the BMW, then did not put down the SLR (self-loading rifle), but dragged their bodies with his left hand while holding the rifle up and at the ready in his right hand. Physical acts which indicate that it was someone experienced in violence and also comfortable handling deceased persons – all out of character for Bryant.

He was also very familiar with killing using a firearm; most of the kills in the Broad Arrow were single head/neck shots – he was very economical/professional in his shooting, recognizing instantly a kill-shot when it happened and then quickly shifting to a new target. The shooter also stopped at 29 rounds in the 30-round magazine to reload (probably using the military technique of the third to last round being a tracer/marker round). This allowed him to continue firing without re-chambering. What he did with Annette Mikac by demanding she get down on her knees illustrates some experience with capturing and/or assassinating people.

The handling of the *Poster Boy* of Port Arthur, Walter Mikac, shows the depth of horror and manipulation that went on. The shooter specifically stopped to whack Mrs. Mikac and the little girls. He got out of the Volvo, told Mrs. Mikac 3 times to get down on her knees (she did and begged for the lives of her little girls), the shooter even followed one little girl around a tree. Now here is where it gets real ugly. The bodies are lying in situ closed off from the public with Police barrier tape. An unknown "doctor" gets permission from some official to take Walter to see his ripped-up family in order to help him in the *healing process*. He is permitted to spend 15 minutes at the crime scene looking at his freshly head-shot wife and two daughters (have you ever heard of such a thing?). After this *healing process* he is escorted away into the hands of the Coalition for Gun Control and spends the next year travelling around lobbying for gun control. EMA documents call the Mikac tragedy a *win-win situation* – go ahead, look it up.

The scripting of this psy-op⁴⁷ is evidenced in several aspects. I mentioned the three firearms in the JFK article and how those

⁴⁷ In this book, also referred to as **psycho-political operations**. see *DEFINITIONS*

48 Carjacking the BMW at the Port Arthur Historic Site tollgate makes absolutely no sense apart from leaving a trail of set-up evidence to incriminate the patsy Martin Bryant – Schulze uses the appropriate metaphor – *bread crumbs*. During the police interrogation (4 July 1996), Martin Bryant said he drove a BMW from Fortescue Bay north of Seascapes cottage to Seascapes cottage. He always said he was **not** at the historic site. (The descriptions of the gunman at the tollgate provided by the Cheoks and Debra Rabe support this.) Without any doubt Martin drove to the peninsula in his yellow Volvo. But if he carjacked the BMW at Fortescue Bay and drove it to Seascapes, then what happened to his yellow Volvo? It would then have conveniently been available for any blond-haired impersonator of Martin Bryant to drive around in. Then there is the matter of a surfboard attached to the yellow Volvo – **surfboard singular with no board cover on it**. If we accept this, what then are we to make of the related statements given by **four** witnesses: “On the roof of the car was a surfboard in a **creamy/yellow canvas style board cover**” (Copping); “I saw a yellow Volvo sedan with the **surfboards** on top” (J. Dutton); “I stopped a vehicle, a yellow Volvo sedan with **surfboards** on top of it” (I. Kingston); and, “I noticed the Volvo had a surfboard strapped to the roof with a **silver cover on it**” (McElwee). Ian Kingston’s statement is extremely interesting because the yellow Volvo he stopped was driving around inside the historic site. Who was driving it? Was it the gunman? Was it one of two gunmen each driving a yellow Volvo? Note that the entrance to the Port Arthur Historic Site via the tollgate was not the only driveable road into and out of that site. And if you thought it could not get any more bizarre, note there is **no** official evidence offered to prove the BMW allegedly carjacked by Martin was the same BMW carjacked at the tollgate, was the same BMW torched at Seascapes. There were singular and plural surfboards, covers and no covers for the surfboards, singular and plural yellow Volvos plus **five** different registration plate IDs for them. The possibility of there being more than one BMW **cannot** be dismissed – without hard evidence.

firearms corresponded to the desired banned firearms. It seems that the 3 firearms were woven into the script, and the script called for the use of the heavier .308 in the shooting of the vehicles. The .223 Norinco ammunition would have been unlikely to penetrate significantly into the vehicles, whereas the .308 with the heavier jacket was able to cut through the car bodies quite well. Once the script was written and the plans set in motion, then the fact that Bryant’s .308 wasn’t available had to be quickly overcome, thus the substitution of the SLR. The shotgun was left in the boot at the tollgate.

DAEWOO SHOTGUN DENIED

THOUGH officials denied it, medical facts in the form of shotgun pellets found in victims confirm that a shotgun was discharged inside the Broad Arrow Café. Official documents describe that a Daewoo shotgun was found in the luggage compartment of a yellow Volvo. And if that shotgun had belonged to and had been used by Martin Bryant, his fingerprints would have been all over it and the shells in the magazine. But, believe this because it is true, the cops did **not** lift the fingerprints from that shotgun. And the reason they did **not** lift those prints and include them with the alleged evidence is, those fingerprints were **not** Martin Bryant’s. Because, Martin Bryant was **not** the gunman. – **ed**.

The planting of the evidence trail to Bryant/Seascapes also stands out. First, the bag left in the café with Bryant’s camera and some ammunition – and the knife with Mr. Martin’s blood on it (carefully wrapped in cloth to prevent loss of evidence). Then there is the leaving of the Volvo at the Tollgate with Bryant’s passport in the boot. Now come on! this car is this intellectually disabled (IQ 66) fool’s pride and joy – a vehicle with a surfboard permanently attached to the roof - and he simply walks away from it?⁴⁸

Then after whacking the occupants of the BMW and dragging them out of the way, the shooter heads off to Seascapes. But according to the script he has to make sure that the police and everybody knows he has a hostage. So as he nears the general store he runs the BMW across the road and in front of a car about to leave. He gets out and demands the girl get in his car, she goes hysterical so the guy volunteers. He puts the hostage in the boot as the witnesses in the shop look on, then casually walks back to the hysterical woman and shoots her 3 times through the door. **Another bread-crumble to follow to Seascapes.**

Now he arrives at the turn-off for Seascapes, and he wants to make sure everybody knows where to turn, so he drives in and parks the BMW. Then he takes a position at the entrance, standing where everybody can see him and the rifle as they approach, and proceeds to blast away. After sufficient vehicles are disabled and people are wounded that the trail can’t possibly be lost, he then proceeds to Seascapes, takes the hostage inside and then a bit later a nice smoky fire with the BMW. The only thing missing was a neon sign saying: “my name is Martin Bryant, follow me.”

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Although a trail was laid from the Broad Arrow to Seascope, it couldn't be too good. The burning of the BMW was more than just setting a signal fire. The Volvo was left at the toll gate and it would have heaps of DNA and prints from Bryant – and one would expect prints and DNA from the shooter. However, the BMW at Seascope would have **NO prints or DNA of Bryant**, but would have the identical unknown prints and DNA of the shooter taken from the Volvo (and possibly the café). So it had to be torched, along with Seascope, to prevent the link of the massacre to an unknown assailant.

Also, the location the BMW was taken to be torched is well away from Seascope and perfectly positioned with the boatshed between it and Seascope. All the better to prevent the heat from the smouldering car body from interfering with the night vision equipment in Seascope. (Night vision equipment?) Yes, just listen to the tape where Bryant warns off the police who are advancing during the night that they are “about to shoot their main man.”

There is a lot, lot more to this story, but you get the picture. Just listen to the available tapes and Bryant's voice tones and his naive comments and you realize this fool is a patsy. Once an intelligent person takes the time to actually look at the facts around this massacre, the façade falls away. Heck, at some point the actual evidence and the number of unusual coincidences must reach a cognitive critical mass with even the dumbest in society.

It was the job of the media to mislead the dumb-down masses, make sure that they never become aware of the actual evidence or all the unusual coincidences; to keep the masses hyped up with emotion so they wouldn't reason. The media have done their job well, the sheeple [people who act like sheep] continue to graze. The sheeple are even dissuaded from asking questions – you wouldn't want to soil the memories of the victims would you? You don't want to get a reputation as a “conspiracy theorist” would you? It looks like the *Powers That Be* have gotten away with it.⁴⁹

After discussing this case with various persons, it is amazing how dumbed-down the population is. Denial is not some river in Egypt, it flows though Australian society. **Orwell had it right when he referred to the twisting of people's minds to accept War is Peace and Slavery is Freedom** - I can now confirm that Insanity is Sanity. Try discussing the facts of the Port Arthur Massacre with most Australians and they immediately look at you as if you lost your marbles. However, if being crazy is defined as not being able to deal with reality - then who's the one not dealing with reality? ■

(amended; added emphasis)

⁴⁹ Not so fast Kemosabe. The truth does **not** disappear. More and more people are waking up to the reality that **the deaths, pain, and misery inflicted on them has not been caused by some 66-IQ boy-man**. More and more people are starting to think – the first step to them beginning to question. This book is a compilation of many facts and much evidence all of which *points the bone* at the psychopaths, the criminals, and the crawling sychophants who **premeditated, planned, and perpetrated** that official **mass murder** at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, in April 1996.

EMAILS RECEIVED BY EDITOR
7 March 2013
murder.research@gmail.com
martinbryantisinnocent@gmail.com

■ "I live in [Queensland]. I am a friend of XXXXXXXXXXXX and I have followed the PAM [Port Arthur Massacre] since it happened. XXXX has some remarkable things to say. Plus I was informed unofficially that **ASIO were at Port Arthur** before the Massacre started. I am convinced that it was a **false flag event.**" (added emphasis)

■ "Great listening on fairdinkum aussie [interview; fairdinkumradio.com] the other night, I really am interested in acquiring your book when it is available, if you could forward me the particulars that would be great. Congratulations to you and all of the researchers for stepping up for the truth. It is time to start making the felons in this issue as well as their complicit counterparts accountable for their crimes, as well as any others out there that have committed similar atrocities, again congratulations."

■ "I just want to say I agree with you on Bryant's innocence. I have no information on the Port Arthur shooting, but I have lived in Tasmania and have **seen first hand police corruption in a certain area of the state.** They were trying to pin a drug bust on an innocent couple. I believe they were responsible for setting Bryant up. Thank you for writing a book on this. I'm surprised that your address is Austria, I suppose that makes it harder for the Tasmanian police to pin something on you as they will surely try. When the authority of a state is corrupt, it is very hard to reveal it. Thank you for trying, I believe **the truth will come out in the end.**" (added emphasis)

■ "I understand you are compiling a book about the Port Arthur shooting. I wish to advise that I served about ten years in the ADF Reserves in an Infantry Battalion in the 19XXs. I represented the Battalion on the Battalion six man shooting team at the AASAM (Australian Army Skill at Arms meeting) on three occasions, and was the best shot in rifle, machine gun and pistol in my last year with the shooting team as well as being the Battalion top shot in my last year in the ADF. I also represented the winning Army team in the tri-service shoot on two occasions as I recall. I also held the cross rifles award when I left the ADF. As a person with shooting skills **I find it impossible to believe that Martin Bryant with an IQ of about 60 and mental problems did the crime at Port Arthur on that fateful day.** Some person highly skilled was responsible from what I have read about the shooting. **I suggest that Martin Bryant did not do the crime but rather a special forces shooter** by the way the shooting was done based upon what I have read. A number of the families of those killed that day asked for an investigation/inquiry and this was rejected by the Federal and State Government. I have also read that the Federal Government has put a 30-year embargo on the matter. **No trial of Martin Bryant ever was held.** If he was insane then why was he not stopped from having access to firearms? A firearm used in the shooting was found to have originated from Victoria as I recall and this was not investigated as I recall. I believe the event was **covertly planned and carried out.**" (added emphasis)

THE TELLING TOLLBOOTH
Commodore, Corpses, Corruption
Port Arthur Incident
Keith Allan Noble

*Thinking is toll-free.*⁵⁰

JUST off the Arthur Highway on the Tasman Peninsula was the tollbooth at the entrance to the Port Arthur Historic Site. People wanting to visit the site stopped at that tollbooth, paid the entrance fee, then drove through the tall trees down Jetty Road to the parking area near the seashore at Mason Cove close to the Broad Arrow Café. And after their visit, they would return back along that road passed the tollbooth then out onto the highway heading happily home. But not on 28 April 1996.

With so much uncertainty being part of the Port Arthur incident, it might have been understandable that officials and the media did not concentrate too much on what happened at the tollbooth. What with the mass murder at and around the café, and the televised siege at Seascope cottage, and with the shooting of the children and the taking of a hostage in between, what happened at the tollbooth was just another one of the **seven crime scenes** about which the public could do without too much detail. So much tragedy. So much pain.

For those who have not read it, return to the beginning of the book and note the *OFFICIAL NARRATIVE* entry – the words of the Tasmania Police commissioner, then Richard McCreadie. You will not find one word about the tollbooth. **Not one word** about what went on there. Or about the shootings. No mention of the BMW. Nought. Of course like everything else in the Port Arthur case, this can be glossed over and ignored. Or, it can be investigated with very disturbing findings guaranteed – which is probably the reason why this McCreadie glossed over the tollbooth and what really happened there. There are only two reasons officials ignore things: **stupidity** or **complicity**.

Amidst all the uncertainty of the Port Arthur case, a few things are known without conflicting versions muddying up the waters. Let's look at some of these certainties.

After the shooting ended at and near the café, the gunman, with his firearms, as well as one of his sportsbags in the boot (the other he left in the café) drove up Jetty Road in a yellow Volvo. This is certain. It was witnessed and videoed. People said it was Martin Bryant, but this was never proved in a jury trial. People claimed it was his yellow Volvo, but this too was never proved. Assertions, no matter how often or sincerely expressed, do not become truths.

⁵⁰ Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749-1832).

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Then there was shooting on Jetty Road – one of the seven crime scenes. There, three Mikacs died. There are many uncertainties surrounding the aftermath, but there is no uncertainty about them dying there. Eyewitnesses have stated in writing that **the gunman was not Martin Bryant**, so he must not be blamed for those deaths. It was never proved. And now, before we go any further, we must back up a bit to the time before that shooting. How long before is not certain, because the officials do not want you to know.

PAHS TOLLBOOTH



board with admission charges on left

What follows are the words of the eyewitness Debra Jane Buckley who declares this in her *Witness Statement* (see Part 7):

“Earlier today at about 1:45 p.m. my husband and I travelled to Port Arthur from Hobart. We were travelling in an Avis rent-a-car which was a **red [C]ommodore** sedan. On arrival at the Port Arthur complex we stopped at the toll gate and paid our admittance. We then drove down Jetty Road toward the carpark. As we travelled down the road, and trying to establish which way we should be heading I saw approximately thirty people running and jogging across the road in front of us, from left to right. They were moving toward the grassed area which is between Jetty Road and Church Street. My immediate impression was that a bus load of people had just arrived. I heard someone yell out, something to the effect of ‘Don’t go down there, there’s someone with a gun.’ I believe that the person yelling this was a man. My husband then reversed our car and turned to travel back toward the toll gate. **I noticed a gold-coloured BMW** which was directly ahead of us also reversing and turning to head back in the same direction. We followed the BMW back to the toll gate and **stopped behind it.**”⁵¹ (added emphasis)

So now we have the gold-coloured BMW which McCreadie and his fellow officials did not want you to know about. You will not find one word about Mrs. Buckley in the official literature, including the documents used to falsely incarcerate Martin Bryant. Recall the reasons why officials ignore things: **stupidity** or **complicity**.

⁵¹ Debra Jane Buckley. *Witness Statement*, 28 April 1996. (and hereafter)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Let's spend a few moments on what this eyewitness Mrs. Buckley, who most interestingly is said to have been from New Zealand, has told us. Readers of her statement are led to believe it was the first time Mrs. Buckley and her husband Thomas Mark had visited the Port Arthur site. Just tourists from New Zealand travelling around beautiful Tasmania, in a **red Commodore** sedan rented from Avis. Not a smaller more economical vehicle to rent and run, but a big 5-6 passenger Commodore for just the two of them – or where there other passengers? Or maybe someone or some things in the boot? Nothing is certain.

Then that red Commodore is motoring down to the café and Mrs. Buckley says they saw people moving toward a "grassed area which is between Jetty Road and Church Street." She says that matter-of-factly, as if she knew all the streets at PAHS, which suggests she had been there before. It gets interesting. But nothing is certain.

Now put yourself in Mrs. Buckley's situation. After seeing all those people moving to some grassed area, would you think the following: "My immediate impression was that a bus load of people had just arrived."

Would you have had that impression? And immediately? It seems that Mrs. Buckley had a bus load of people on her mind. Maybe two bus loads. If you missed it, in Part 4 there is a relevant Insert called *TWO BUS LOADS*. Might Mrs. Buckley and her husband Thomas Mark have had a connection to or an interest in a bus load or two of people at Port Arthur? The timing of their arrival at the historic site, and Mrs. Buckley's words, do suggest this. But nothing is certain.

And isn't it interesting that when all those people were on the move, a man yelled out to them. Who was he? How did he get to where he was so quickly? How did he know there was "someone with a gun"? He did not say shooting, as if he had heard shots. And was he the person who later covered the faces of the dead as was reported by the eyewitness Paul Cooper? Who was this man? Who was he working for? It gets even more interesting. But nothing is certain.

We have the gold-coloured BMW enter the statement of Mrs. Buckley. It seems as if it was in front of the red Commodore. Now were the Buckleys following those people in that gold-coloured BMW with a mutual purpose in mind? Or was it just a coincidence? Well the facts suggest there is a relationship, more specifically between the passengers in these two vehicles. Facts suggest it was not a coincidence.

All those people in the two vehicles arrived at PAHS together – just as bus loads of site visitors, primarily Americans, were to have boarded the ferry *Bundeena*. All those people had the same experience on Jetty Road. They all drove back to the tollbooth – suggestively, the **BMW ended up leading the way again** – and stopped there knowing a man with a gun was loose and possibly heading their way. And as we shall see, the people travelling in the gold-coloured BMW lost their lives at the tollbooth, and the two Buckleys lost their red Commodore.

*The tollbooth
crime scene
tells us a tale
which you
will not find
in the official
literature.*

And to those readers who say it was all just coincidence and fate, this editor says that is not the way investigations are conducted. Proper investigations, conducted by serious investigators into the death of 35 people and the wounding of 23, do not dismiss anything as *just a coincidence*, or *not worth looking into*. If investigators of the Port Arthur incident really wanted to know who killed the little Mikac girls on Jetty Road, those investigators should not have looked for evidence on the front page of any newspaper, The Mercury for example: *THIS IS THE MAN*. But they did. So nothing is certain.

Returning to the statement of Debra Jane Buckley, she tells us this:

"My husband and I then both got out of our car. We went to the building at the gate. I heard the female staff member tell my husband that the police had been called and that she believed there was someone down the road with a gun. **I had a short conversation with an occupant from* the BMW. This person was of dark complexion and perhaps of [G]reek extraction.** Whilst talking with this person for some reason I turned around and saw a person approximately **30 metres** down the road in the direction from where we had just come. I noticed that **this person had shoulder length blonde hair, and my initial impression that it was a woman.** I noticed that this person had a gun with a long barrel, and was pointing it into the bush which was off to my left, as I faced this person. This person was holding the gun at shoulder height as if ready to fire." (added emphasis; * Note Mrs. Buckley did not say inside the BMW. Her words suggest the person she spoke with was outside the BMW.)

Again, you will not read anything about this in the official literature on the Port Arthur case, because what it leads to is not Martin Bryant. This is why the mongrel McCreadie glossed over it. This is why Bugg did not tell you about it. *The man was Martin and Martin was the man, there was just no State interest to communicate the real plan.*

Both Buckleys alighted from their Avis red Commodore sedan. They were right at the tollbooth and Mrs. Buckley said they wanted to ask the staff member there what was happening. So it is reasonable to believe that when they got out of their vehicle, they did not take all their personal possessions (handbag, papers) or the keys of the vehicle with them. Or lock the doors. There was no need to. The booth was just there and they only wanted to ask a *simple* question. And while Mr. Buckley was asking that question of the "female staff member" (what a formal way to say it), Mrs. Buckley said she spoke with "an occupant **from** the BMW" (what a formal way to say it). Then she described that occupant as a person.⁵² Whether it was a man or a woman, Mrs. Buckley was attempting to keep it a secret. She said something about appearing Greek, but even then she did not reveal whether or was a man or a woman. So the sex isn't certain. But we can be certain about Mrs. Buckley doing her best to **keep the identity of that occupant/person/Greek a secret.** And this is just at a tollbooth not a militarized border. So why did Mrs. Buckley say what she did? It is not certain, but that person she was trying to keep secret about was dead a few minutes later, according to the list of victims. But again, is this certain. (see Part 9)

⁵² Describing anyone as a "person" implies a lack of a relationship* between the user and the human being described as a person. By using the word "person," Mrs. Buckley tried to convey that she did not know the identity of the woman or man with whom she had a conversation at the tollbooth. This is suggestive because it **would not matter** if the dialogue Buckley had was benign. But her use of the word "person" suggests that the dialogue she had was sinister, and Buckley knew it. So she attempted to deny the relationship she had with the BMW passenger with whom she spoke. She did this by using the word "person." (* Means any contact in the broadest sense.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Now the bizarreness of what happened at this tollbooth gets more obvious. Mrs. Buckley said she saw some person "approximately 30 metres down the road." She said she did not know why – you are to believe she was not watching and waiting as she was having a conversation with a person from the BMW, who it seems was then outside that vehicle, and who was of "dark complexion and perhaps of [G]reek extraction." Buckley first thought the person was a woman. This is credible as several witnesses at the tollbooth said the gunman had **hair below his shoulders** – which Martin Bryant never had.

This Mrs. Buckley is a troubling witness. Specific with some things, but only impressions about others. Unable to say the word man or woman even after she spoke with one. Then she said about 30 metres down the road. How accurate is her stated distance? Well, her husband Thomas Mark Buckley gave a different distance. In his statement he said: "I was standing about 80-100 mts away." So Mrs. Buckley might be out with her number of metres. Or, is the distance that Mr. Buckley said just too far? It does matter once you learn what other actions went on at the tollbooth, actions kept from the public. To this editor, it seems Mr. Buckley gave the more accurate distance, but how accurate is not certain. And from this point on, Mrs. Buckley's words have no credibility. What both Buckleys want readers of their statements to believe is that they saw the gunman on Jetty Road, and there he pointed a rifle at then killed the Mikacs. Mr. Buckley states this in relation to that terrible action:

"The person [gunman] then shot the female who had been waving her arms about. The female then fell to the ground, whereas the person with the gun then pointed it at a child, who was a few feet on the top side of the female. The person then shot the child. The child also fell to the ground. I heard both of these shots. I was standing about 80-100 mts away, when this occurred."⁵³ Again, note how far that shooting took place from Mr. Buckley who saw **and heard it**.

So how then would Mrs. Buckley explain her statement given she was about "30 metres" away, plus the fact she did not say one word about seeing a woman (Mrs. Mikac) or two children with the shooter. And not one word about hearing an assault rifle being fired several times, to kill three people. Mrs. Buckley could not be certain at all. Was Mrs. Buckley really there? It is inconceivable that at 30 metres, in a direction she was looking, that Mrs. Buckley did not see Mrs. Mikac, and/or her two young daughters, and/or hear several shots (evidence says six) being fired from a high-powered rifle. It seems we can be certain about Mrs. Buckley being a highly dubious witness, one with motives never made clear and certain to the public.

So the Buckleys were standing near their red Commodore which was stopped behind the BMW, with both vehicles parked near the PAHS tollbooth. And according to Mr. Buckley, some person, who he, like his wife, first thought was a female because of the long hair, had shot people 80-100 metres away. What would you have done in that situation? Well, this editor believes you would not have approached that armed person because to do so would have invited death. But very suggestively, that is exactly what three passengers in the BMW did.

⁵³ Thomas Mark Buckley. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996. (and hereafter)

This editor believes any sane thinking person would have got away from there as fast as possible. And if you had arrived at the tollbooth in your vehicle, you would have got back in it and driven away as fast as possible. **Get the bloody hell out of there.**

But not the Buckleys. There was their red Commodore right in front of them. A brand-new new one most probably. Turn the key and they were out of there. Rubber ribbons to the highway. But that did not happen. No. According to Mrs. Buckley, this is what they did:

"This person was holding the gun at shoulder height as if ready to fire. I then began **running with my husband** in the opposite direction. We initially were running down the road but then decided to take some cover by running in the tree line. **I don't specifically remember hearing any shots fired.** We then **flagged down a car leaving the toll gate** and we travelled in the rear of this vehicle to the shop before the toll gate itself." (added emphasis)

So Mr. Buckley tells us he saw the shooting and the killing down on Jetty Road. He also said he heard the shots. But according to Mrs. Buckley, who saw nothing and heard nothing, her husband was running with her as the shooting was going on. And then after leaving their own vehicle, in which there were all their personal possessions at the tollbooth, they then "flagged down a car leaving the toll gate" and got a ride to the shop. Note the car the Buckleys flagged down was at the same and only tollbooth (toll gate) where the Buckleys' own red Commodore was parked. Now, do you think the Buckleys are mad? Or, did they have a sinister motive to leave their vehicle at the tollbooth, with the keys in it, facing the highway, ready to go, to get someone or something the bloody hell out of there?

And during this highly suggestive behaviour of the Buckleys, neither of them said a single word about the gold-coloured BMW, or about the passengers in it, or the person who was of "**dark complexion and perhaps of [G]reek extraction.**" Did the Buckleys warn them? Tell them to drive away fast? Apologists might say people do abnormal things in abnormal situations. Yes they do. But to that, this editor says running away from your own rented vehicle, in which are all your personal possessions, and then flagging down another vehicle at the very place where you are is beyond abnormal. It is highly suggestive. The possibility that Buckleys deliberately abandoned their vehicle to be used by another person is more credible than Buckleys having a panic attack. The gold-coloured BMW did not power away from the tollbooth. That might have induced some panic. But as far as we know, that BMW and all its passengers waited for the man it seems they knew, and wanted to speak with – the gunman.

About the Buckleys nothing is certain. Everything is highly suspect. After eyewitnesses have told us they went to the tollbooth and saw bodies there but **NO vehicles**, any reasonable person has to ask some questions. Who drove that red Commodore away? Who and what was in it? Where was it driven?⁵⁴ The Buckleys did not return and collect it. **IT WAS GONE.** There is a lot of uncertainty in relation to what exactly happened at the tollbooth that Sunday afternoon.

⁵⁴ After the incident at and near the Broad Arrow Café, visitors did leave the site in their vehicles. There was a second roadway in and out of the site. Though normally closed, it does seem it was soon opened. The historic site staff who had been away in Swansea returned to the site via this second roadway. It is conceivable the red Commodore departed the site via this second roadway. But given it was so close to the Arthur Highway, it was most probably driven directly to that highway from the tollbooth. There, if the driver turned left and drove via Nubeena then Taranna (see Map at Part 4), what happened at/around the Port Arthur general store and Seascope cottage would have been avoided. Driving this way to Hobart would have been completely unhindered and would have probably gone unnoticed.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

So now let us consider that gold-coloured BMW, about which its co-owner Sidney Kenneth Nixon said: "No one had permission to take this vehicle apart from Rosemary and her friends and set fire to it as what occurred down at Port Arthur. Martin BRYANT did not have permission to take the BMW."⁵⁵

Funny that Mr. Nixon would make a statement about some person not having "permission" to take his vehicle. The word "permission" is not a word associated with vehicle theft. According to the official narrative, that BMW was stolen (carjacked) from Mary Rose Nixon. It was never a matter of some person having permission, or not having permission. You don't give permission for anyone to steal your car, unless some scam is going on. Mr. Nixon does not say anyone stole his vehicle, which clearly is what happened according to the official narrative. And note Mr. Nixon separated Martin Bryant from the burning of his prized BMW. Nothing is certain.

The public has been told there were four passengers in that BMW. This has never been proved. In his statement, Mr. Nixon said this: "On the Sunday the 28 April 1996, the four of them set off to visit Richmond and Port Arthur. Their intention was to visit Port Arthur first, they left around 9:30 am." Let's examine this. Mr. Nixon said the "four of them," but he never said who the four were. He did make statements about people, but they may not be the four who the public has been encouraged to associate with the BMW. In his statement, Nixon also said this:

"On the Monday the 22 April 1996, Mr and Mrs Robbie and Helene SALZMAN and Jim POLLARD arrived at our house to stay for three days and then travel around the State. Rosemary and I lent our friends our BMW sedan, tan in colour, registration number DI 5858, to save them the expense of a hire car. They enjoyed their stay with Rosemary and myself and so decided to remain the entire time with us with the BMW at their disposal. Rosemary was acting as their tourist guide and I remained on our property working."⁵⁶

This extract seems so benign. But when it is studied and related to other details obtained from officials, things do not mesh well. In the pages ahead, there are two images of four alleged human bodies, allegedly dead, allegedly near the PAHS tollbooth. Some viewers are quick to identify the body in red pants is that of Mr. Pollard. But when the wording of the statements and the colours identified therein are studied, this does not add up. In addition, a close friend of the man has stated that Pollard was a conservative person and that he never wore or would have owned red pants. So who was this person?

The *Statement of Witness* of Mr. Nixon is one and a half pages. On page one, he describes the above mentioned people as "our friends." But, on page two, he describes them as "her friends" referring to his wife Mary Rose. Now what might this mean? A distancing of Mr. Nixon from the Port Arthur incident, more specifically from what went on at the tollbooth? There is more to this. After he identifies who he is – name, address, marital status, children, etc. – Nixon tells his readers about Mary Rose, his wife. Now why would he feel com-

⁵⁵ Sidney Kenneth Nixon. *Witness Statement*; 24 July 1996. (and hereafter) Note again that Nixon does not accuse Martin Bryant of burning the BMW. If Nixon believed Martin had torched his BMW, it is reasonable to conclude that Nixon would have declared that belief in his statement. But Nixon did not say this.

⁵⁶ It is believed the Nixons had a property at Crabtree, an area/place c.30 kilometres south-west of Hobart. This is interesting for two reasons: **i.** Mr. Nixon said that Mr. and Mrs. Robbie and Helene Salzman, and Jim Pollard arrived at his house on 22 April 1996. He does not say how his friends arrived there as they did not have their own vehicle. Given the distance from Hobart, it seems that some person (who?) drove them to the Nixon home. Or, did Mary Rose Nixon go and collect them (from where?) in the BMW then drive them back to the Nixon home/property; & **ii.** In his statement, Mr. Nixon said that "around 9:30 am" on 28 April 1996, four of them (which four?) left the property to go to Port Arthur and Richmond. Nixon said: "Their intention was to visit Port Arthur first." Given the good weather that day, and the well-maintained vehicle they were in, the drive to PAHS would have taken c.90-120 minutes. That would have put them at the tollbooth well **before 12:00**. But according to the statement of Debra Buckley, she and her husband drove right behind that BMW as it passed the tollbooth into the historic site at c.**13:45**. So **where was the BMW and its four(?) passengers (who?) between those two times?** It is very easy to say sightseeing – but that is a guess, an unproved allegation. Also note that by providing the BMW sedan to their "friends," the Nixons ensured there were **no car-rental records** bearing the surname of Pollard or Salzman. And if those people had travelled to Tasmania as (carless) sea-ferry passengers, there might have been **no permanent written record** of their presence on the island. If there had been no shooting at the tollbooth, then any or all of those people could have been negatively involved in the incident at Port Arthur with there being **no paper trail record** of them ever being there.

pelled to tell the world about his wife, when his statement was supposed to be about him and the Port Arthur incident. Well, on reflection, it seems what Mr. Nixon states about his wife has a lot to do in relation to the tollbooth. Mr. Nixon says: "Mary had visited her mother at **Bilambil Heights** in New South Wales (NSW) and had returned to Tasmania on Saturday the 20 April 1996." (added emphasis)

So, over a week before the Port Arthur incident, Mrs. Nixon had returned to her husband Sidney Kenneth Nixon at Crabtree, their property in Tasmania. Well, so what? Mrs. Nixon must have done many things in April 1996. Some just before the incident – on Friday the 26th, for example. So why focus on a visit Mrs. Nixon made to her mother in northern NSW? Sane people do not generally say things that do not have any meaning to them. So what really is this reference all about? Well, it is reasonable to conclude there is some connection between Mrs. Nixon's visit to NSW and the PAHS tollbooth. Otherwise, Mr. Nixon would never have mentioned Bilambil Heights and his wife's recent visit there. The two things do seem connected.

Where is this place called Bilambil Heights? In northern NSW. This is interesting. And why? Because there are two other relevant places in northern NSW: **i.** Ocean Shores, which is about 35-50 driving kilometers away from Bilambil Heights; and, **ii.** Brunswick Heads which is about 5 kilometres south of Ocean Shores. These three places are all **quite close together**. (search the Internet or look at an atlas) About half an hour driving time at the most between them. Bilambil Heights is significant, because that is where Rose Mary Nixon went. And this put her very close to Robert and Helene Salzmann who lived at Ocean Shores. And, close to Russell James/*Jim* Pollard who lived at Brunswick Heads. It seems, that they all knew each other. Recall, Sidney Kenneth Nixon described them as "friends."

About a week before the mass murder at Port Arthur, they all might have had the opportunity to meet. It is not unreasonable to conclude this. And then, it is said **they all died together** at the PAHS tollbooth on the afternoon of 28 April 1996. (This editor would like to say we are certain of this, but we are not. This is just the official record. Whether true or not has never been proved with certainty.)

Skeptics might say all of this is just a coincidence. But this editor thinks not. Look all you want in the corrupt documents prepared by the DPP, but you will not find a report of any investigation of these four. They are presented as four luckless visitors to the historic site at Port Arthur. It is said they were passengers shot in their vehicle, but this is false as we shall see. Witnesses who were at the tollbooth tell a different story to the lies pushed by Damian Bugg QC⁵⁷ – as if QC meant something. (Recall that Bugg is nothing but human scum. People who advance themselves at the expense of the mentally-handicapped deserve the strongest public condemnation.)

So what did happen after the two suspect Buckleys wilfully abandoned their Commodore and asked for a ride in some other vehicle leaving the tollbooth? Well, there is more uncertainty. The gunman driving some yellow Volvo had a clear road to pass by the tollbooth.

57 QC is the abbreviation of the legal phrase and title Queen's Counsel. KC is used for King's Counsel. This award is based on a number of requirements depending on the place where it is conferred. Awardees tend to be competent senior lawyers (aka barristers in some countries). Note that wikipedia lists one of Damian Bugg's achievements as "successfully prosecuting Martin Bryant." Given Martin's **extremely low IQ**, a moral QC would never have allowed this victim of the State to be imprisoned **on false evidence with NO TRIAL**. That Bugg participated in a corrupt legal process that put an innocent **boy-man in prison forever** tells us all we need to know about his QC.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

There was nothing blocking his exit. But he stopped. Why he did is not known. Whether it was preplanned that he stop, or whether he had received instructions enroute to stop, or whether someone from that gold-coloured BMW flagged him down, or..... It is not something the DPP has made public, and it never will be made public by the DPP. Regardless, the gunman stopped at the PAHS tollbooth. The following is from the *Witness Statement* of Freda/Frida Cheok:

"As we were travelling towards the toll gate [*sic*], I could see two cars ahead and presumed one was going in and the other was coming out. As we approached the toll booth [*sic*] I saw that one of these cars was a gold-coloured BMW in our lane, facing us and was blocking out [*sic*] path. It wasn't until we almost reached the toll gate area that I saw the BMW was parked in our [entrance] lane. I also saw a yellow coloured Volvo sedan, which I noticed had a surfboard on the top, parked on the road ahead of us but in the correct [exit] lane, but further back from the BMW.... I would estimate that there was less than a car's length between Debra's car [which we arrived in] and the BMW when we came to a halt."⁵⁸

If there are any other *Witness Statements* which describe the time before this, this editor has not seen them. Again, why the gunman stopped is not something the DPP has revealed. Another confounding fact is that the witness Freda/Frida Cheok, and Nicholas Emmanuel Cheok her son, said that when they arrived and stopped at the tollbooth, two people were seated inside the yellow Volvo with the gunman – conversing with him presumably. And as stated several times in this book, no genuine visitor to the historic site would have got inside a vehicle with a gunman who had just shot several people.

Whoever those people were in the Volvo, they must have known the gunman personally, or had knowledge about his mass murder plan. The gunman did not stop at the tollbooth because he liked the fancy BMW. He did not skid to a halt and shoot the people who arrived in that BMW. No. He stayed in the Volvo he was driving and it seems that two people got out of the BMW and walked over then sat with him inside his yellow car. The DPP does not want people to know this because it just ruins the official narrative about a *lone-nut* gunman driving all over the place killing people here and there and inside the BMW. But it is not the truth. It seems people who arrived in that BMW knew the gunman and they went to him. Here it is extremely important to note – those people did not know Martin Bryant and Martin did not know them. There was no misunderstanding.

From everything this editor has studied, those two people who got into the yellow Volvo with the gunman were Helene Salzmann (she sat on the front passenger seat), and Robert Salzmann (he sat on the rear seat behind the driver seated on the right front seat. The two Salzmanns from Ocean Shores, New South Wales. And seating in the front passenger seat of her BMW, Mary Rose Nixon waited. What was she thinking? What did she think was going to happen? How could this woman who had her own family, her own children, have been involved in this unfolding insanity? Did the two Salzmanns pressure her? Threaten her? Was it really Mary Rose Nixon?

⁵⁸ Freda Cheok. *Witness Statement*; 15 July 1996. (and hereafter)

Allegedly, the driver of that BMW was Russell Pollard of Brunswick Heads. He was a friend of Mary Rose. She probably addressed him by the familiar name *Jim*. Those who knew him did. Surely he would have driven away if Mary Rose had said: *Let's get out of here Jim*. But it seems as if she wanted to stay. Did her husband know this side of his wife? Did their children know? (Their daughter Dr. Rosemary Nixon is one.) What the hell went on? Don't waste your time looking in official documents. There's nothing about this. Just lies, unproved assertions, and false statements to **set up innocent Martin Bryant**.

Whatever was said to or with the gunman did not endear the two Salzmans to him. And when Robert Salzmann alighted from that yellow Volvo – thinking no one knows what – he stepped off the land of the living. He did breathe a few more times, but his last gasp was just a few moments away. This is what Nicholas Emmanuel Cheok wrote in his *Witness Statement*:

"There was a bit more talking, about ten seconds, between the blonde haired male and the older man and then the blonde haired male lifted up the gun and **pointed it at the chest** of the older man and something was said...and then I heard a blast...and the older man's **chest just seemed to cave in** and he fell to the ground and didn't move."⁵⁹ (added emphasis)

Then it got a lot worse. With the witnesses just metres away, and the gunman, with his hair "**long below his shoulders**" and oblivious to who was watching turned to face Russell Pollard. We have to ask, had Pollard lost his senses? He saw his friend Robert Salzmann(?) get a bullet right into his chest, and given the power of the assault rifle that bullet would have gone right through him. If Mary Rose Nixon said a cautious word to Pollard, we will never know. One person who knew Pollard personally told this editor he was no fool. So what was going on that made Pollard think that he could get the upper hand? The DPP does not know. The only thing certain then was the .308 round tight in the breech ready for *Jim*, and the person who fired that round was definitely **not Martin Bryant**. This is what Freda/Frida Cheok saw:

"I then saw the man get out of the driver's seat of the BMW and walk around the front of his car...and go in the direction of the blonde-haired man. As the man from the BMW was walking towards him, the blonde-haired man then shot this man.... **Both these men were shot in the area of their chests**, definitely the man from the BMW was **shot in the chest** because as he laid on the ground **I saw a dark patch in the area of his chest.**" (added emphasis)

And what did the son of Freda/Frida Cheok witness?:

"The blonde-haired male was half turned to us when he shot the second man. I think he shot the second man **in the chest area**. When the blonde-haired male shot both men, he was very close to them. I would say the gun was **only inches away from the chest** of the second man when he shot him and the gun was **right up to the first man's chest** when he shot him." (added emphasis)

⁵⁹ Nicholas Emmanuel Cheok. *Witness Statement*, 14 July 1996. (and hereafter)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Readers, some of you might think that the two mentioned eyewitnesses, being mother and son, could have influenced each other. Well, it seems not. Here is what the driver of the vehicle they were in said in her *Witness Statement*:

"[H]e shot the person he had been arguing with. The bullet appeared to go **through this persons chest, and out his back....** I heard another two shots. I looked again, and the older man from the BMW was on the ground, along with another woman. This woman was on the road between the gunman's car and the BMW. I'm not sure where she came from. She was wearing a pink, blue and white knitted jumped [*sic*; should be jumper, a pullover or sweater]. I think he (the gunman) dragged her out of his car [the yellow Volvo], but I am not sure."⁶⁰ (added emphasis)

So from three eyewitnesses who were just a few metres away with an unobstructed view of this mini-massacre it is reasonable to conclude the following: **i.** The gunman was in a yellow Volvo; **ii.** A man and a woman were inside that Volvo with the gunman; **iii.** The man, believed to be Robert Salzman got out of the Volvo followed by the gunman; **iv.** The gunman took his rifle from the back of the Volvo and shot Salzman pointblank through the chest; **v.** A second man, believed to be Russell Pollard got out of the BMW and walked to the gunman; **vi.** The gunman shot Pollard pointblank through the chest; **vii.** The gunman then dragged the woman from the Volvo and shot her; **viii.** Then, the gunman either dragged the woman from the BMW and shot her, or shot her in the BMW before dragging her out. (See Part 7 for additional facts within the *Witness Statements*.)

This killing at the fourth crime scene clearly confirms the gunman was a professional killer, probably a psychopath with no conscience. This is not killing you learn how to do and how to remain in absolute control throughout, by shooting at some little cardboard target in the bush somewhere, which is all Martin Bryant ever did.

This killing at the tollbooth, was pointblank killing. Looking people right in their eyes as their chests were blown inside out. No qualms about murdering women – *drag 'em out blow the bitches*. When Martin heard about the shooting at Port Arthur, he asked if anyone was hurt. It was not some evasive reply. Martin was not clever. He doesn't have the brains to be clever. Just as he didn't have the mind and the will to methodically murder four adults at the historic site tollbooth, just after murdering three, two of whom were children, down along Jetty Road. And all that just after murdering 24 and wounding 23 at and near the Broad Arrow Café.

Martin Bryant did not have the mind and the will, or the motive, to kill any person. He even **admitted that he was afraid to fire** the firearms he had. And there is not one skerrick of evidence from any psychiatrist who was or was not in the employ of any government that proves otherwise. Ian Sale and Paul Mullen and the whole bunch of those overweening psychiatric demons proved absolutely nothing. **NOTHING!** Just assertions and opinions as if they meant something sound and reliable and worth incarcerating a *boy-man* for.

⁶⁰ Debra Lee Rabe. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996. (and hereafter)

OFFICIAL IMAGES OF TOLLBOOTH CRIME SCENE

LIKE so much about the Port Arthur case, some things do not seem right when consideration is given to the images of the tollbooth crime scene which have become part of the official narrative.

Several images of a supposed crime scene appear on the Internet and on the Tasmania Police video commonly (mis)identified as the *training video*. More specifically, there are images which it is implied are of the sealed roadway near the tollbooth, images which it is implied are of shot dead bodies lying on that roadway, and images which it is implied are of a vehicle (yellow Volvo) parked on the edge (western side) of that roadway. In the video, there is a short section of images photographed from a helicopter flying over a section of roadway which it is also implied is near the tollbooth. But little is clearly visible and there is no time given when that fly-over took place.

**RUSSELL POLLARD(?), HELENE SALZMANN(?),
MARY ROSE NIXON(?), NEAR TOLLBOOTH(?)**



LOCATION

There is nothing in the images of the bodies and the vehicle which confirms the location. No recognizable features are part of the images. An unaltered image of a harbour is instantly identifiable as Sydney Harbour if its famous bridge is in the background. Without that recognizable feature, it might just be an image of some other harbour. The image above (from the *training video*) is just an image of what appears to be three bodies on the ground. There is no way of knowing where the location is. Most people do not think. They just accept it is near the PAHS tollbooth because this is what officials have said. But there is **nothing** in the image to prove it was taken near that tollbooth. Nor is there anything in the image proving the people are dead. From this image no one can, with **certainty**, say who these three people were/are. Or if they are male or female. Or where exactly the bodies are located. What we do know from this image is that people, who do not think, believe what they are told it shows.

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

If the *Witness Statement* of Sidney Kenneth Nixon has not been manipulated by some official(s), the purple-suited body (see arrow) in the image above might be that of his wife Mary Rose Nixon. But what is the identity of the other two? And were these three people travelling together in the gold-coloured BMW at the Port Arthur Historic Site? Neither the clothing nor the body in red long pants correspond to the descriptions given by Mr Nixon, so do not jump to the conclusion it must be Helene Salzmann. Note there is no visible bullet exit wound on the body in red long pants. The identities of these three and where this image was taken has never been proved with hard evidence during a trial. Note the third unidentifiable body off the bitumen. Like the others in this image, there is no evidence which confirms where it really was videoed. Or, when it was videoed.

ROBERT SALZMANN(?) NEAR A VOLVO



Does this single-body image show the original scene? Or, was the scene staged later? Are there two blood-flow *streams* from the body? Why is one *stream* a darker colour, as if the blood was older? Why is the other *stream* (see arrow) a brighter red colour as if the blood was fresh.

When were these scenes videoed? The shooting at the tollbooth occurred around 2:00 p.m. Unless an official with a camera was there almost immediately (which would suggest premeditation), there would have been long shadows cast across the road from the trees on the western side of the road, which runs north-south. According to historical records (timeanddate.co) **sunset** was around 5:18 p.m. on Sunday 28 April 1996. But there are no shadows in either of these body-related images. Another troubling point is that in the images three of the bodies have pinkish ID tags attached to the left wrists. This suggests they had been attended to by the coroner. So **when were these scenes really videoed?** The absence of shadows says not Sunday. So on Monday morning before the media arrived? If so, why then is there fresh-looking blood near the body adjacent to the vehicle? – **ed.**

Recall the gunman had been driving toward the Arthur Highway then stopped near the tollbooth. Thus, unless the yellow vehicle was re-positioned, it faces in the direction of the highway. So what can we learn from the accompanying images? Well in the image, identified as *ROBERT SALZMANN(?) NEAR A VOLVO*, there seems to be a body of a male lying on the roadway with the head in the direction of the highway. The editor says seems because there is nothing else shown in the image to aid with the determination of the location.

Another thing is the image is so poor making an identity from it impossible and thus unacceptable. It appears to be a male is all we can say. We see no wound to the **chest**, though a bullet entry wound is usually small – it is the bullet exit wound that is larger and more visible. Given the position of the body suggests the gunman was facing the highway, this suggests the victim had been standing with his back to the highway. Some words from Nicholas Emmanuel Cheok suggest this might be correct:

61 In the image with three bodies, the one (see arrow) in the purple suit might be that of Mary Rose Nixon. In his statement, Mr. Nixon said his wife wore such a coloured suit. He also said Helene Salzmänn wore red pants and a white top. But red and white clothing is not a combination in that three-body image. Those who knew Russell Pollard do not believe he would have worn red pants. So it seems more likely the body in red pants is that of Helene Salzmänn. And this would mean the third body lying off the sealed roadway is that of Russell Pollard. But that is not the location where he was shot according to the statement of the witness Nicholas Emmanuel Cheok. Russell Pollard was approaching the gunman who was standing on the roadway, not off the roadway near the treeline. Pollard then stopped or was about to stop when the gunman shot him at **close range** in the chest. From that description, it is reasonable to believe the body of Russell Pollard would have ended up on the sealed roadway – just like the body with red pants. But Pollard **would not have** worn red pants his friends have said. Nothing is certain. It is as if some official(s) set about staging the scene – after the media came and went on Monday – so it could be videoed in the midday light with no shadows. In the process, it seems official(s) took the wrong bodies from that **22-body refrigerated truck** built for the incident. Then, at the tollbooth they put the **wrong bodies in the right places**, or put the **right bodies in the wrong places**. It is not certain.

“I then saw him [the gunman] walk around the back of the Volvo and back to where he was standing when he was talking to the older male. This older male [Robert Salzmänn?] had just stayed standing in the same place as when he got out of the Volvo.”

Then the gunman shot the older man and he fell to the ground with his head facing the highway. This is a reasonable conclusion. But two things are not so readily explained. The body is at full-length and both arms are outstretched. For the victim, who either died instantly or within seconds, this means he would have had to lock the muscles in his legs, put both arms out, then fall backward in a straight line. Like the body in the red long pants (& striped top), this body in the blue top appears to have been **placed** in the position it was videoed.

Now this editor has no forensic pathology qualifications or experience. But he is of the belief that a .308 bullet fired directly into a human chest would shut down that body quickly – the bullet would go in (entrance wound), pass through (internal wound), and travel out (exit wound) very quickly. The expression *collapsed like a sack of potatoes* comes to mind. But the body near the vehicle looks as if the victim **controlled his fall** which produced the stretched-out-straight look on the ground – or, was the dead body **positioned** like that to make it look better on video? If the victim did collapse like the proverbial sack of potatoes, the body would have been in a heap on the ground. It might not have even looked like a human body. And if that is true, then some official with an eye for how things would look later as a video image might have done a little repositioning.⁶¹

The next thing immediately noticeable in the coloured version of the image, not so much in the black and white version, is the difference in the blood flow from the body. When it decomposes and oxidizes, blood darkens. Well with the image showing the alleged dead person lying near a yellow Volvo, it seems that there are two *streams* of blood from the body and one of them is clearly a different colour. One *stream* appears darker, and thus it is reasonable to conclude

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

that stream might be older. The other stream appears lighter, and thus it is reasonable to conclude it might be more recent. Regardless of when the video was made, the newer(?), reddish pattern is disturbingly suggestive when compared with the older(?) pattern. Was additional blood added? Was the scene staged sometime after the bodies were first removed then returned?

About the image of this person on the roadway adjacent a yellow Volvo, very little can be derived from it with certainty. The time, date, and location is not discernible, so we do not know when the image was videoed. Nothing in the image tells us when the person on the road surface died, or in fact if the person in the image is even dead. We cannot identify the person as there is nothing in the image which confirms the identity. The yellow Volvo is identifiable (so too is the registration ID plate on other images). Regardless, it could have been any yellow Volvo, not necessarily the one owned by Martin Bryant.

In none of the *Witness Statements* this editor has read is there any mention of Robert Salzmänn, and more specifically what type and colour of clothes he was wearing on Sunday 28 April 1996. The body on the road surface might be that of Robert Salzmänn, but there is no hard evidence in the image to prove it is. To rely on what the police say is to rely on the word of criminals.

And what can we learn from the image showing three bodies? Again, the time, date, and location is not discernible, so we do not know when the image was videoed. Nothing in the image tells us when the three people died, or in fact if they are dead. We cannot identify any of the three as none of the faces are visible. Bodies should not be identified solely by the clothing on them as clothing is not unique to any individual. The road surface could be almost anywhere.

What do the witnesses say which might help us learn something? Mr. Nixon declared this in his *Witness Statement*: "When Rosemary [Mary Rose; his wife] left she was wearing a purple leisure suit and Helene SALZMAN was wearing red pants and a white top." Again, Sidney Kenneth Nixon did not mention what his friend *Jim* Pollard was wearing the day he drove away in his prized BMW with Mrs. Nixon and Mrs. Salzmänn. And Nixon never said one word about the mysterious Mr. Salzmänn. Was Salzmänn really there?

So comparing these facts to the image of the three on the ground, all we can see is one body wearing a purple leisure suit and we might be tempted to think that it is the body of Mary Rose Nixon. Perhaps. Recall Mr. Nixon said: "Helene SALZMAN was wearing red pants and a white top." But there is no body dressed in that combination of clothing colours. So where is the body of Helene Salzmänn?

Supposedly there was a body nearby that was the body of Robert Salzmänn, but we cannot be sure of this. Based on the colour of the clothing, it seems that the body of Helene Salzmänn is not one of the three in the image. And the body some people casually claim is that of Russell James/*Jim* Pollard is dressed in clothes of colours that do not correspond with the clothes he was known to possess and wear.

*Witnesses
at the tollbooth
were scared,
and fleeing
was their
priority
– all very
normal and
understandable
– but fleeing
was not
the priority
of those
people (spooks?)
who went
to the tollbooth
in that BMW,
and who met then
spoke directly
with the gunman.*

Returning to the *Witness Statement* of Freda/Frida Cheok, she said: "As the man [Russell Pollard] from the BMW was walking towards him, the blonde-haired man [the gunman] then shot this man.... Both these men were shot in the area of their chests, definitely the man from the BMW was shot in the chest because as he laid on the ground I saw a dark patch in the area of his chest." At the time, the statements of the witness suggest the gunman was standing on the roadway, on the bitumen surface. So if all this is true, it is reasonable to conclude the body of Pollard should be, like the body of the man shot before him, on the road surface.

Well there is a body on the road surface, but we cannot tell its location in relation to the male body near the Volvo. And this body is dressed in long red pants, a blue shirt-like top, and a multicoloured (pink, dark, white) horizontally striped pullover. Is it the body of Pollard? Recall the other Cheok witness said: "I would say the gun was only inches away from the chest of the second man." So two men were fatally shot at the same place with the same rifle in the same manner – pointblank to the chest. But the first man fell on his back in a nice straight line with arms fully extended. Whereas the second man fell also in a nice straight line legs together, but fell on his front with both arms folded under the body. How could this be? And there is **no visible exit wound** on the back of the second body.

This editor spoke with a person who knew Pollard quite well. That person told the editor that friends and acquaintances of Pollard find it hard to believe he was dressed in such an outfit – red pants, pale blue shirt, stripped jumper. This was not the *Jim* Pollard they knew, who lived and worked in the country before retiring at Brunswick Heads on the coast, near Ocean Shores in northern New South Wales. Then we have these words from the witness Debra Rabe, who was the driver of the vehicle in which the two Cheoks were seated as they watched these killings right in front of them. Rabe said this:

"This woman was on the road between the gunman and the BMW. I'm not sure where she came from. She was wearing a pink, blue and white knitted jumper [*sic*; should be jumper]."⁶²

So Rabe was of the belief this person wearing the multi-coloured jumper was a woman. Rabe said the body of the woman was on the road surface between the Volvo and the BMW. So the weight of evidence is on the body dressed in red pants, blue shirt and horizontally striped pullover being that of Helene Salzmänn. (Recall that Mary Rose Nixon had been wearing a purple leisure suit.) But then comes the crunch, as this editor was told that Helene Salzmänn had short dark hair. (see Part 9) Not a head of grey balding/thinning hair, which is visible on the body wearing red pants.

So what happened to the body of Russell James/*Jim* Pollard? Well, there is a third body in the image, off the sealed road surface. But that location does not make sense with the descriptions provided by the witnesses who said Pollard was shot at pointblank range in the chest quite close to where Robert Salzmänn(?) had been shot. So really, nothing is certain with these images from the official video.

⁶² What Debra Rabe witnessed and described adds weight to the belief that the body clothed in red pants is that of Helene Salzmänn. (It is hard to believe a man who spent quite a bit of his life in rural Australia would wear a "pink, blue and white knitted" anything.) But if this is true, it again puts the body of Mr. Russell Pollard off the road and some distance from where it is believed he was shot by the gunman – that is, shot closer to the other male, Robert Salzmänn. Nothing is certain.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

In several ways, the tollbooth crime scene is a turning point in the Port Arthur case. There were three crime scenes before the tollbooth, and three after. A Volvo which featured in the first three scenes, was then abandoned at the tollbooth and had no further part in the incident. The gunman acquired another vehicle, the BMW, at the tollbooth. Evidence suggests that some or all those killed at the tollbooth were attempting to restrain or redirect the gunman. Their deaths (if real) strongly suggest they failed. After the tollbooth, a living hostage is introduced into the case. *Etc.*

But regardless, what happened at the tollbooth has never been made clear with evidence to the public. The official narrative wants you to believe four entirely innocent people usually described as occupants of a BMW – were killed there. But an examination of some related facts suggests not all those victims were altogether innocent. So is there anything which it is reasonable to conclude?

It does seem that some action was planned for the tollbooth. But whether what happened there was the intended outcome, or whether it was something which occurred due to a changing plan is not known. That the gunman stopped when his exit from the historic site was not blocked in any way, tells us **he stopped deliberately**. If someone from the BMW flagged him down or blocked the exit road in some way, then that person was clearly involved in the incident. But this editor has seen no evidence or anything suggesting this. So it seems the gunman stopped because he had been told to stop at the tollbooth, or he recognized the BMW as his new set of wheels.

Whether the gunman knew any or all of the people who had been travelling in the BMW is not known. But recall that it seems at least two of those passengers were seen inside the yellow Volvo speaking with the gunman. There was no other reason for them to get into that vehicle with the gunman. After killing the Mikacs on Jetty Road, it is believed the gunman placed his firearm inside the vehicle with him or in the boot. Regardless, the presence of the firearm would have been known to the two people who got into the yellow Volvo. It is inconceivable that they just decided to have a chit-chat with a departing historic site visitor. It seems they knew the gunman personally, or knew of him. And they knew they were with him and the inherent danger of being near him while he was so obviously armed.

It is reasonable to conclude that the gunman carjacked the BMW for specific reasons. It was not due to a whim. Leaving the yellow Volvo at the tollbooth put it on public display. It encouraged people to believe Martin Bryant was the gunman. It allowed Martin Bryant's passport to be (allegedly) found in the Volvo. This allowed officials to wave that document around and to get Martin's identity into the media networks and his name on the lips of everyone.

For some never explained reason – there are so many of them in the Port Arthur incident – a *hostage* was taken at the Port Arthur general store. This editor has not seen anything to suggest Glenn Pears was anything but a victim whose fate had run out. But evidence might exist proving he was in some way involved.⁶³

63 If it was strictly a matter of taking a hostage, why did the gunman not take one of the people at the tollbooth? That he did not, suggests the gunman had been instructed to get rid of them, just as the suspected ASIO operative Anthony Nightingale was shot at the Broad Arrow Café. And then at the nearby Port Arthur general store, why did the gunman choose Glenn Pears? Was Pears unlucky, or was there something that connected him to the incident beyond just being present at the store? And if it was a hostage the gunman really needed, why did he go back and shoot just Zoe Hall, the companion of Pears? There were other people nearby. The gunman could have shot several there with his rifle. So why only shoot Hall? And why did he take Pears rather than anyone else at or near the store?

This being so, the gunman could not have put anyone in the boot of the Volvo as there were firearms inside it. So by transferring his firearms into the passenger compartment of the BMW, the gunman had an empty boot in which to transport Pears? Just a thought.

And again, we must return to the two questionable Buckleys. If their *Witness Statements* are complete and truthful, and have not been manipulated by some corrupt official(s), there is some reason why they **abandoned** their red Commodore at the PAHS tollbooth. This pair might or might not have been a married couple. They might or might not have been from New Zealand. But the wording of their statements tells us they are both educated. This tells us that their leaving their rental vehicle behind, when it was not something they had no choice about, was a deliberate and intended act. And this red Commodore disappeared very soon after the Buckleys got a ride in another vehicle driving away from the tollbooth. (If they had time to find another vehicle in which to leave the tollbooth, then Buckleys had enough time to get in their own and *get the hell out of there.*)

It is reasonable to believe that the red Commodore played a part in the Port Arthur incident. It was delivered to the tollbooth by the innocent appearing and sounding Buckleys, Debra Jane & Thomas Mark. (If these are their real names. This editor has not been able to locate any couple in New Zealand with these names.) The Commodore could have served two functions: transportation and carriage. Thus, it is reasonable to believe that something significant could have been carried to the tollbooth and/or away from the tollbooth. What?

The other highly significant thing about that Commodore is that this editor has not been able to find any mention of it other than by the two Buckleys. According to them, we know it was an Avis vehicle (registration plate DK 2661), it was red, they parked it right behind the BMW at the tollbooth where they abandoned it. Then it disappeared. No one else seems to have seen it. So if all this is true, in a very short period of time someone drove it away. Who? Where to?

In the literature, the BMW is always associated with four passengers. But we do not know if there were only four. There may have been five. There may have been someone in the boot. Recall that the use of the boot **bothered Mr. Nixon** so much he mentioned it in his statement. Now was he prompted to write that because Glenn Pears was transported to Seascope in the BMW boot? Or, because some person was transported to the historic site in the boot of his BMW?

The gunman arrived at the tollbooth worn out and disheveled according to an employee at the tollbooth.⁶⁴ Then the carnage started at the café, moving to the bus parking area, on to Jetty Road and the tollbooth, killing all the way, then the gunman raced to the general store. This is what a witness said about the man who she saw there: "I remember thinking he was well groomed and clean.... I remember he was very neat and well groomed – **this sticks in my head.**"⁶⁵ So was there only one gunman? Or two? (The brothers Benjamin and Warren Overbeeke?) The second delivered in the BMW with the first driving himself away in that red Commodore. Just a thought. ■

⁶⁴ Steven John Howard. *Witness Statement*; 30 April 1996. According to witnesses at the historic site, this gunman was wearing Nike-type runners, trainers, or sandals.

⁶⁵ Debra Lee Rabe. According to this witness, the gunman she saw at the tollbooth then at the general store was wearing **Blundstone-type boots**. (see images at Part 7) Thus, questions arise. When Rabe and the two Cheeks arrived at the tollbooth, where the people were seated inside the Volvo conversing with the gunman, was that gunman the original from the historic site? Or, had there been a change of gunman with the first (who wore **Nike-type runners**) having driven away in the red Commodore, with the second about to start his murderous actions while wearing **Blundstone-type boots**? Recall that Rabe said the gunman who she saw was not disheveled or tired looking. She said he was "very neat and well groomed." Given what had transpired within the last hour, her stated observation **must not be dismissed or glossed over.**

THAT BLOODY DOOR
Port Arthur Incident
Andrew S. MacGregor

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur: 2001-04

*Even as early as sundown that Sunday,
a stench indicative of a cover-up was
enveloping everything.⁶⁶*

ON page 74 of a document in which Damien Bugg⁶⁷ states facts, he declares: "There are two entrance doors – one off the balcony into the café to the left of – if you could just show that, please? There is that entrance doorway and there is another entrance doorway there. That last entrance doorway, the one on the right, is the one through which Bryant walked when he went back into the café."⁶⁸

On page 109 however, Bugg states: "Another couple, Peter and Carolyn Nash, were also in this area of the premises. They moved to the door out of the gift shop area – if that could be indicated – but, unfortunately, that door was locked." We now have three doors to the public section of the building known as the Broad Arrow Café.

It was the gift shop exit door that Bugg stated was locked. He was incorrect. **The door couldn't be opened.** The lock was broken. As a direct result of this door no longer functioning, **seven people lost their lives.** At this point in time there is no sense in pointing fingers at any particular person or persons from the Port Arthur Historic Site in relation to this door. That is the responsibility of Occupational Health and Safety.

It is this *locked door* that created another report to be prepared by Damian Bugg. On page 32 of that report, he states this: "At page 109 of the transcript I said, 'Another couple, Peter and Carolyn Nash, were also in this area of the premises. They moved to the door out of the gift shop area but, unfortunately, that door was locked.' I accept that, on a consideration of the additional material provided to me, that statement of fact was not correct. I was briefed by the Police about the status of the doorway on the afternoon of the 28th April 1996 and informed that the door was locked for security purposes against petty theft."⁶⁹

This statement is open to different interpretations. The first being that the DPP was briefed about the door on the 28th April 1996. The other interpretation is that at some time after the DPP was briefed about the door and its condition on the 28th April 1996. If we consider this statement made by Bugg, and then consider the headlines on Tuesday 30th April 1996 issue of *The Mercury*,⁷⁰ which on page 3

⁶⁶ Stewart K. Beattie. *A Question of Egress Denied*; 2009: p. 2.

⁶⁷ Then director of public prosecutions in the state of Tasmania. Also referred to as the DPP.

⁶⁸ *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 19 November 1996.

⁶⁹ *AN INQUIRY BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS INTO THE DOOR AT THE BROAD ARROW CAFÉ AND RELATED MATTERS*; 23 July 1997.

⁷⁰ Daily tabloid newspaper published in Hobart, Tasmania. Owned by the US-based *News Corporation* – Rupert Murdoch.

reads "Two-minute terror," it is thus certain that the *two-minute* aspect of the shooting within the café was initiated very early in the history of the event. It is then worthwhile noting the comments made by the DPP in his report⁷¹ under the heading: *Did the door malfunction or not open on the 28th April 1996?*

Under that heading, the report reads as follows: "I am satisfied that the door was not locked from the inside on the 28th April 1996." This concession immediately opens the way for any civil action in relation to a duty of care to the survivors and relatives of those slain within that part of the Broad Arrow Café, as we are now informed that the original evidence given to the Hobart Supreme Court was incorrect. However, there is still more.

The fourth paragraph under this heading on page 17 of Bugg's report⁷¹ states: "On the 30th April 1996 a carpenter employed by the Authority was required to paint out the windows of the Café building and secure the doors and windows (with the exception of the disabled persons entrance door) against unwanted entry. This was effected by nailing the doors and windows to their frames. At the time this was done the person concerned, who had heard of the suggestion that the door had not opened, checked the lock with the aid of a Police officer who was inside the building at the time. The Police officer operated the handle inside, whilst the carpenter examined the tongue of the door locking mechanism from the other side. The tongue moved slightly but would not retract sufficiently to enable the door to open."

What we have here is an admission that the investigating police at the Broad Arrow Café on the 30th April 1996, two days after the massacre, were alerted to the fact that the door lock was not functioning, and that the door was not locked but that the lock was inoperable.

This completely negates every comment made that this particular door had been locked for security reasons against petty theft, be they made by the DPP, the coroner (Ian Matterson), or the Tasmanian attorney general (Ray Groom). Then on page 18 of the same report,⁷¹ Bugg asks: *Was the Door Malfunction Reported prior to the 28th April 1996?* Under this heading the DPP states: "I am satisfied that none of the staff actually working in the gift and craft area reported the malfunction outside discussing it amongst themselves and other workers prior to the 28th April 1996."

This statement is conditional in that it limits the reporting to only those persons working within the gift and craft area, and it must be remembered that there were several other personnel employed at the Historic Site who would have been in a position to notice that this particular door was not functioning and may have very well reported the malfunctioning door. However in the very next sentence, the DPP contradicts himself when he states: "The manager in charge of this part of the building indicated to me that she verbally reported the matter to a member of the maintenance team approximately 2 weeks prior to the 28th April 1996."

⁷¹ AN INQUIRY BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS INTO THE DOOR AT THE BROAD ARROW CAFÉ AND RELATED MATTERS; 23 July 1997.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A verbal report is still a report, and the Historic Site Authority becomes remiss once that report is not acted upon. So when the DPP makes the comment, "There was no follow up request and the manager believes that she did not make any written report or request for the examination and repair,"⁷² there is not one iota of reduction of the responsibility for the Historic Site Authority in their *Duty of Care* in relation to those persons slain or injured, mentally or physically due to the malfunctioning doorlock.

In fact, **the last sentence in this chapter is the most damning for the DPP. It concludes: "The door was malfunctioning and staff knew about it."**⁷²

In what has been described as the most thorough investigation ever by the Tasmania Police, the Tasmanian DPP has admitted that one vital fact was not correct, that being that there was a malfunctioning door, fitted with a fire-exit doorlock. Besides being totally unlawful to physically lock such a door so that it is inoperable from the inside of a building, it is also a physical impossibility to intentionally negate the fire-exit doorlock except by removing the actual lock, or nailing the door shut. Thus the carpenter with his hammer and nails on the 30th April 1996.

Since the fire-exit doorlock was not removed from the Gift Shop door, then the only way for the door not to open was that the lock was broken, or the door was nailed shut. In fact, the only way for the door to have been locked for security purposes against petty theft, was to nail it shut. In the initial investigation of the massacre at Port Arthur, it was not the police under detective inspector John Warren who were in charge. It was the coroner who had original control when both the coroner's delegation and the senior police arrived at the Port Arthur Historic Site at 8:00 p.m., on the evening of the 28th April 1996. In the Port Arthur Seminar Papers, coroner Ian Matterson states this:

"On site at 2005 I conversed with Inspector John Warren, the officer in charge of the police major crime scene. Having assessed no person had, at that stage, been apprehended and charged with any offence arising from the deaths on the historic site, I advised that I would take over the area as a coronial site with the operations to be conducted in tandem with his major crime investigation.... A 'walk through' of the site with Inspector Warren, several other senior police officers, my two coroner's clerks and the State Forensic Pathologist then commenced.... Our party then moved to the Broad Arrow Café. This was the scene of utter devastation with bodies, personal possessions, food (some part eaten), chairs and tables in complete disarray. I do not intend to note in any detail our observations within this shop. Suffice to say a total of twenty (20) deceased were found within the building...."⁷³

So it was the coroner, Mr Matterson, in company with detective inspector John Warren and others who inspected the door within the Broad Arrow Café building, and the bodies stacked up against it. It may not have been obvious to the police, but to the coroner, the

⁷² AN INQUIRY BY THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS INTO THE DOOR AT THE BROAD ARROW CAFÉ AND RELATED MATTERS; 23 July 1997.

⁷³ Ian Matterson. *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*; Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 11-12 March 1997: p. 91.

TIMELINE TO APRIL 1996 MASSACRE
Port Arthur, Tasmania

■ JUNE 1995

Press Release. Uniform national gun laws drawn up in Canberra.

A specially constructed morgue truck unlike anything in Australia or perhaps the world, refrigerated and capable of carrying 22 bodies is delivered to the Southern Tasmanian Mortuary Service. It is used only once – at Port Arthur – then advertised for sale.

Code Brown, a disaster emergency response plan, involving multiple casualties, is instigated at the Royal Hobart Hospital (RHH).

■ NOVEMBER 1995

Roland Browne, speaker for Tasmanian branch of the Coalition for Gun Control, warned all Australians that if Tasmania did not enact tougher firearms laws then there would be a massacre in Tasmania of massive proportions.

Ray Groom as attorney-general removed the right for any worker or volunteer to claim compensation related to PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) from the *Workers Compensation Act*, the main injury resulting from the Port Arthur massacre. Since then, several of the victims have suicided.

Coroners Act 1995 is introduced containing a new clause that any finding of any subsequent coroners inquest (which allows much more evidence than a normal court) must not conflict with or contradict the prior findings of the supreme court in the same case. John Howard [when prime minister] actively discouraged an inquest being called into the Port Arthur massacre.

■ MARCH 1996

The warning is repeated – the speaker for the national anti-gun lobby in Tasmania said there will be a massacre in Tasmania unless there are uniform gun laws.

Ray Groom stands down as premier voluntarily to take on the duties of attorney-general, minister for justice, minister for tourism, minister for workplace standards, minister responsible for the Port Arthur site. All offices having some responsibility for the Port Arthur Historic Site and the aftermath of the massacre.

■ APRIL 1996

The warning is again repeated as national uniform gun laws all ready and prepared are rejected at a meeting of police ministers.

Disaster exercises for all emergency services are fully rehearsed on the peninsula after 1 year of intensive training.

■ 28 APRIL 1996

Code Brown, just brought up to scratch, is fully operational and fresh in everyone's mind. The RHH is prepared for a full-scale disaster.

■ 11:00 a.m. 28 APRIL 1996

Top 10 managers of the Port Arthur site are evacuated in three government vehicles.

■ 1:00 p.m. 28 APRIL, 1996

Seminar for trauma specialist doctors from all around Australia, involving response to a mass shooting, is completed at or near the RHH. All 17 ambulance personnel are in attendance at Hobart Ambulance Headquarters, despite it being a Sunday. Three helicopters are available this Sunday despite there being normally only one. (cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

■ 1:24 p.m. 28 APRIL 1996

The only reported police on duty within an hour of the Tasman Peninsula, both called out by radio from police headquarters in Hobart to attend at Saltwater river, 1/2 hour drive from Port Arthur, in relation to a first ever, supposed heroin cache, radio in their arrival. (heroin cache is soap powder)

■ 1:27 p.m. 28 APRIL 1996

Massacre at Port Arthur commenced.

■ 27-28 APRIL 1996

Seven hundred journalists from 17 countries arrive for a conference beginning on 29 April in Hobart, Tasmania. Eighty are bussed to the PA site in a pre-booked coach.

FINALLY

Two members of Army Intelligence have confirmed to me, separately and personally, that the Port Arthur massacre was a planned intelligence psyop [psycho-political terror operation] using international and Australian personnel; member of ASIO with [a British] English accent has backed this up to me personally as well.

Barrie Unsworth (NSW premier at the time) let the cat out of the bag that the planning for the massacre was begun 10 years prior, when he emerged from a state and federal ministers conference in Hobart stating to the waiting media, that unless they get uniform national gun control (why?) there would be a huge massacre in Tasmania.

The SOG (Special Operations Group) within Tasmania Police responded to the massacre according to the SOG Manual prepared in accordance with the November 1995 (how convenient) Anti-Terrorist Plan drawn up by SAC-PAV (Standing Advisory Committee for Protection Against Violence) – under whose control the plan placed them. SAC-PAV is run by the Protective Security Co-ordination Centre in Canberra. Their (SOG) main job on that [28 April] and subsequent days was liaising with the media and attempting to **shut up witnesses and suppress evidence.**

Charlie Jones

The Port Arthur Massacre

beforeitsnews.com

4 July 2012

(amended; added emphasis)

FOOTNOTE On 11-12 March 1997, a seminar was conducted at Melbourne, Victoria, under the auspices of Emergency Management Australia. Many papers were presented and subsequently they were compiled into one document: Port Arthur Seminar Papers. One paper, which had **Australian Funeral Directors Association** approval, was presented by Stephen Parry: *Port Arthur massacre 1996 – AFDA national embalming team detailed report*. In that paper, the following appears:

- “**Day Four Wednesday 1 May 1996** First of the deceased persons leave the scene at Port Arthur site and are moved to the Royal Hobart Hospital mortuary.” (p. 106) How were 35 bodies stored at Port Arthur if the mortuary truck manufactured for the incident held **only 22 bodies**? Where were the other 13 bodies stored? What was done with all the bodies at Port Arthur over the interim 3-day period?
- “**Nelson Brothers had organized for an embalming box and a special large equipment case to be manufactured ready for the incident.**” (p. 112) This is undeniable proof the April 1996 mass murder at Port Arthur was an officially **premeditated, planned, and perpetrated** psycho-terror incident. Martin Bryant did not order or manufacture this embalming box and equipment case. – **ed.**

*Bugg used his
intelligence
not to
determine
the truth
but to
conceal
the truth.*

bodies at a fire-exit door, which didn't open, is an elementary cause of death, and Mr Matterson would have been very aware of the consequences of the faulty fire-exit doorlock, which failed to give the victims any chance of escape.

The Historic Site is a Tasmanian Government enterprise, and the ramifications were considerable. Had the scenario been a major fire within the building, the full wrath of the law would have been felt. However it was a gunman, and apparent moves were made to diminish the responsibility of the management of the historic site by various means, including altering facts of the massacre.

Before the door came to any relevance, there was no concern over the time spent in the café by the gunman during the massacre. All reports by surviving witnesses stated the same thing. The gunman was in no rush, and selected his targets and then moved to them and shot them.

There is no corroboration whatsoever of the supposed 29 shots fired inside the café building, but there is **ample evidence that many more shots were actually fired**. Police secured the Broad Arrow Café six hours after the massacre, and people were noticed to enter the building and souvenir spent cartridges. To demonstrate this interference with the evidence, there was one spent cartridge placed on the table under which Jason Winter died. Since the evidence given by Mr Bugg states emphatically that the gunman never approached that area of the café, then the only conclusion can be that an unknown person picked up the spent cartridge and placed it on the table. The only conclusion, forensic, ballistic or any other expert can conclude is that a minimum of 29 shots were fired by the finding of 29 spent cartridges by the New South Wales forensic team.

The corroboration for those shots must come from the amount of damage by bullets on the walls, ceiling and floor and other resting spots such as the rounds that were lodged in the Coca-Cola dispensing machine and ice cream freezer, which were not on the drawing prepared by the forensic team.

Wendy Scurr states that when she was approaching the café from the Information Centre, which is on the west side of the café, a bullet passed her. She and her husband later went to the building and inspected the hole in the windowpane which the bullet had made before it passed by Wendy.

However there is **no damage to the windowpane indicated on the sketch plan** to show where that bullet came from. What the court was presented with though was one spent round, 6 fragments of bullet jacketing, and 9 items of damage.

Wendy Scurr tells of the human remains that were on the walls, and ceiling. As she **worked among the wounded**, Wendy's hair and shoulders became covered with blood and human tissue which had dripped onto her from above. There was however no indication of any damage to the ceiling caused by any bullets, or fragments thereof.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Paul Parker, father of the young waitress Colleen Parker, commented on the number of shots that must have missed their target after seeing the actual damage caused by bullets and bullet fragmentation inside the Broad Arrow Café, when he was permitted to examine the Broad Arrow Café with his daughter, on the advice of her psychiatrist Ian Sale.

Tasmania Police ballistics expert sergeant Gerard Dutton in his Port-Arthur related article says: "Fired cartridge cases littered the floor while bullet damage and blood spatter were apparent on the walls. The carnage was sickening."⁷⁴

Bugg stated this in the Supreme Court during the sentencing of Martin Bryant: "It's unlikely that it misfired because there were live rounds found in the café area."⁷⁵ The forensic sketch plan of the building prepared by the assisting NSW police reveals 29 fired cartridge cases, 1 spent round, 6 bullet fragments, 9 items of damage, and zero live rounds.

Whether the gunman fired 29 shots or 58 shots inside the building is of little relevance to the actual murders. Again, the actual time that this massacre occurred in is really not relevant to the actual acts of murder either. However, if there is a responsibility created by a broken door lock, that places blame upon the management of the Port Arthur Historic Site, which is a government enterprise, then a person can understand why the push was on to create the myth of 29 shots and the gunman leaving the building within 90 seconds of the commencement of these murders.

What did happen though was that several survivors of the Port Arthur massacre attended the sentencing of Martin Bryant. There, they listened to the director of public prosecutions Damian Bugg as he made his statement of facts to the presiding judge William Cox. **At the end of Mr Bugg's statement of facts, many of them approached the DPP and criticised his statement as being either incorrect or not factual.** Mr Bugg dismissed the criticisms as being irrelevant to the objective of ensuring that Martin Bryant was properly incarcerated.

The problem of the door though just didn't go away. It resurfaced on the ABC-TV **7-30 Report** where three survivors made mention of problems within the historic site, including the door. The Tasmanian government minister responsible for that Port Arthur Historic Site, Ray Groom, was also interviewed. He replied with these words: "Cause of the murders was not a door. The cause of the murders was Martin Bryant firing lethal weapons at people in a very short space of time, a **matter of seconds**, and murdering 20 people in the Broad Arrow Café and 15 elsewhere, and of course wounding many people. I don't believe that that door issue is a principle factor in the matter."⁷⁶

There was renewed Tasmanian government activity. There had been previous reports into the massacre, being Pat McAlpine and Don Woodland's from the Salvation Army. However, the Tasmanian joint

⁷⁴ Gerard Dutton. *The Port Arthur shooting incident*; Australian Police Journal; December 1998: p. 31.

⁷⁵ *The Queen v. Martin Bryant*; 22 November 1996: p. 117.

⁷⁶ Again, note the emphasis on a very short period of time. Here, the mongrel Groom had the shooting time down to **seconds**. (Groom was the politician who, it is said, was pleased Martin Bryant was strapped down onto a hospital bed as that **increased the pain** from his third-degree burns.)

party parliamentary asked Max Doyle to look into the problems surrounding the massacre. His interim report almost caused a state of apoplexy within the Tasmanian government when part of it was leaked to the media. The final report by Doyle was to be ready by the end of May 1997, but it was not until the 25th June that it was released by the joint-party parliamentary committee that had commissioned it. Hobart's newspaper The Mercury reported that event:

TOO HOT TO HANDLE

"The long-awaited Doyle Report into the turmoil at Port Arthur was still being kept under wraps last night – and it may never be publicly released.

The top-level, joint-party parliamentary committee which ordered the report is finding it too hot to handle. The committee – consisting of Tourism Minister Ray Groom, who has been in the front line of the Port Arthur fallout, Premier Tony Rundle, Labor leader Jim Bacon and independent MHA [member of house of assembly] Bruce Goodluck – held a behind closed doors meeting with special commissioner Max Doyle last night. They have had the report since Wednesday night. But those who have read it say it is political dynamite and a potential legal minefield.... Over the past week, authority chairman Michael Mazengarb, board member Geoff Stump and chief executive officer Craig Coombs have all resigned."⁷⁷

To overcome this problem, the DPP was required to make another report to answer many of the questions raised in the Doyle report. This report by the DPP centred on that door which **could not be opened during the massacre at Port Arthur.**

There was also activity within the Port Arthur management that came under criticism. In February 1997, the management released a memorandum to all staff titled *Port Arthur Incident Recent Media Speculation*. This file reads (indented below):

On Tuesday evening, the television media ran news and current affairs articles on several issues related to the Site. In several instances the comment was made that a door at the front of the retail area was inoperable, and it was suggested that the seven deceased within the retail area may have been alive today if that door had been operable.

The articles failed to adequately research or explain the issues relating to this door, and the overall impression is that the staff and management of the Site may be in some way indirectly responsible for the deaths of these people. Unfortunately, the way the Site was portrayed in these articles has resulted in instances of hostility being directed toward staff members, and there is some uneasiness between staff members with conflicting views.

This memo is being distributed to inform staff of the relevant issues and bring some control to the situation.

Issues Relating to 'the Door' Mentioned in Media Releases:

⁷⁷ Michael Lester. *State leaders face dilemma over Port Arthur report – TOO HOT TO HANDLE*; The Mercury; 20 June 1997.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

The door that is referred to was located on the south side (front) of the retail section, opening onto the centre of the verandah decking – immediately at the right of the existing stone wall with the large picture window.

The door did not provide external access directly into the public retail area. It provided access into a small space which was used as a store room. This room had three doors: the external one as mentioned, and two internal doors to the retail area. One door was never used and had retail equipment & wares stacked in front of it, the second was fitted with a signage to the contrary that that this was not an entry/exit and the public should use the café entrance. As the store was also used by staff on duty to store their personal bags etc, this door was normally kept closed or drawn-to, but not usually locked.

Examination of the external door following the incident revealed that the door latch mechanism was inoperable – whilst the internal handle moved as per normal, the latch bolt failed to retract into the door. There is some debate within staff as to whether this mechanism failed on the 28 April or whether it failed at some time beforehand. This is an explosive issue which could divide us and cause major harm and conflict when in reality it is a non-issue. It is extremely unlikely that the Authority & Staff should possess liability in relation to this door for the following reasons:

The door is not a *required exit* as defined by building regulations – the Building Code of Australia includes provisions governing the provision of external doorways to any building. This includes regulations on the number of exits, and the distance from any point inside a building to an outside space. The Broad Arrow Café complied with these regulations, checked by Tasman council when building alterations were undertaken in June-July 1995.

The door was not in use that day – no member of the public would have entered or exited the building through the doorway on that day or even in the preceding 9 months, and it is believed that it was not used by staff that day – hence no member of the public would have observed that the door was operational at any time. The door could not be misinterpreted as a public exit – it did not open directly from the public retail area to the outside – it was simply access into a non-public space; nor did it not have any signage which might indicate people could pass to the outside – in fact it had signage to the contrary.

Did it provide access to a safe area or a danger area – assuming for one moment that the door had remained operable, and also assuming that the people within the retail area had sufficient time to exit through it, the question arises as to would these people then be safe? On making this assumption, you must also take into account the possibility that the gunman could also use the door and pursue people out through it. No one, expert or otherwise is going to unequivocally state that they could guarantee one or all of those people would be alive today if they had been

*The Tasmanian government commissioned several reports but the authors were not permitted to address the ultimate issue – **the Truth.***

able to pass through that doorway. Evidence indicates that the gunman pursued and gunned down people outside the café in a similar fashion as inside. Therefore, any persons exiting through the door would have been passing from one life-threatening position to another life-threatening position.

Door function – the door appears to have been used only infrequently by staff at any time during the past, occasionally for deliveries or to connect to power when working outside on the decking. It was not used every day and was in no way essential to the operation of the retail area. The infrequent use is part of the difficulty we have in ascertaining the time at which the latch became inoperable.

The nature of the incident – the incident could not have been predicted and hence the staff and Authority could not have been expected to foresee and undertake measures beyond the required regulations – measures which only might have saved lives.

Both the Tasmania Police and the Coroner would be aware of the issues relating to the door for some time – the Tasmania Police took several statements in relation to the door in May-June of 1996, and have seen no reason to proceed further with inquiries.

If the door was operable, would it have saved lives? Perhaps. Perhaps not – the deceased may have simply got two steps outside before they were gunned down in a similar manner. To dwell on this question is likely to be far more destructive than constructive, at best an exercise in futility. To debate conflicting opinions and views between ourselves has the potential to open a whole range of old wounds and perhaps bring us all *down* in the end.

The media has presented a one-sided view. They have followed the old adage of not-letting-too-many-facts-get-in-the-way-of-a-sensational-story. Unfortunately, some people are taking exception to the Site based on what they have seen in the media.

This is only likely to get worse in the near future as additional related articles are expected.

Our role in all this is to ensure we don't add 'fuel to the fire' – by getting drawn into a volatile emotional debate, and that we don't bring each other down – by discussing 'what if' scenarios until we all become manic depressives.

Can we support each other through these difficult times.
Thank you.

(end)

⁷⁸ Max Doyle. *Report of the special commissioner for Port Arthur, Mr. Max Doyle, into matters affecting the Port Arthur Historic Site and other associated matters.* Hobart; 1997.

Now consider some of the arguments used in this statement with the time frame given by survivors outside the café of five minutes or more. In his report,⁷⁸ Max Doyle was scathing regarding this memorandum and its release to staff of the Port Arthur Historic Site. In section 8.12, the commissioner wrote (indented below):

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

An important item that has been continually raised by a large majority of people making submissions to the Commissioner is that associated with a door in the...Café which was deficient in its operation and could not be opened from within the building.

The Broad Arrow building was divided into sections, with one section operating as the café/restaurant and the other section used for commercial sales such as craft shop items, books and pamphlets, clothing and towels, etc. The two areas were screened off, but the general access to the areas was through the main doors. However, within the commercial craft area, there was a door which led to an outside area. This door had been reported as having a problem with the locking device and handle mechanism.

Advice has been given that the handle of the lock would turn, but that action failed to draw back the locking bolt, or head, from the door jam area so the door could not be opened.

Many staff members who worked in the area, and other staff members generally have confirmed that the door was used regularly by staff to allow them to go outside for a cigarette or a rest, or indeed to go to outside toilets, etc. It has been further stated that workmen used the door to gain access to power supply when they were using electrical tools, etc. It was further evidenced that on warm days, the door was propped open so that fresh air could circulate through this area of the shop and that tourists and visitors and shoppers used the door to access and egress the shop.

Indeed, the Commissioner was advised that the authority was aware of the problem, the door had been inspected and the lock found to be faulty and inoperable, and although it had been intended to have it repaired, such action had not been attended to prior to the shootings.

Consequently, it has been put to the Commissioner that, on the day of the shootings, some **seven people** in the shop area had rushed to the door area and had been shot at that spot. It is contended that the two staff who were working in this section would have been aware that the door was inoperative on the day and that is why they hid behind the counter as there was no other way to escape from the shop area. Both these staff members were shot whilst it is thought they were hiding from Bryant.

After the tragedy, much speculation and discussion was made about this door and eventually a staff memorandum was sent out from the office in respect to the door. The Commissioner discussed the issue of this memorandum with the CEO saying it was a very unusual action to be taken and that the wording of the document is, in itself, somewhat surprising. He was asked if he approved the issuing of the memorandum. Mr. Coombes, the CEO, advised that he was away at the time the memorandum was issued and that the Chairman of the Board had, he believed, not only approved the content of the memorandum, but Coombes felt the Chairman had encouraged its preparation and release.

*Any official who
argued over
a door lock,
really did not give
a damn about
all those who
had been
shot to death.*

In discussion with the Board on this subject, the Chairman agreed he was aware of the memorandum, but declined any comment on its issue, *etc.*

The Commissioner is of the view that the memorandum is in rather bad taste when one considers the circumstances of the event. He is also of the opinion that a "door is a door" and in the case of an emergency such as that which took place on April 28, people who were in the vicinity of the craft shop may well have realised their inability to escape from the shop through the main door of the café (an area in which Bryant⁷⁹ was present and in the course of discharging his firearm) and accordingly attempted to rush from the building via the door which was inoperable.

It can be fully appreciated that persons making submissions and comments on this door episode have very strong views that the Authority had a duty of care to act on the reported malfunction of the door's mechanism. Comment is also strong on the fact that people would believe the door could be opened and in the emergency that day, attempted to use it to make their escape.

The memorandum, however, remains a hot topic of debate. It contains such statements as:

i. Examination of the external door following the incident revealed that the door latch mechanism was inoperable – whilst the internal handle moved as per normal, the latch bolt failed to retract into the door. There is some debate within staff as to whether this mechanism failed on the 28th April or whether it failed at some time beforehand. This is an explosive issue which could divide us and cause major harm and conflict when in reality it is a non-issue. It is extremely unlikely that the Authority and staff should possess liability in relation to this door for the following reasons:

There is ample evidence to confirm that the door mechanism failed before the April event and, indeed, had been reported as deficient.

ii. The door was not in use that day – no member of the public would have entered or exited the building through the doorway on that day or even in the preceding 9 months, and it is believed that it was not used by staff that day – hence no member of the public would have observed that the door was operational at any time.

The comment that the door had not been used during the preceding 9 months is denied by staff who not only saw it being used, but actually used it themselves.

iii. Did it provide access to a safe area or a danger area – assuming for one moment that the door had remained operable, and also assuming that the people within the retail area had sufficient time to exit through it, the question arises as to would these

⁷⁹ Doyle just agreed with his official mates – *Martin Bryant was the gunman and he killed everyone inside the Broad Arrow Café.* Doyle had a perfect opportunity to address this wrong. He could have prepared a report with substance, one that might have resulted in Justice for all the victims. But Max Doyle **did not**.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

people then be safe? On making this assumption, you must also take into account the possibility that the gunman could also use the door and pursue people out through it. No one, expert or otherwise, is going to unequivocally state that they could guarantee one or all of those people would be alive today if they had been able to pass through that door. Evidence indicates that the gunman pursued & gunned down people outside the café in a similar fashion as inside. Therefore, any persons exiting through the door would have been passing from one life-threatening position to another life-threatening position.

It is quite irrational to argue in this manner. It could be easily put that if the gunman had pursued people through this door, then he may have only shot one person, so saving six others at least.

iv. Door function – the door appears to have been used only infrequently by staff at any time during the past; occasionally for deliveries or to connect power when working outside on the decking. It was not used every day and was in no way essential to the operation of the retail area. The infrequent use is part of the difficulty we have in ascertaining the time at which the latch became inoperable.

Here admission is made that, in fact, the door was used. The date on which the door problem was reported has been confirmed to the Commissioner as being before the tragedy. This was shown via the written comment and verbal admissions made to him.

v. The nature of the incident – the incident could not have been predicted and hence the staff and Authority could not have been expected to foresee and undertake measures beyond the required regulations – measures which only might have saved lives.

Perhaps a duty of care requires the Authority to be responsible for such matters.

vi. If the door was operable, would it have saved lives? Perhaps. Perhaps not – the deceased may have simply got two steps outside before they were gunned down in a similar manner. To dwell on this question is likely to be far more destructive than constructive, at best an exercise in futility. To debate conflicting opinions and views between ourselves has the potential to open a whole range of old wounds and perhaps bring us all “down” in the end.

These comments are amazing! To suggest that this is an exercise in futility and “could bring us all down” – **really does not address the need for open and honest consideration of such an important issue.**

vii. Our role in all this is to ensure we don’t add “fuel to the fire” – by getting drawn into a volatile emotional debate, and that we don’t bring each other down – by discussing “what if” scenarios until we all become manic depressives.

*Max Doyle
had a precious
moment to
speak up,
to say something
is wrong here
– but he
shut up
and never fought
for the truth,
for Martin Bryant.*

*How many
victims would have
to die
trapped by an
emergency door
that would
not open
before officials
in Tasmania
would admit
they were
responsible?*

Again, comments such as “don’t add fuel to the fire” and “that staff could become manic depressives” are such as perhaps confirm the concerns already expressed in this report of the lack of quality and professionalism of some of the management staff. **(end)**

Max Doyle then makes another statement in section 8.12. And considering that the apoplexy caused by the interim report, and that this report was toned down, this statement must be viewed as a revelation (indented below):

The concerns of so many people in respect to the “door” issue having been expressed to the Commissioner, he is of the opinion that **some form of investigation is necessary** to address the various issues of:

- Uncertainty of escape,
- Legal responsibility of maintenance,
- Operation of the various activities and the requirements of Building Regulations and Health Regulations,
- Regularity of inspection by Council and Government Inspectors of the operation,
- To address the correctness of comments such as those contained in the Staff Memorandum,
- To assist in the healing and recovery process.

The Commissioner is aware that the Office of the D.P.P. has been advised that a police investigation into the door matter concluded that the door was locked for security reasons in order to prevent shoplifting etc, yet such comment differs considerably from the information given to the Commissioner by staff who actually worked in the shop.

Then other submissions have been made that certain evidence given at the Bryant [hearing] is either **incorrect, or not factual**. Such matters as the time of the tragedy, etc. are being queried. (added emphasis)

Very particularly, many of those who have lost family and/or friends believe that there must be available to them some forum, or enquiry process, that will permit them to state their views, concerns and evidential type statements so that they are recorded. **Some have gone so far as to request a full Coronial Enquiry or a Royal Commission into the whole affair.** The Commissioner considers that a Coronial Enquiry would not achieve this end in that the decision of the Criminal Court cannot be changed by such an action. Again, a Royal Commission would be costly, and would involve a tremendous amount of hurt, trauma, and stress.

However, there is, in the Commissioner’s view, a need to provide some forum for those wishing to make submissions to be heard and their views recorded. Accordingly, it will be recommended that an opportunity be given for a form of semi-judicial hearing to be undertaken to address this issue. **(end)**

DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE

THOUGH motive need not be proved in law, the question of motive inevitably comes to the fore. Murderous acts prompt people to ask themselves and others – Why? Why did the perpetrator(s) do whatever was done? Though murder is an act perpetrated by humans, it is an aberration at the end of a behaviour scale. So understandably, people want to know what prompted or motivated the perpetrator(s) to kill. Officials charged with the responsibility of investigating the act(s), which are identified as crimes, also seek information which might help identify the motive. Knowing the motive for a crime can help investigators carry out their investigations.

All this is easy to comprehend. But it is not without associated problems. If the perpetrator of some murderous act is apprehended alive, he/she might be willing to relate what his/her motive was. In some (most?) cases, the motive might be glaringly apparent. But what if a perpetrator will not say why she/he did what was done? What if the perpetrator does not really know her/himself? And what if the perpetrator dies or is killed during the incident? Then we are left with having to identify what we believe the motive was, but never knowing with certainty if our conclusions are correct. We like to think we have good analytical minds, but.....


After Port Arthur, people raised the Dunblane incident as the motive. This incident took place in Scotland on 13 March 1996. That was 46 days before the incident at Port Arthur. Now given the heinous nature of what happened at Dunblane and the considerable media coverage, there would have been news or commentary on it for weeks in Australia. It is hard to imagine Martin Bryant did not, in some way, be it limited or not, hear or see something about Dunblane. But no credible evidence of him having discussed that incident seriously seems to have been presented. What happened was, people were quick to say the Dunblane Massacre (*sic*) motivated Bryant, or what happened at Dunblane was one of the factors which motivated him to perpetrate the incident at and near Port Arthur.

But there is no proof of this. And that something on this might have come out of the mouth of a psychiatrist does not confirm anything. No psychiatrist would know. And even if a person with a very low IQ said something specific is what caused her/him to do whatever was done, can we be sure as false confessions do happen. And another reality is that people with low intellects can respond in ways which they think they are expected to. Leading questions can produce answers which mislead an investigator and not take her/him in the right direction. This is why such questions are associated with unprofessional investigators.

There is no evidence Martin Bryant engaged with the Dunblane incident in his mind. There is no evidence that incident prompted him to amass firearms and "shitloads of ammo." The fact an incident occurred at Dunblane does not mean Martin Bryant perpetrated the incident at Port Arthur, which is how those using faulty logic relate the two incidents. There is no proof of any linkage whatsoever. If Martin mentioned Dunblane, it just makes him like millions of other people. His girlfriend reported nothing about him that led her to believe he was influenced in any way by Dunblane. – **ed**.

NOTE For details of this shocking incident which took the lives of 18 (2 adults, 16 children) read Sandra Uttley's *Dunblane Unburied*; 2006. Based on thorough research and official papers, her book reveals the official narrative is not the truth.

**DUNBLANE
UNBURIED**



bookfinder.com

*Amidst all the
official
disagreements,
the person
who was
completely ignored
was
Martin Bryant.*

The Commissioner Max Doyle is quite correct when he states that the Coronial Enquiry cannot overturn a decision of the Criminal Court. It is however section 25 (4) of the *Coroners Act 1995*, which holds the relevant law. It states this: "(4) If in the course of the criminal proceedings a person has been charged on indictment, the inquest, on its resumption, must not contain any findings which is inconsistent with the determination of the matter by the result of the proceedings."

What this means is that the coroner's court cannot overturn the conviction in the supreme court. However, since the matters pertaining to the door have not been brought before any court, then it is quite open for the coroner's court to consider just what part those facts did play in the deaths of the people who died within the Broad Arrow Café.

A Royal Commission however can overturn such a conviction. There is no actual process for the "semi-judicial enquiry" that Mr Doyle recommends, and **of course that matter was never considered**. Instead there was simply another report. What would have created the apoplexy with his interim report? Could it have been that in his interim report, the special commissioner did in fact recommend a Royal Commission, which so many people have been calling for?

The special commissioner had already witnessed the tremendous hurt, pain and trauma that the survivors had endured, not so much because of the actual massacre, but in their treatment in the aftermath, and the ways in which they had been silenced. His report had been reduced to about one third of the original. Almost a score of survivors had been calling for a proper inquiry into the massacre, and they all felt as though they had become untouchable, lepers within their community.

When the special commissioner first began his inquiry into the various aspects of the Port Arthur massacre, he received instructions not to talk to those survivors who were still receiving medical treatment. Mr Doyle showed the letter to Graeme Scurr, the husband of one such survivor, and asked him his opinion as to whether or not the survivors should be given the opportunity to talk with him. Scurr's advice was not to send the letter out to everyone at once. Mr Doyle asked why, to which Graeme Scurr replied that he would be killed in the stampede of survivors wishing to talk to him. **The isolation treatment meted out to Martin Bryant at Risdon Prison was also being used on the recalcitrant survivors.**

In his report on the Broad Arrow Café door, the DPP shows a completely different style to that of the special commissioner. Mr. Bugg states under the heading: "The scope and nature of the inquiry: The Special Commissioner, when he wrote to me on the 10th July, suggested that I make some public invitation to interested parties and staff that "should they desire so, they make contact with your office to arrange to give a submission" and concluded by saying, "the inquiry must be seen as completely open and available to the public for consultation."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Mr Bugg thought that was inappropriate. He concluded that any inquiries would be made in camera (secretly in his office).⁸⁰ He also concluded that he would **not** electronically record his interviews, but use handwritten notes, and that these notes would be retained by him and **not** form part of his report. Bugg writes (indented below):

I formally commenced the Inquiry on the 11th July when my secretary contacted the persons named in the Special Commissioner's list. Sergeant Bonde provided me with copies of statements and additional background information by letter dated the 13th July and I commenced interviews in my Office on Monday 14th July.

I spent all of Tuesday the 15th and Wednesday the 16th July in the Tasman Peninsula conducting interviews, inspecting documents and files. I returned to my Office on the 17th July and concluded interviews, reviewed the material I had obtained and conducted telephone interviews with persons interstate on Friday the 18th and Sunday the 20th July. **(end)**

So it took nine days from start to finish for Mr Bugg to obtain the necessary information for him to prepare his report. Mind you much of the information had already been gathered in previous statements made to police immediately after the massacre. In relation to the door, Mr Bugg was then able to make some conclusions. He states (indented below):

I have previously stated that I have interviewed most staff who worked in the craft souvenir section of the building between its re-opening in July 1995 and the 28th April 1996. I am satisfied that there is sufficient evidence from these staff members to conclude that the doorway was put to the following usage:

- 1) the exterior handle was always deadlocked against entry;
- 2) the interior handle was usually unlocked, i.e. the door could be opened from inside;
- 3) the door was, during summer, kept shut and was not available to the public;
- 4) those staff members working in this area of the building who smoked would, when their duties permitted, use the doorway to exit the building to smoke cigarettes;
- 5) during the summer when the weather was very hot the door was held open by placement of a stone in front of it to permit an additional flow of air through the building. When this occurred members of the public and some staff used the open doorway as an access or egress point in addition to the other two doorways identified (the main front doorway and the side doorway). This also facilitated the movement of customers through the retail and food areas during what is regarded as the busy period (January/February);

⁸⁰ This is what all officials do best, things in secret behind closed doors – never openly, never publicly for the world to know.

6) for a period during the summer of 95/96 the doorway was locked against entry because a group of youths visiting the district had stolen property from the gift and craft area of the premises. At about this time, it would seem, a specific direction was given that staff were to ensure that the door was locked against entry presumably with the exception of those very hot days when the door was propped open to create a through draft;

7) sometimes particular staff of the Authority who were having lunch on the deck in front of the craft shop section would be sought by telephone at the Broad Arrow Café and the doorway was used to give them entry from outside to the telephone in the souvenir section of the building. **(end)**

As can be seen, that door, which Mr Bugg had originally passed over as simply being locked in his statement of facts to the supreme court, **caused two special reports to be prepared:**

1. That of the special commissioner Max Doyle who in his interim report apparently requested a Royal Commission; and,
2. The reply of the director of public prosecutions, Damian Bugg.

However, if there is consideration put to item (6) of Bugg's conclusions, in relation as to how is a fire doorlock actually negated in relation to the supposed petty thefts, when it is both illegal and impossible to do so without removing the actual fire-exit doorlock? Since the actual lock was not removed, then either the lock itself was faulty or the door would have had to have been nailed shut. Whichever way it goes is immaterial, as **both contain a high degree of culpability**, which falls upon the management of the Port Arthur Historic Site.

An article in The Mercury newspaper was headlined as follows: *Faulty door did not affect toll: Report*. The actual article reads: "An official inquiry has rejected claims that a faulty locked door was responsible for up to nine deaths in the Broad Arrow Café in the Port Arthur Massacre. The inquiry was conducted by Director of Public Prosecutions Damian Bugg at the request of the joint parliamentary committee following the report of Port Arthur special commissioner Max Doyle."⁸¹

Bugg's 52-page report made two key findings. They are: **1.** The door was not marked as an exit; and, **2.** He was unable to determine that any person attempted to escape through the door.

A person should consider the importance of any door that is not marked as an exit door, even though it is plainly visible that this particular door does lead to the outside. There is also a matter of credence in Bugg stating that he was unable to determine that any person attempted to escape through the doorway. There is though *prima facie* evidence that **people headed for that door in an attempt to escape**. That was the position where bodies were recovered.

⁸¹ Sue Bailey. *Faulty door did not affect toll: Report*. The Mercury; 13 August 1997.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Attachment three to the Bugg report was an appraisal of the lock by a senior locksmith from the firm Jacksons Security of 123 Murray Street, Hobart. Mr Bugg had the lock removed from the door, and then conveyed it to Hobart where it was examined and the appraisal submitted. It reads (indented below):

LETTER OF JACKSONS SECURITY
Re: Broad Arrow Café fire exit lock

Dear Sir,

At your request I have examined the lock that you have indicated came from the Broad Arrow Café at Port Arthur.

The lock is a Lockwood 930 series fire escape lock, either 936 or 929, the exact identification being made impossible because of the absence of the internal handle. However the condition of the lock's internal rose rules out the possibility of the handle having another function except fire escape.

On examination of the lock I have found that both handles would have been in working condition, however evidence of deterioration in other parts of the lock lead me to believe that the lock was not functioning in its normal capacity.

- * Corrosion has occurred within the latch body which would cause difficulty in retracting the latch.
- * A crack in the spindle housing (latch retractor) would have created tension within the latch mechanism making it difficult for the latch to retract.

IN SUMMARY

Without having examined the lock fitting and the door jamb into which it was locking, it is difficult to give a full assessment of how the lock was actually functioning in everyday use, however it is my opinion that although this lock may have been difficult to operate, it would not have been impossible to open the door.

We have now been informed that the non-operating door lock was a "fire exit lock". This type of lock has only one function and that is to permit people inside a building to exit post haste in the case of an emergency such as a fire. The legal requirements in relation to this lock are very specific.

If the first person to reach the door failed in her/his endeavour to open it, I cannot see those victims behind her/him saying: "Move over. Give me a go." Furthermore, there was a greater period of time for the escapes to have been made, especially when it is remembered that the men were able to find hiding places for their wives before they were murdered. This and the fact that the gunman was not as competent as has been alleged, demonstrate the **official moves made to deny justice to the victims.** ■

(amended; original & added emphasis)

*After
Damian Bugg
set up
innocent
Martin Bryant
to die inside
Risdon Prison,
the State
made Bugg a
Member of the
Order of Australia
– it was
State buggery
at its best.*

ENDING

ANY thinking and reasonable person who delves into the writing on and the research into the Port Arthur case will find question after question arising in her/his mind, if all the known facts are considered honestly. Given the incident itself was horrific, those questions are not minor. Thus, answers to them require more than parroting the words of some lying and/or clueless official(s).

Working against any such person who attempts to understand the case is the fact that the State has had total control over the incident before, during, and after it took place. Evidence confirms this. The incident at Port Arthur was not something spontaneous or something hastily thought up the night before. All the planning – things like the conferences and seminars, the 22-body refrigerated mortuary truck, the embalming equipment, *etc.* – not only **confirms the State was involved**, but also confirms that **Martin Bryant was not involved**. He simply could not have made all the plans then carried out all the necessary acts. His mother and his girlfriend have candidly revealed – he did not have the brains for it. **He had the competence of an 11-year-old boy.**

That the State insists Martin Bryant was the sole planner, the sole organizer, the sole gunman, the sole everything tells us how corrupt the State is. Witness after witness, investigator after investigator, fact after fact, tells us that Martin was no more than a patsy. In the early part of the SOG siege at Seascope, he might have enjoyed the excitement, and pretending to be *Jamie*, and making snacks for all those in the cottage. But during that time, there is no evidence he knew what had taken place at the Port Arthur Historic Site, and at the tollbooth, and at that general store, and out on the highway near Seascope. That someone who had some physical similarities had used some yellow Volvo and had murdered so many people is not something any of the evidence says Martin knew. The corrupt State wants you to believe Martin Bryant knew and did everything. **But he didn't.**

Then after the incident had ended, the corrupt State fought long and hard to prevent people, who had lost members of their families at the Broad Arrow Café, from being given all the details related to the inoperative emergency door there. Martin Bryant had no control over that door before, during, or after the incident. The State did, and it exerted all its resources to maintain control over that door, and over the café, and over the historic site staff. Against all the many long-established and internationally recognized investigative procedures, the corrupt State has taken steps to see that evidence in this case was either not collected (fingerprints), or it was allowed to disappear (video camera), or it was ignored (*Witness Statements*). Recall the many evidential items that went missing from Seascope.

As for the shocked and shattered families, every subsequent suicide, the crushing grief and misery, and all the unanswered questions, the State does not give a damn. Martin is going to pay for the sins of the State. He is now paying dearly for them at Risdon Prison just outside Hobart where he is being tortured to death by despair. Acts by the corrupt State confirm **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!** ■

JUSTICE

9



CONCERN

The absence of proved truths means justice in the Port Arthur case has not been served and arbitrarily three lawyers decided what the truths are, what justice is, then sent an innocent person to prison.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
■ FORETHOUGHTS	Image	585
■ INTRODUCTION		587
■ THE MERCURY	Noble	589
ZARA DAWTREY	Image	
ABOUT AUSTRALIA		
MICHAEL DYSON	Image	
EMAIL MASS MURDER		
■ SUMMARY	Beattie	599
BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT		
MAGNA CARTA 1215		
■ UNSAVOURY JOHN AVERY	Noble	603
JOHN AVERY	Image	
JUST A FEW JOHN AVERY QUOTES		
LETTER TO JOHN AVERY		
■ ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO	MacGregor	613
JUDGES AND JUSTICE ARE NOT....	Image	
WHAT THE IGNORANT OVERLOOK		
JUDICIAL CORRUPTION AND....		
TERRY McCARTHY	Image	
EVERYONE KNOWS HE DID IT		
■ MISSING EVIDENCE	Noble	631
COMMODORE (GM) 1996	Image	
NAKED BLACK-HAIRED WOMAN	Image	
OFFICIALLY KILLED....		
BENJAMIN OVERBEEKE(?)	Images	
PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT....		
RUSSELL POLLARD(?)	Image	
ROBERT SALZMANN(?)	Image	
HELENE SALZMANN(?)	Image	
PLAQUE – OFFICIALLY KILLED....	Image	
■ ENDING		644

COUNTS

Images 15, Inserts 16, Notes 83, Pages 62

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

FORETHOUGHTS

■ “Judicial corruption concerns acts, behaviour or attempted acts that **impair the search for or the submission of truth** in the delivery of justice. This pertains to investigations and pre-trial processes in addition to actual trial process.” (added emphasis)

Asian Human Rights Commission

*NEPAL: Supreme court punishes
the messenger and ignores the message*
19 September 2008

■ “With over 20 years as a police officer in Queensland i can categorically say this is the most disgusting & disgraceful travesty of justice i have ever encountered in my entire life. This is blatantly a **false flag operation which was purely & simply to disarm the Australian public**. The whole timeline from the Tavistock Institute psychiatrists involvement to the manner in which Martin was treated by the legal system is unbelievable. My heart goes out to poor Martin who has just been used as a **patsy!!**” (*sic*; added emphasis)

The Cadstar¹

*Port Arthur Massacre BA Cafe Shooter?:
Martin Bryant innocent*
youtube.com
28 November 2012

■ “**Australian courts are little concerned with democracy or justice.**” (added emphasis)

G.E. (Tony) Fitzgerald²

The Australian
4 November 2005

■ “What is not pardonable is if the mistakes are committed as a result of deliberate attempts to deceive the public. And we all know that, in some instances, pressure can lead some people to pull the wool over our eyes to turn off the heat. In fact, deception can sometimes succeed in doing just that – relieve the pressure on authorities to come up with something to appease a demanding public. But in so doing, justice is not served. **No justice is ever served if the truth is embellished or compromised.**” (added emphasis)

Freeman Opinion

philstar.com
14 January 2009

■ “The *lone-nut* theory³ is never true. Corrupt cops are accessories to all these very public crimes designed in advance to achieve some broad social agenda. These seem to be the two major lessons the increasingly outraged American [and Australian] public is beginning to learn. The secondary lesson is that psychiatric drugging is a crucial precondition to the execution of these acts and, by implication, the entire psychiatric industry is a hoax used for multiple purposes harmful to the health of everyone who uses them.”

John Kaminski

The shooter setup
justgroundsonline.com
6 May 2013

¹ Without a name, we have no way of checking this Internet post. But the content seems credible. Not all cops are liars, but the organizational structure and their work ensure lies are the currency of cops in general. This is what Bruce Day, another cop with **20 years experience** in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, says in his book *Hey Cop!*; 2008; pp. 147, 150: “Lying gets easier the longer you stay on the police service” and “[E]verything internal is built upon a system of intricate lies.”


² A former state and federal judge. He authored a most damning report* which rocked Queensland in the late 80s. It detailed the gross and notorious corruption within the Queensland Police Force. Cops were found to have a marked propensity to be deceitful and dishonest. Twenty-five years on, Queensland cops are still questioned, criticized, and cursed by the public who the cops do not serve – just google: police violence ethics Queensland. (**Fitzgerald Report – Report of a Commission of Inquiry Pursuant to Orders in Council; Brisbane: Queensland Government; 1989.*)

³ The *lone-nut* theory is prized by officials. It is easier to deal with than a case in which there is a real perpetrator, or there are multiple perpetrators. And thus, by not conducting a proper investigation, investigative expenses are greatly reduced.

⁴ See Insert *TASMANIAN DISASTER INCIDENTS* in Part 4. Bushfires are a dangerous fact of life in Tasmania and other parts of Australia.

⁵ Selsor was officially killed with a lethal injection on 1 May 2012 in Oklahoma. Whether caused by lethal injection, or at the end of a rope, or after years of cage-induced insanity, death is the inevitable end result. When innocent Martin Bryant was sent to prison, it was for the term of his natural life. (no parole) Officials will cause Martin's death. They will call it justice to ease their conscience – if they have any. But it is **murder** as State officials want Martin to die in prison. They were fully aware that the sentence will **lead to his death**. Working together, the killers John Avery, Damian Bugg, and William Cox will have **caused the death** of innocent Martin Bryant. And his cold lifeless corpse will be the proof.

⁶ Readers are encouraged to read the book *Injustice* by author Smith. He reveals how evidence is manipulated by lawyers. (Though the legal system in the US is in many ways different to that in Australia, the foundation of both is the inherently flawed adversarial system. After the first few pages of his book, it seems that Smith had a doomed client. But bit by bit, this good lawyer fought the system and proved his client was innocent. But in 2019, Krish Maharaj is still in prison (since 1986). **He has served nearly 33 years because legal systems resist admitting their errors.** see reprieve.org.uk article *Kris Maharaj turns 80* by Smith.



■ “Too many unanswered questions, so glad to see some people have woken up. All the best to Carleen [Bryant]. Maybe now some victims also might get some justice. They had an inquiry for all the fires,⁴ **what happened to investigating Port Arthur???** It’s disgraceful and the **greatest injustice in Australian history.**” (added emphasis)

Kathy of Victoria

Massacre victims' families outraged over mum's book....
perthnow.com.au
5 December 2010

■ “To state that there was a trial of Martin Bryant in relation to the Port Arthur massacre is a misnomer in every sense of the word, as except for the media witch hunt by the rabid journalists who conducted their own kangaroo court, **there was never any trial.**” (added emphasis)

Andrew S. MacGregor

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur
2001-4: p. 205

■ “The only difference between death and life without parole is one you kill me now, the other one you kill me later.”⁵

Michael Bascum Selsor

Interview with a death-row inmate
(7 May 2010 interview by Josh Rushing)
english.aljazeera.net
10 May 2012

■ “[P]olice interview a witness to prepare the prosecution case, and this is a process that will reflect police predispositions.”

■ “[T]here is rather a nebulous line between effective adversarial lawyering and what amounts to suborning perjury.”

Clive Stafford Smith⁶

Injustice
2002: p. 84

■ “In the context of miscarriages of justice, the process of case construction has in some ways moved further, beyond just building up the case against the suspect; notoriously, the suppression of counter evidence has come into play.... This pushes the ‘closed mindset’ of investigations to the extreme – not so much ‘closure’ but the veritable **exclusion of all [evidence] that does not fit the initial narrative.**”⁶ (added emphasis)

Stephen P. Savage, Becky Milne
in Handbook of Criminal Investigation
2007: p. 615

■ “To one degree or another, **all frame-ups of people are orchestrated by prosecutors** acting behind the scenes.”

Hans Sherrer

Prosecutors are master framers
Justice Denied
1999: vol. 1, no. 9

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

INTRODUCTION

ON the cover of all books in the EUREKA STOCKADE series appear insightful words of the German philosopher Nietzsche (1844-1900): *All truths kept silent become poisonous*. It is these words which have led to this book being compiled.

Since well before, how much the public has yet to learn, the incident at and near Port Arthur which took place on 28 and 29 April 1996, truths have been kept secret from the people of Australia. It is not as some unthinking people imagine. There most probably never was any plenary meeting where motives and massacres and media coverage were discussed and voted on. A meeting with an agenda and ad hoc committees and refreshment breaks and words from the chairman about how everyone is expected to contribute to the overall success of the incident. No. Not that sort of meeting.

Slowly, quietly, incrementally, the deadly process was moved forward. Those who had to know were told all they needed to know. Those who did not have to know were kept away from the truth. And the devil's cauldron was slowly filled with an abomination of ingredients, all stirred by evil acolytes – the smell pure Stygian. Men dressed in grey soul-less suits worked at bringing the whole thing to success. A decision here, a decision there. Site selection here, patsy conditioning there. A 22-body refrigerated wagon here,⁷ a special embalming box there.⁸ A few *words* with the right person here, some actions there. Slowly and quietly the planning was done.

And on that Sunday they came with no idea about what had been prepared for them. Innocent. Sacrificial lambs. Good decent people to be shot to death to show the nation that shooting people is wrong. Good decent people to slaughter and harm with a patsy to blame and officials to spread the name – Martin Bryant. And after the horrible deeds were done, the truth was kept silent and lies and disinformation became the currency of communication. Shocked beyond comprehension, people at and near Port Arthur found themselves in a psycho-political exercise planned to terrorize then traumatize them. And it did. Then they were lied to and the truth was kept from them – from all Australians.

The poison is there, bitter and lethal. Seeping and trickling, it just won't stop. The truth is not lies, and lies are not truth. There is no justice. The Port Arthur incident is **the worst contrived injustice in all Australian history**. This injustice does not only refer to the damnation inflicted on innocent Martin Bryant, or on the families, friends, and relatives of the murdered and wounded. No. This injustice was inflicted on the entire nation. Legislated legal processes have been completely ignored so lies can be further worked into the minds of those too weak to disbelieve. It is injustice on a Hitlerian scale, proving yet again *the bigger the lie the more it will be believed*.

No honest thinking person, who undertakes a serious study of the Port Arthur case literature, can arrive at any conclusion other than: we the people have **not been told the truth** and considerable official efforts have been made to **keep the truth from us**. It is poisonous.

⁷ Hobart, Tasmania.

⁸ Melbourne, Victoria.

This part of the book is headed Justice. This is what we all expect, and are rightly entitled to. But it is not what is always served. Using a corrupt process, **the State has perverted the course of justice.** In that process, the State has stopped the truth from being told to the public, and it made a spectacle of the person it wants everyone to believe is the *lone-nut* gunman entirely responsible for the incident at Port Arthur. It is a process of **one abomination after another.** Note these words of the Latin playwright Terence (c.190-159 BCE): *One falsehood treads on the heels of another.*

And to do what it has undeniably done, the State was assisted by individuals, officials, the media, and all other groupings in Australia which remained silent and thereby helped the State keep the truth hidden. People, especially opinion leaders, did not speak up and express their concerns. Officials more concerned about their mortgages refused to think. And the media had a great big *monster* story to tell eager ears and eager eyes.

Collectively, the nation was stood on its head. Only a few people had concerns and expressed them. Justice was denied a *boy-man* who had the abilities of a grade-six pupil. It was denied without hesitation or reservation. (What came out the mouth of the DPP, Damian Bugg, was abject cruelty.) The sickening Justice (*sic*) William Cox took out his verbal lances and, like the centurion did to Jesus, he drove one right into Martin's side, calling him a "social misfit." Cox thought that was a good thing to say, as he considered Martin was a mentally-handicapped idiot who could be hated and humiliated with impunity. Well Cox, your words tell us what you are – **despicable scum.**

And if you think this is being a bit too hard on Cox, just reflect a little on what he did to Martin Bryant, without having heard or seen a single word of hard evidence. Assertion after assertion was made by Bugg with not one proved during a trial. And after Avery's plea of guilty was submitted, the State said and wrote whatever it wanted about Martin Bryant.

And this is what this killer Cox said: "MARTIN BRYANT – on each of the thirty-five counts of murder in this indictment you are sentenced to imprisonment for the term of your natural life. I order that you not be eligible for parole in respect of any such sentence."⁹ It is a **death sentence.** Death by slow relentless torture. As Cox knows. But you are supposed to have respect for this honourable gentleman who has half an alphabet hanging from his rear. All titled up complaisant to the max, a man whose conscience abhors facts.

The whole Port Arthur case is poisonous to the extreme. There is a cure for this poison and it is called Truth. But for all those willingly involved, this cure will be worse than the disease. So now they are in a dilemma. They can come after this editor and *kill* him. Or they can hunker down and hope things pass over, or better yet Martin Bryant dies which will give them another opportunity to push their corrupt official narrative. But truths kept silent become poisonous. Eventually, they will taste the bitterness on their forked tongues. And the Truth will still be there, it won't ever go away. – **ed.**

⁹ *R v Martin Bryant*, 22 November 1996.

THE MERCURY
Port Arthur Conspiracy Anger – Rebuttal¹⁰
Keith Allan Noble¹¹

*The Mercury listens to, learns from and leads
the Tasmanian community by providing readers
with a major forum for debate.*¹²

FOR international readers, and for Australians unaware of the media situation in Tasmania, The Mercury is that state's largest-circulation daily newspaper. Of tabloid format, it is printed in the state capital Hobart and has an **average daily readership** of c.44,500. It is a standard mainstream (traditional and conservative) newspaper, announcing itself as **The Voice of Tasmania**.

The Mercury is owned by News Limited, the chairman of which is Rupert Murdoch. According to wikipedia.org: "News Limited publishes a nationally distributed newspaper in Australia, a metropolitan newspaper in each of the Australian cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, Perth (Sundays only), Hobart, and Darwin and groups of suburban newspapers in the suburbs of Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Brisbane and Perth. The company publishes a further thirty magazine titles across Australia."

Now some say this weighty press portfolio does not encourage or entertain non-traditional news and views. In Tasmania specifically, The Mercury claims it is a "major forum for debate," but this is not true in relation to all topics. As we shall soon see.

But before we look at the *Port Arthur Conspiracy Anger* article, which appeared in The Mercury on **9 May 2013**, we must put some things into their context. Without doing this, readers might wonder why the gripes of some Mick Dyson in relation to a place called Port Arthur are of any interest. They are, but first we need to elaborate a little on The Mercury and Port Arthur, as the relationship between the two is a highly significant story in itself.

On Sunday 28 April 1996, a murderous shooting incident at and near Port Arthur thrust Tasmania into the international news: Where is Port Arthur? What happened? *etc., etc.* people asked. At that time, an international media conference was scheduled to be held in Hobart commencing the next day, Monday 29 April 1996. The related literature says c.700 media people were booked to attend that conference and of course such a major incident held their attention. As part of the *incident management*, the government of Tasmania actually provided a bus service and a guided tour to journalists on Monday 29th, after the siege at Seascope cottage had ended.¹³

¹⁰ On 17 May 2013, this 10-page rebuttal was emailed to the reporter Zara Dawtrey of The Mercury. But this editor has not received a reply, either directly or through the paper. On 13 October 2013, two more rubbish articles were published by The Mercury and other Murdoch media outlets in Australia: **1. Police officer's chilling contact with a killer** by Kieran Campbell; & **2. My time with mass killer Martin Bryant** by Phil Pyke. No investigative journalism is reflected in those articles. Both are opinion pieces from two people whose opinions are meaningless, and who have no understanding of **Truth** and **Justice**. The articles do not address any of the many unanswered serious questions in the case. Nor do the articles say a word about the **refrigerated mortuary truck**, or **special embalming equipment** all manufactured before the planned mass murder was officially perpetrated. And the articles also do not tell the readers that **Martin Bryant had no legal representation and there was no trial**. A five-page rebuttal (14 October 2013; available MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com) was sent to The Mercury. And again, no reply was received.

¹¹ The editor of **MASS MURDER: Official Killing in Tasmania, Australia**. 1st ed Jun 2013; 2nd ed Jan 2014.

¹² themercury.com.au; About Us.

¹³ The siege ended at 8:35 a.m. on 29 April 1996 when Martin Bryant was apprehended naked, burnt, and disoriented at Seascope cottage. See Richard McCreddie. *Port Arthur – An Overview of the police response*. Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 6.

Then things went the way they should not have gone – things went against the law. It was as if the killing and wounding of over 55 people permitted the media to exceed its clearly defined limitations. One commentator stated this: “[O]utrage against this [*boy-*]man was akin to the old wild west lynch mobs. I just couldn’t forget the trouble that the media went to profile Bryant, from enhancing of his photograph to make him look like a wild-eyed Manson maniac to the innuendoes that his house was an arsenal for military weapons.”¹⁴ (added italics)

There were no limits to it. Excess was the order of the day, the week, the month – in fact, excess goes on to this day. After destroying that innocent *boy-man*, his chance of getting a proper trial was zero. This is what the same commentator stated: “All of this made finding an impartial jury almost impossible – perhaps that was the idea.... Martin Bryant’s trial was not by jury but rather by media.” Periodically, whenever the media has a slow-news day, some reporter somewhere whips together an article about a crazed, mad, *lone-nut* gunman, finds an image in the archive, then meets the deadline – oh so thoroughly convinced that not only is her/his story well written, but that Martin Bryant deserves to have his guts kicked in one more time.

The following is a comment this editor has seen, and he believes such lapses of sanity are most definitely aided and abetted by the media’s unethical and unprofessional mishandling of the Port Arthur case: “MARTIN BRYANT SHOULD HAVE BEEN PUBLICLY CASTRATED WITH A RUSTY BLUNT KNIFE AN THEN WASHED WITH SULFURIC ACID THEN SENT TO GALLOWS.”¹⁵ (*sic*; original capitals) It is no excuse that the crime was heinous and upsetting, so it is understandable people take a few liberties. This is completely unacceptable.

Where were the voices of the wise old chief editors in April 1996? The ones who could prepare enlightening articles with all the essential cautions. Gone – replaced by mindless employees who didn’t then and still today don’t give a damn about Truth and Justice. Who are disdainful about the legal principle of **people being innocent until proven guilty** in a trial – not declared guilty after some process conducted by corrupt lawyers. Their media channels flow with stories about corrupt police, corrupt prosecutors, corrupt judges, corrupt politicians, and verily, corrupt men of the Church. Yet all this they wilfully overlook. With their critical faculties underdeveloped or held in abeyance, they mindlessly report the corrupt official narrative.

Somehow, in relation to the Port Arthur incident, these media minions expect us to believe that everyone associated with the State told the truth and nothing but the truth. For that one incident, everything was ridgy didge spot-on-honest as the day is long. And it was Martin Bryant who told all the lies. He must have. He killed those little girls. *Everyone knows he did it. Get me that RUSTY KNIFE and the SULFURIC ACID. Then we’ll fill his arse with broken glass.....*

The Mercury was right in there hammer and tongs – unfortunately, a wise editor was absent. This gave the world that two-page tabloid spread of innocent Martin Bryant beneath that big banner headline

¹⁴ Ned Wood. *The Port Arthur massacre conspiracy*; members.iinet.com.au; 2 September 2012. An image of Martin Bryant which was manipulated to make his eyes appear demonic and deranged was widely used by the media. Cruel writers and/or editors still use it. For details related to the arsenal of weapons allegedly found inside Martin Bryant’s home, see the Insert *FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT* in Part 7. It reveals how this concocted evidence was set up by a corrupt cop.

¹⁵ *Benny of Brisbane*, Australia; topix.com – 22 March 2013.


OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

of certainty: **THIS IS THE MAN.**¹⁶ That image The Mercury used was stolen, and it was against the law to publish such an article. The article demonized that *boy-man*, who, with his 66 IQ, was totally bewildered and beyond comprehending what was being done to him. There sure was no debate – just columns of hate and vitriol.

One of those employees of the State whom we are to believe is a meticulous teller of truths is **Michael Charles Dyson**. We are to believe he knows nothing about the Port Arthur incident beyond what he learnt as a “liaison officer”¹⁷ during the incident. Sounds good, but.... Mick has a reputation. You can read about it on the Internet. Everything significant about him within this book is on the Internet and has been for some time. *Where there’s smoke, there’s fire.*

It seems Dyson likes violence. And when you have someone who is keen about violence in the police force – for Dyson it was Tasmania Police – it is not hard to imagine things could go awry, seriously sour. And it seems they did. This is how Dyson describes his real interest: “I was being given an opportunity to go to the more strategic level and become involved in the overall command of violent incidents **which is my passion....**”¹⁸ So we have a man who not only likes being involved with violent incidents, but one who tells the world he has a **passion** to be involved with death and destruction. Well as for this editor, it is my belief this Dyson is sick – a mentally-imbalanced person who is dangerous. And devious, as we shall soon see.

ZARA DAWTREY



original cropped image

Now Mick Dyson is the person Zara Dawtrey of The Mercury has written about under the headline *Port Arthur conspiracy anger*. But first, who is Zara Dawtrey? Well, a writer at that newspaper and this editor cannot be more specific than that. An Internet search of her name turned up the to-be-expected Facebook and Twitter references. But beyond this, it seems Ms. Dawtrey writes articles in several areas: cars; crimewatch; sports; *etc.* Bits of anything for The Mercury. No serious articles of investigative journalism were found. This has led this editor to wonder just how well investigated the piece on Dyson is. Well, an analysis of

it is disturbing. The Port Arthur incident resulted in over 55 people being killed and wounded and Dyson was right there in the thick of it. But readers of Dawtrey’s article don’t get much more than a few sentences including the standard **conspiracy cliché**. Dyson seems to have had a little cry to Dawtrey and she has written a few words (362) to appease him. Below, her entire article which appeared in The Mercury has been sequentially segmented and *italicized* with this editor’s (Noble) comments following.

¹⁶ Headline used by The Mercury for a badly worded article identifying Martin Bryant with the incident at Port Arthur. The last sentence of the article dated 30 April 1996 reads: “This man is Martin Bryant, 28, a man of mystery from Hobart suburb of New Town.” Note The Mercury was not the only media channel to identify Martin Bryant with the incident – identify him without any hard evidence to prove the endless assertions.

¹⁷ This is the job description that Michael Charles Dyson states he had during the Port Arthur incident. See Insert *FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT* in Part 7 for details.

¹⁸ Commission of Inquiry Relating to the Death [SOG Killing] of Joseph Gilewicz; *Transcript*; Hobart: Dept. of Justice (*sic*); 7 September 2000: p. 426.

SIX months after a Facebook profile purporting to belong to jailed mass murderer Martin Bryant caused widespread community concern, a vicious international internet campaign is accusing two local police officers of being the real killers.

This editor cannot comment on any Facebook profile. He knows nothing about the so-called social-networking websites. It is correct that Martin Bryant – the *boy-man* who had an **IQ of 66** and a klutz-factor off the scale – has been **incarcerated forever**. But Dawtrey does not tell her readers that Martin will never be released from Risdon Prison. As you read this, he is being tortured to death there by despair and drugs. Martin will be the **36th State victim** of the Port Arthur incident. (Other people who were involved with the incident have died of suicide – **indirectly killed by the State**. Of course the State does not want you to know this.)

As for “accusing two local police officers of being the real killers,” this is not accurate at all. Probably all, certainly most, of the cops who were involved with the incident have retired from their respective employers. Today, no local cops are being accused of anything. And, no retired cops have been accused of anything that is not well documented on the Internet – documented for some time it seems. Dawtrey does not name both ex-cops. Why? Is this because when **Michael Charles Dyson** phoned Dawtrey he did not identify his mate **Gerard Dutton**? As for accusing them of being the killers, this editor would like to see the proof in writing.

Dutton is the technician who miraculously raised rifles from the dead. Then, without any hard evidence, he pronounced they belonged to Martin Bryant.¹⁹ But this was not proved because there was **NO trial**. For an exposé of Dutton’s *Statutory Declaration*, see the noted book (Part 6). The author of that exposé ends it with these revealing words related to this charlatan miracle worker: “it cannot get any worse than the errors demonstrated within his sworn statement.”²⁰

And the other ex-cop cum security company executive is of course Dyson. He is also indentified as *Mick/Rick(?)*, *Jamie*, and it is believed he was **one of the gunmen at Seascapes cottage**. The other gunman there, who it is believed was also the gunman at the other six crime scenes is **Benjamin Overbeeke**. This editor has never said Dyson shot any person. To say this editor said Dyson is “the real killer” is deceptive nonsense. You can read lots more about Dyson in the noted book, particularly Part 7 (The Witnesses). In it, there is the nine-page Insert titled *FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT*. Dyson submitted that statement 4.5 months after the Port Arthur incident, and a month after (*sic*) the incident task force ended. But it seems being a **Son of God**,²¹ this *main man* Dyson had dispensation²² to cover up the official lies. But he has made things worse.

Dutton and Dyson have written so many **false and deceptive** statements their incriminating words are now going to cause serious problems for all those who were and those who are officials associated with the killing and wounding at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania. The official narrative is coming apart because of Dutton and Dyson.

¹⁹ See Insert *NEITHER OWNED NOR FIRED* in Part 6 of the noted book.

²⁰ Andrew S. MacGregor. See *STATUTORY DECLARATION EXTRACTS* at Part 6 of the noted book.

²¹ Identity used by Tasmania Police members who belong to the Special Operation Group of thugs.

²² It seems that Dyson was asked by the office of the director of public prosecutions, perhaps Damian Bugg the prosecutor himself, to prepare a document which would cover up things exculpatory for Martin Bryant and inculpatory for the State.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

A conspiracy theorist based in Austria, and claiming to be a former Tasmanian, is writing a book about the massacre in which he claims Bryant is the innocent victim of a killing spree planned and carried out by the government and police.

More inaccurate rubbish. This editor is not from Tasmania and has never claimed to be. Is this Dawtrey's doing, or was she misinformed by Dyson? She definitely should have checked – but did not. A small error, but one not nugatory. It seems to reflect the approach Dawtrey took to the writing of her article – slapdash, no reference checking, get it out for the deadline. Born in Queensland, this editor is in Austria temporarily and normally lives in Germany. Currently, he is contemplating a relocation.

Then comes the cliché: "conspiracy theorist." This is the best that Dawtrey can write. It is a worn-out phrase used to verbally abuse anyone who raises any matter that does not fit into some official narrative. On the usage of this mindless and meaningless phrase, the words of another blonde Facebook user, Ellen Finnigan, appear on lewrockwell.com (24 January 2012). This American activist-author states: "[M]ost of the time the term *conspiracy theorist* is used to slander people who are merely asking questions that mainstream journalists have been content to ignore, or who simply have a higher bar than 'the media said so' or 'the government said so' when it comes to accepting something as truth." **Thank you Ellen.**

It can be said this editor is writing a book on the Port Arthur case. But it is more accurate to say he is compiling a book of writings on that subject. All of this writing has appeared in some form on the Internet. The authors, about 30 of them, are more informed on their specific subjects than is the editor. So if there is any claiming going on, to use Dawtrey's silly word, than the claiming is being done by many more people than just the editor.

Martin Bryant is entirely innocent, legally and factually, of killing anyone at or near Port Arthur in Tasmania. He was never proved guilty in a trial where all the evidence was **weighed by a jury**. NEVER. And factually, any serious analysis of the case reveals so much reasonable doubt, so much corruption, so much falsity, that for anyone to insist the official narrative is the truth only confirms her/his ignorance, obsequiousness, and stupidity.

That the incident was not perpetrated by Martin Bryant is patently obvious. His mother had stated simple little Meccano kits were too complicated for him. In her book, *My Story*, she reveals an incident in which Martin panicked after he became locked inside a bathroom, being unable to unlock the door.²³ The woman who was having a relationship with him says in one of her five statements that Martin would lose the plot, and at times not know what he was doing.²⁴

So given there is no evidence Martin Bryant killed anyone at or near Port Arthur, are we to believe the killing was premeditated, planned, and perpetrated by the Salvation Army, for example – or, by corrupt elements of and associated with the State? Many facts say the latter.

²³ In her poignant book *My Story*; 2010: pp. 140-141, Carleen Bryant relates the following about her son: "Martin had stayed the evening in my home and the next morning, after a shower, Martin had thought that he was locked in the bathroom. He could not unlock the door and started to panic. I called the closest locksmith who arrived very quickly. The lock was OK, but Martin had been unfamiliar with it." At that time, Martin Bryant was **26 years of age**. You are to believe that this clearly mentally-handicapped person, someone who could not resolve a simple doorlock problem and who then panicked, planned and perpetrated a seven-scene massacre over two days and **kept the mighty SOG of Tasmania Police at bay for 18 hours overnight**. To believe such a scenario, you too would have to be mentally-handicapped.

²⁴ Petra Willmott. *Witness Statement*; 28 April 1996.

25 There is **no system of justice** in Australia. The system that exists is a legal system, which has been designed by lawyers for the benefit of lawyers – not the people of Australia. This legal system does **not** focus on the determination of truth. This ensures justice is not guaranteed, because there is no justice without the truth. Presiding over these abominations are judges all of whom are ex-lawyers. They should not be addressed as *Justice* as they cannot guarantee justice is served. The burgeoning record of miscarriage-of-justice cases in that country confirms the trail of human destruction inflicted on innocent people by judges. For a little insight into their gross cruelties, just google **miscarriages of justice** – note the list for Australia is neither complete nor current, and that it only contains the more serious cases and cases that have passed through the courts. No one knows the total number of existing miscarriage-of-justice cases in Australia which have been inflicted and which have not been legally corrected. This is what Graeme Crowley & Paul Wilson say, in their book *Who Killed Leanne?*; 2005: p. 120, about the appalling injustice that goes on within Australia: “The Stafford case may be just **the tip of the iceberg** where miscarriages of justice are concerned, such travesties are widespread and, given the unequal resources available to the prosecution and the defence, **increasingly common**. The Australian justice [read legal] system stands condemned for allowing these **wrongful convictions to proliferate**.” (added emphasis) Australian criminologist Paul Wilson confirmed (19 May 2011) to this editor that there could be up to 7000 miscarriage-of-justice cases per year in Australia. (Not all such cases result in imprisonment, nor are all of them recognized immediately.) Australian justice activist and author Evan Whitton sums it up very well in his book *Our Corrupt Legal System* (2009: p. 96): “The system IS immoral, because apart from everything else, it does not search for the truth.” (original capitals)

ABOUT AUSTRALIA
Democratic Rights & Freedoms

A Transparent Criminal Justice System

It is fundamental to the administration of justice in Australia that a person accused of a criminal offence is **presumed innocent** until **proven guilty beyond all reasonable doubt**.

A person can only be detained by police for a limited period before being either released or charged with an offence and presented to an independent judicial officer (judge or magistrate) who decides whether the person may be detained in custody pending trial. In some cases an initial assessment may be made by police, with provision for judicial review. The question of whether to initiate criminal proceedings on serious charges is determined by an independent office, for example the Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions in the case of federal offences.

An accused person has the **right to a fair trial**, including the right to be informed of the charges laid against them. A trial must take place before a judicial officer who is independent of the executive government and legislature. Generally, a person who is placed on trial for a serious offence that is punishable by a significant term of imprisonment has the **right to be tried before a jury drawn from the community**. With some exceptions, an individual also cannot be compelled to provide self-incriminating testimony in court.

Legal aid services provide assistance and representation to accused people, subject to a financial means test and other conditions. A further fundamental principle of the Australian common law system is the availability of legal professional privilege.

A right of appeal is available against conviction and sentence on specified grounds, including that there has been a miscarriage of justice.

Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade
Democratic Rights and Freedoms
dfat.gov.au
2008
(amended; added emphasis)

*THIS is the prattle pushed by overweening politicians, corrupt members of the legal system,²⁵ and do-and-say-anything officials. It reads well, it says the right things, yet it **stinks to high heaven**. Because, it is not the plain down-to-earth reality which all decent Australians deal with every day. Martin Bryant had all the rights so well summarised above, but they were stripped from him as if he was an in-human monster: **presumed innocent** – the media screamed guilty before he was charged; **fair trial** – no trial, just a sentence hearing then prison forever; **proven guilty beyond all reasonable doubt** – there is so much doubt you would have to be blind, or a liar, not to see it; **jury drawn from the community** – the media contaminated the jury pool, selecting one was impossible; **legal aid services provide assistance and representation** – enter unsavoury John Avery who browbeat Martin to accept Avery’s guilty plea; & **right of appeal** – well, just listen to the hoots of derision coming from Hobart. – ed.*

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

While Port Arthur conspiracies abound online, Keith Noble is making sure his views reach audiences far beyond the confines of the internet conspiracy community. Noble has been emailing chapters of his book to major media outlets, federal and state government ministers, justice officials and police officers who attended the massacre at Port Arthur on April 28, 1996.

There is no Internet conspiracy community that this editor is aware of. There are, however, people who have brains and who use them. People who are not suck-up sychophants. This editor has been directing draft parts of the book to those who have requested it, and to those he believes should be concerned about the **gross injustices** associated with the Port Arthur incident. What has been emailed is open and without charge. (To date, this editor has not received a cease-and-desist notice from any recipient of his emails. To the contrary, interest and support has been positive and growing.) On its completion, the entire book (650 pp.) will be available as a **free pdf**. The editor has no wish to profit from the pain of others.

One of the former officers being accused by Noble is Mike Dyson. "I knew I had to do something about it when he sent a letter to my daughter's house suggesting I should kill myself," Mr Dyson said.

More inaccurate rubbish. The editor has named Dyson who has a long Internet trail related to the Port Arthur incident. Dyson was not, it is believed, at his home innocently growing petunias before, during, and after the incident. This editor does not know the daughter of Dyson. Nor does he know her name. Nor does he know where she lives. That she received and read a letter about her father is quite possible and it is something that Dawtrey should investigate and report about **accurately** in The Mercury. As Dawtrey knows, as she was sent a copy of the mentioned letter, the editor never suggested to Dyson or to any other person that he should kill himself. To be clear here, this is what this editor wrote: "It seems the official killing is troubling this Michael Dyson and his daughter. It will be a loss if he tops himself – we need him alive, not dead." And it appeared in a letter about Dyson, not specifically to Dyson.

The editor's concern was, and still is, that Dyson will harm himself. It would be understandable given what he has done. But this editor does not wish for Dyson to do himself in because we need him alive, not dead. We need him to testify, **under oath**, and tell the people (includes his daughter) what he did before, during, and after the Port Arthur incident. What he has written is false. A Glock²⁶ to his block will give him permanent relief. But it will not help the people gain insights into the Port Arthur incident, more specifically Dyson's highly significant role in the Tasmania Police. This editor believes, lead in his head will confirm what his daughter suspects about her father. This too is something Dawtrey should investigate and report about **accurately** in The Mercury.

But do you think The Mercury will publish any report on anything not part of the official Port Arthur narrative? Do you think that newspaper will publish this rebuttal adding to the debate²⁷ on the incident?

²⁶ Glock is a proprietary name for a range of pistols manufactured in Austria. They are popular with police forces around the world.

²⁷ The Mercury has never published any form of debate related to the Port Arthur incident. An example is *Port Arthur conspiracy anger*. No alternate view but the official narrative was mentioned by the writer of this article. No comments from the public were permitted. The Mercury is trapped by its own criminal act of naming and identifying Martin Bryant with the incident, back on 30 April 1996. The newspaper will never debate the incident. It simply cannot, as debate for The Mercury **died on 30 April 1996**. The truth will be denied, in fact it must be denied. And The Mercury will hide behind the big lie of *respect for the family and friends of the victims*. Can you imagine it: The publisher and editors of The Voice of Tasmania admitting to the world they had made a very serious mistake? They could do that, and do it before poor Martin Bryant is killed inside Risdon Prison. But no one at The Mercury will do that. They will let Martin die slowly, then they will repeat the corrupt official narrative. **No** ethics. **No** truth. **No** debate.

Noble's accusations come six months after Mr Dyson led the charge against a fake Facebook profile purporting to belong to Bryant. Now he and his former colleagues are being described as active participants in the killing spree that left 35 people dead. Mr Dyson and another police officer are repeatedly named in Noble's emails as the gunmen, with the author claiming the two officers dragged an innocent Bryant into the Seascope Cottage and tried to burn him alive.

Again, this editor knows nothing about any "fake Facebook profile" about Dyson. Anyone who takes what is said on Facebook or Twitter seriously is lacking grey matter. And now with Dawtrey, we go from "two local police officers" to "his former colleagues." This is another of her errors. It seems that all the Special Operations Group (SOG) of the Tasmania Police were involved with the incident at Port Arthur. But this editor has never said members of SOG knowingly killed any person at or near Port Arthur. And again, the reporter Dawtrey knows this because she too was sent copies of the related emails.

But the facts do suggest that Glenn Pears²⁸ was unknowingly killed by a SOG member, possibly Andrew M. Fogarty. It is believed he fired an incendiary device into the BMW in which Pears was locked in the boot. There is no hard evidence Pears died inside Seascope cottage. That is an official assertion made without any hard evidence being presented to the public. Two pairs of handcuffs allegedly used in association with that death have suggestively *disappeared*.²⁹

²⁸ Glenn Pears was the man taken from the Port Arthur general store by the gunman, in the boot of the gold-coloured BMW, to Seascope. No physical evidence has ever been presented to prove that Mr. Pears alighted from that vehicle and went inside the cottage. (see *SEASCOPE COTTAGE SIEGE* at Part 4) Quite the contrary. Evidence suggests he died locked inside the boot of that BMW after it was set on fire – not by Bryant but by a member of Tasmania Police. In the classic mode, assertion after assertion has been made by officials who insist Pears was taken inside the cottage by Martin Bryant and then restrained with handcuffs which later *disappeared*. If you believe that, you will believe anything.

²⁹ Several people and many significant things suggestively *disappeared* during and after the Port Arthur incident. See Insert *MISSING EVIDENCE* which follows in this part.

³⁰ Martin had corrective surgery as the burns were quite severe. But these burns did not stop officials from strapping him into a wheelchair and also onto a bed, which increased his pain. Just a little bit of corporal punishment for Bryant the monster: *Everyone knows he did it.*

Dawtrey's words that "Mr Dyson and another police officer [Gerard Dutton?] are repeatedly named in Noble's emails as the gunmen," are absolute nonsense. Of course there are no quotations provided by Dawtrey, just her nonsensical words which are as deceptive as the official narrative. And again, this editor has not specifically said Dyson and his mate Dutton or Overbeeke dragged anyone into the Seascope cottage. What rubbish. Where are the exact words confirming what Dawtrey has alleged?

That Martin Bryant was left inside the cottage to burn is confirmed by the facts. He did not consciously wait patiently with his clothing on fire until he had third-degree burns³⁰ to his back – and only his back. If Martin knew he was on fire, he would have taken his clothes off long before the mighty SOG arrived on the scene. But he did not. He staggered outside in a confused mental state with his clothes on fire. He had no clear understanding of where he was or who was with him. He thought his own house was on fire. Was he drugged?

It is believed Dyson was a gunman at Seascope. From the facts we do know, which are revealed in detail in the book (Part 5), it seems that the SOG fired some form of incendiary device into the cottage and it is the resultant fire which injured Martin Bryant. Regardless of his low IQ, he knew what being burnt was about. That he was only burnt on his back, and he was burnt quite severely, strongly suggests that he was left in Seascope lying prone on his stomach while the fire was underway. Now whether Dyson was responsible for leaving Martin there is something that Dawtrey should investigate and report about **accurately** in *The Mercury*.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Yesterday was Bryant's 46th birthday.

If yesterday was 8 May 2013, then the birthday statement is not accurate. Martin Bryant's birthday was on 7 May 1967. Whether he knew it was his birthday is not known. Dawtrey does not add anything to this point. It suggests she has **never been to visit Martin**. He is incarcerated at Risdon Prison where he is being slowly tortured to death by despair and with drugs (enforced psychiatric drugs – not medication). Unless there is a miracle, he will die in prison.

MICHAEL DYSON



ex Son of God
eyes not manipulated

Noble released an email to mark the occasion, again naming Mr Dyson as the real murderer and calling for Bryant's release. After failing to get a reasonable response from the author, Mr Dyson yesterday contacted City of Vienna officials to advise them of the potentially criminal campaign. "This person has sent surface mail postmarked in Vienna to members of my family and has a large email list ... to which he is continually sending written material in which he claims that I am responsible for the mass shooting at Port Arthur in Tasmania," he wrote.

That is what Dawtrey wrote. Below is a copy of the email the editor wrote and sent on the birthday of Martin Bryant. Please read it and see if you can confirm anything that was published in The Mercury.

MASS MURDER Over 120 Witness Statements

Dear READER

7 May 2013

Today in the American state of Mississippi, Willie Jerome Manning came within hours of being murdered by lethal injection.³¹ Mr. Manning has been in prison (Parchman) for 20 years for crimes he did not commit. According to huffingtonpost.com: "The FBI has said in recent days that there were errors in an agent's testimony about ballistics tests and hair analysis in the case." (7 May 2013)

Today in the Australian state of Tasmania, Martin Bryant is being murdered slowly by despair, enforced drugging, and official damnation. Martin, who has/had an IQ of 66 (school grade 6 level), has been in prison (Risdon) for 17 years for crimes he did not commit. According to Lloyd T. Vance and Steve Johnson on scribd.com: "Scores of other witnesses can't understand why the media reports differ greatly from what they saw and heard. The eyewitnesses can't understand why their testimony recorded by police **was not used**. Even the police can see the bulk of evidence points to others." (9 Dec 2012)

Extracts of over 120 Port-Arthur-case *Witness Statements* are now included in the forthcoming book (June 2013). You will be stunned

³¹ If capital punishment existed in Tasmania, Martin Bryant would have been **murdered** (hung by the neck until dead) by the State years ago. See Insert *STATE MURDER* in Part 3.

when you read what is in these statements. They came to me from someone with a conscience in the office of the director of public prosecutions in Tasmania. The content of most of these statements has never been made public before. Witnesses clearly confirm Martin Bryant was set up by the State. It is absolutely criminal what has been done to Martin. Witnesses cannot understand why their testimony was not presented in a trial. What these witnesses reveal tells us exactly why there NEVER WAS A TRIAL. Martin is completely innocent and the State could never have proved him guilty.

The family, relatives, and friends of those who were shot (at least 35) and those who were wounded (at least 23), and all those whose lives and families have subsequently been maimed and destroyed, have been lied to by officials. Officials like John Avery, Damian Bugg, William Cox, etc.

Martin Bryant was not the gunman at/near Port Arthur. The murderer is believed to be Benjamin Overbeeke. And at the cottage, the principal person believed to have been involved is the former Tasmania Police SOG member Michael Charles Dyson - aka: Mick/Rick; Jamie; Gunman of Seascope. (mdyson@calypto.com.au)

And finally, today is the birthday of Martin Bryant. He is now 46 years of age. Please pray for him and his dear mother and sister, Carleen and Lindy.

Thanks again to everyone who has sent me info.³²

Sincerely,

Now, did you find any words confirming what Dawtrey wrote in her article? Did you find any words that correspond with what Dyson claims? **There are none.** It seems that Dyson told Dawtrey all sorts of inaccurate things, which she then failed to check and this is unprofessional. Then, she incorporated Dyson's inaccurate nonsense into an article which was published in The Mercury. Then gullible people read it and they must have thought what an awful person in Vienna. And gee, poor Mr. Dyson being written about. This is real do-not-tell-the-whole-true-story reporting in The Mercury of 9 May 2013. It is the same style used to report on Martin Bryant since 30 April 1996.

Attorney-General Brian Wightman said yesterday the former officer had his full support.

So there we have Wightman offering his full support to the former **Son of God**, Michael Charles Dyson. But, do you really believe that Wightman knows what Dyson did in 1996? Of course he doesn't. But Wightman had to support Dyson, otherwise the official narrative for the Port Arthur incident will fall apart. But let's wait and see. Things are now starting to come undone for Dyson (& Dutton). He will become a pariah, and Wightman will no longer be available for comment. Old cop mates will abandon Dyson, this man with a passion for violence. One wonders whether his daughter will too, once she learns the whole truth, which unfortunately she will not learn from a debate conducted by The Mercury – **The Dumb Voice of Tasmania.** ■

³² Even after *MASS MURDER* is released, this editor is still very much interested in information related to the Port Arthur incident. If you have information, please email it to either martinbryantisinnocent@gmail.com or to murder.research@gmail.com – **Thank You.**

SUMMARY

Stewart K. Beattie³³

*In the darkness of secrecy,
sinister interest and evil in every shape have full swing,
where there is no publicity there is no justice,
publicity is the very soul of justice.
It is the keenest spur to exertion and the surest of all guards
against improbity.
It keeps the judge himself while trying, under trial.
The security of securities is publicity.³⁴*

AFTER reading the narrative who would deny a host of officials have veiled this event in secrecy? Who would scoff at a suggestion that there was from the 28th April, deployed in this nation, “sinister interest and evil in every shape”? So it must be given **publicity**.

Did you know the word conspiracy derives from the Latin? **spirare** – meaning to breathe or blow together. When one looks at any part of this event it seems all of those who are desperate to keep all these matters in “darkness” would dare to deny they – breathed, planned or plotted together...at some time. For the Port Arthur incident was swamped by fortuitous coincidences (FCs) far in excess of any believable ratio! The FCs were wall to wall! Try getting basic medical attention in the State today and you may begin to understand what I’m saying.

So I make no apology the foregoing text is to that end — PUBLICITY! Recently I learned that like the Victorian Police, who had their special area for exercises in the remote Wonnangatta Valley of Gippsland, so too since before 1968, the Tasmanian Police used to regularly camp on the Football Oval at Nubeena and conduct their accreditation and refresher exercises around the Peninsula.

The Officers of the Tasmanian Police Service were not only a familiar sight there at Port Arthur, but the Tasman Peninsula was familiar territory to all of them. In fact on the afternoon of the 29th April 1996, Mr. Graeme Scurr responded to a query by his son as to the sudden proliferation of helicopters in the skies over the Peninsula saying, “oh is probably just another one of their bloom’n exercises.”

Finally, the April 28th ‘96 shootings rekindled the brutal history of Port Arthur, but it is much more than the fate of 35 innocent lives or the hurt, physical injury and trauma to so many, still ongoing, suffered by their loved ones and every one of the survivors, even as traumatic and disturbing as that may be. But please, after all of the foregoing points raised here, and in light of the shroud of evil secrecy that conceals much of the massacre and various subsequent

³³ Author of *A Gunsmith’s Notebook on Port Arthur*; 2006. (see *BIBLIOGRAPHY*).

³⁴ Jeremy Bentham. in *The Works of Jeremy Bentham....* (vol 9); 1843: p. 493.

BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT³⁵

- "THE jury verdict in Casey Anthony's murder case [2008-11; Florida; USA] has created quite a stir. Many people were utterly convinced of her guilt and were shocked when the jury found her not guilty of the homicide charges against her."
- "Regardless of how you may feel about Casey Anthony as an individual, her case demonstrates that a person cannot be convicted of a crime unless the prosecution proves its **case beyond a reasonable doubt.**"
- "With all of the evidence brought in court, many people are now curious about what exactly is meant by 'beyond a reasonable doubt.' In this post, we will do our best to explain what that admittedly vague phrase means."
- "We hear the phrase 'beyond a reasonable doubt' all the time in court, on TV and in the movies. Yet, a precise definition of what that means has been elusive. In fact, some in the legal community have argued that there should not be a precise definition."
- "Over the years, there have been several schools of thought on what reasonable doubt means. Some courts have described reasonable doubt as a hesitancy to act, as opposed to a willingness to act. Other courts have described reasonable doubt as being firmly convinced. The U.S. Supreme Court has described reasonable doubt as a doubt 'based on reason which arises from the evidence or lack of evidence'."
- "Thus far, the jurors who have spoken out about their verdict in the Casey Anthony case have made comments that relate the supreme court's definition. In short, the jury in the Casey Anthony murder trial found that they had a reasonable doubt based on the lack of evidence they saw in court."
- "One juror indicated that the jury would have convicted Anthony if they were going by feelings alone. However, the jury needed to look at the evidence that was presented in court. They found the **evidence was lacking....**"
- "Whether a defendant is **accused of murder**, drug crimes or any other crime, that defendant is presumed to be innocent until enough evidence is brought to prove the defendant committed the crime beyond a reasonable doubt."

Penn Law LLC Blog

What does 'beyond reasonable doubt' mean anyway?

criminalattorneyppa.com

7 July 2011

(amended; added emphasis)

³⁵ There are similarities and differences between the way the law works in Australia and the United States. Many of the same legal issues and legal principles are subjects of deliberation. One of them is the cardinal principle **beyond reasonable doubt**. Another major difference is that in the United States, defence lawyers are generally of the belief that their role is to defend their client(s). Thus, their allegiance is to their client(s). In Australia, it generally seems defence lawyers first give their allegiance to the court. The US attorney fighting for her/his client(s) is legendary, whereas in Australia this much needed aggressiveness to **determine the truth** is devalued.

*THE legal concept of **reasonable doubt** as it applies in criminal trials is a widely raised concept, but it is not well understood by those involved with such trials. In the Port Arthur case, there was no trial. It is not unreasonable to believe officials never wanted a trial to take place because there is so much reasonable doubt that Martin Bryant premeditated, planned, then perpetrated the killing of 35 people and injuring 23 others. There is no hard evidence to prove he did. – ed.*

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

judicial happenings, consider this statement by Mr. Damien Bugg QC who oversaw much of the aftermath. He said this:

"I think it is rather sad that people who are ill-informed about the circumstances of this matter seem prepared to make comments about such a significant social tragedy that have no basis in fact."³⁶

It may matter little to the ignorant and even less to the *dumb-downed mo*, but sadly, if we ordinary people allow such obvious treachery and arrogant disregard for the entire aftermath judicial episode by one of the case's main players to go unchallenged, and allow this affair to fade from our memory failing to search out and expose all of the truth, **history shows such a degree of treachery destroys all of the classes of humanity in the long run. For at Port Arthur, treachery in the form of a conspiracy was most certainly in evidence.**

So after carefully considering this small contribution to the review and publicity of this dreadful affair I cannot help but be appalled by the further and continuing lies, half-truths, deceit, injustice and seemingly indifference, perpetrated not only upon the incarcerated, the survivors, and Tasmanian people, but **upon our whole nation of people**. There are a goodly number of scoffers! Sadly they appear to number among those who **should know better**. The truth will eventually be exposed, and those who dared pervert the course of justice to such extent, must be brought to account, tried for their part in the crime, and if and when found guilty, prosecuted to the full letter of the law.

As I have already said, it becomes immaterial at this stage, as to whether or not Martin Bryant was the shooter at any or some of the 7 crime scenes, as that proposition was never the motivation for this project. He was most definitely implicated in the whole affair, but to what extent I shall leave it to the reader to conclude at this point, and to a open inquiry and/or trial in the future. However, quite categorically, I'm caused to reflect deeply after careful study over 5 years and the reading of millions of words on the subject to conclude Martin Bryant does most definitely deserve a fair trial at least, as he did not receive anything remotely resembling such on November 19th 1996.

Why did ALL these experts make so many bungles on the one hand, and be so coincidentally fortuitous with regard to their preparedness on the other? Experts such as hierarchy of the State Police, SAC-PAV, Psychiatrists, Firearm Examiners, Photographers, Ballisticians, politicians, lawyers and the media and those who boast their title as "professional grief counselors" – what ever that title infers – they all erred. I certainly am not of the belief they are all incompetent fools or bunglers, far from it. **For like most subterfuges, they almost fooled a nation for a time.**

Only much diligent investigation and public inquiry will provide truthful answers. Some of those who take for granted that precious right

³⁶ Sydney Morning Herald; 22 February 2001. It is not possible for this editor to take this devious Bugg seriously. Not a thing which he spoke about or placed on long lists was ever proved at a jury trial. But in the mind of Bugg, we are to believe that whatever the Bugg says proves the guilt of Martin Bryant and must be accepted. **What utter balderdash!** Bugg was an official – a bureaucrat. He didn't make the law. All it seems he did during his DPP tenure was use that office to promote himself. When did he abide by the ethical stand a person is innocent until he/she is proven guilty? He never did in the Port Arthur case. This bit of scum was quite content to let Avery have his corrupt way with an *11-year-old boy-man*. Then, Bugg took that false and coerced plea of guilty and used it to gut an innocent human being. Again and again, Bugg himself made comments about Martin that had no basis in fact and still have no basis in fact. **What a mongrel he is.**

– free speech – like newspaper editors for instance, still today cannot resist their scoffing vitriol and dismissive quips toward any who dare question the Administration: it reminds me of what St Peter under Almighty God’s inspiration wrote in regard to these times, “..there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts.”³⁷

MAGNA CARTA 1215

NO free man shall be taken indeed imprisoned, either dispossessed, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, nor pass over him, nor send over him, except by means of the legal judgment of his own equals indeed the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny or delay Right or Justice....

NOTE For details on the irrevocable right of every Australian (includes Martin Bryant) to trial by jury – a sound jury deciding on matters of law and fact is democracy in action – see rightsandwrong.com.au

By the sheer weight of knowledge obtained from statements of witnesses to the Port Arthur incident, many ignored by officials, one is persuaded to conclude that the whole of the people of Australia are burdened with a great raft of treachery, enforced by assented, unconstitutional legislation, which is not law as it denies we the people of our heritage and birthright. Such preemptive legislation could I believe be successfully argued before an impartial Court (should that now ever be possible), to be **legislative action beyond the powers of the State and Federal Parliaments and the Government**. For with regard to our freedoms these matters are to the Parliament *ultra vires*. (Latin: beyond its power)

Simply, our basic Rights I speak of were unquestionably reaffirmed in the Magna Carta in 1215, which is statute law in Australia. An original copy of the Great Charter lays behind glass, preserved in the Federal Parliament by Canberra’s hypocrites. Are you aware that this covenant was drawn up between the people and the monarch a great many years before any politician was legislating enactments in any Parliament of the Realm? This is the fountain head also of America’s *Bill of Rights*, and their embattled 2nd Amendment.

Why therefore should there not be a patient confidence in ultimate justice for “we the people” here, for those who died then, and those who have been caused to take their own lives since because of it? We Australians are all victims of Port Arthur, and so those of us who are able should consider: let us enjoy the experience of one of life’s finest privileges, that of being an advocate of those unable to defend themselves. ■

(amended; added italics; original emphasis)

³⁷ *The Bible* (KJV); 2 Peter 3:3.

UNSAVOURY JOHN AVERY
Port Arthur Incident
Keith Allan Noble

*The Tasmanian Bar is an independent referral bar, made up of practitioners who are entitled and have elected to practice solely as barristers. Mr Avery was never a person who made that election and thankfully was not a member of the Tasmanian Bar.*³⁸

JOHN AVERY



failed to defend Martin Bryant

ONLY some sense of brevity curtails this article. To include everything known about this A-1 mongrel John Avery would be to inflict another wound which the Port Arthur case can do without. We can all do without that – and him.

According to law in Tasmania: "An accused person is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty and is therefore under no obligation to give or call additional evidence in order to prove his/her innocence. It is up to the Crown[/State] to prove that the accused has committed the offences alleged and if the Crown does not prove this to the satisfaction of a jury, then the accused will be discharged."³⁹ The majority of Australians know this is the requirement right across Australia. An accused person charged with an indictable offence who declares her/his innocence cannot be convicted without a trial. But this did **not** happen for Martin Bryant whose plea of innocent was refused, who was then denied a trial, and who was then declared guilty.

³⁸ Michael O'Farrell (President of The Tasmanian Bar). letter to editor; 25 January 2013.

³⁹ Supreme Court of Tasmania – supremecourt.tas.gov.au; Tasmania – *Accused Persons*; 4 September 2009.

see following page

⁴⁰ Supreme Court of Tasmania – supremecourt.tas.gov.au; *Tasmania – Legal Representation*; 4 September 2009.

⁴¹ *Overview*; Hobart Community Legal Service; 30 June 2013 (see: hobartlegal.org.au/tasmanian-law-handbook/courts-lawyers-and-law/legal-profession/overview)

42 Aileen Alda Kingston. *Witness Statement*; 17 June 1996.

43 For a brief, detailed, and shocking account of the so-called justice in Britain, read the article *Miscarriages of Justice*; *The Guardian*; 15 January 2002. All the living hell inflicted on the innocent people (many were from Ireland) identified in that article was inflicted by *Justices* – bewigged mongrels of the corrupt British legal system. Three recent books exposing the sickening cruelty are as follows: Sandra Lean. *No Smoke: The Shocking Truth About British Justice*; 2008; L.A. Naylor. *Judge For Yourself How Many Are Innocent*; 2004; & Michael O'Brien. *The Death of Justice*; 2008.

44 In *Our Corrupt Legal System*; 2009: p. 235, author Evan Whitton says this: "If, as in Britain, 1% of Australian prisoners are not guilty, **235** of 23,555 inmates in 2003 were probably **innocent**." (added emphasis) That old joke about every prisoner says he/she is innocent is not funny one bit. Being innocent but still being on the wrong side of the bars is frighteningly easy as the cops and courts in Australia are adept at putting **innocent people** (female & male) inside cages called prisons. And anyone wanting to learn about the **hell** and **madness** Graham Stafford endured after being falsely convicted and imprisoned for a murder in Queensland, which he **did not commit**, read this book: *Who Killed Leanne Holland?*; 2007, by Graeme Crowley and Paul Wilson. Every day he was in prison (served **over 14 years**), Stafford said he was innocent – and he was. (See THE CHARLES SMITH BLOG; 30 April 2010 for case details.) For details related to miscarriages of justice, see Robert N. Moles. *A State of Injustice*; 2005. (netk.net.au/home.asp) And for those concerned about injustice going on in New Zealand, read the following book which stems from the terrible case of David Bain, an innocent man who was incarcerated for allegedly killing five people. David served **13 years** before he was freed: Joe Karam. *Bain and Beyond*; 2000. Bruce Day was a cop in Winnipeg, Manitoba, for 20 years. In his book (*Hey Cop!*; 2008), he reveals this: "After a big case there was hardly any evidence that was the truth."

According to documented legal procedures in Tasmania: "Defendants who cannot afford legal advice can seek legal aid through their private solicitor or go to the Legal Aid Commission Office."**40** But this did **not** happen for Martin Bryant.

According to the process of legal representation in Tasmania: "Lawyers are a means of contact with the law so that people can feel that they are not lost in the difficult language and complicated processes of the law. This is why lawyers have obligations on them to communicate with their clients – their special knowledge and expertise creates a **relationship** between lawyer and client that requires the lawyer **to act responsibly** and openly with their [her/his] client."**41** But this did **not** happen for Martin Bryant. So what did happen for him and how was John Avery (not) involved?

Well before he was even arrested on the morning of 29 April 1996, Martin was not referred to as a *person of interest*, or as the *alleged* gunman. No. Martin was identified as the gunman without any cautionary comment. Directly and/or indirectly, the cops were telling people, Martin Bryant was **the gunman** of Port Arthur. In one of her *Witness Statements*, Aileen Kingston states:

"I wish to add that on the afternoon of Sunday the 28th April 1996 I was shown a passport by Detective Peter **HESMAN** which contained a photograph of BRYANT as being the male who paid his entry fee...."**42** (original emphasis) It does not get plainer than that. This Tasmania Police detective did not show Kingston a photograph, or a passport in which the name and address were covered over. No. Hesman showed Kingston the entire passport. So most understandably the name and address in that passport were circulating at speed around PAHS before the sun set that Sunday.

Then the media geared up. In less than 36 hours, Martin Bryant was being headlined nationally as *THIS IS THE MAN, THE KILLER, etc.* But no media outlet anywhere in Australia, certainly not in Tasmania, was prosecuted for breaking the law related to illegal publication. The State accepted the fact that Martin was being declared guilty and the State certainly did not raise the fact that "an accused person is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty." And then Martin Bryant was officially announced as being guilty on 29 (or 30) April 1996, when, at Royal Hobart Hospital, he was formally charged with one Port Arthur murder (Kate Elizabeth Scott).

Now for those who think Australia has a half-way decent legal system having inherited *The Best of British Justice*,**43** well it is not quite so. There are a few problems – serious problems. One of them is called **miscarriage of justice**. This in plain language means you can be done in for a crime you did not do, and you can find yourself inside for the remainder of your life even if you are innocent. And do not for half a second think this is a rare occurrence, one that is easily righted through the *appeal court safety net*. If you think anything like that, then you have no idea how the corrupt legal system functions in sunny Australia**44** – how it functioned in Tasmania for innocent Martin Bryant who has now been imprisoned **since May 1996**.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

By law, Martin Bryant was entitled to legal representation. And he **had enough money to engage the best lawyers in Australia** – a *Dream Team*. But this did not happen. And why didn't it happen? Well, all Martin's money was being controlled by a State agency called the Perpetual Trustees. And that agency was not going to set about getting Martin the legal representation he desperately needed at the end of April 1996. No. Martin was cut off from his own money because the State **never** wanted Martin to plead not guilty, **never** wanted him to have an ethical lawyer, **never** wanted him to have a jury trial. And once **his access to his own money** was cut off, Martin's throat was figuratively cut in the process.

Martin Bryant was treated as indigent, a pauper to be thrown crumbs of compassion to give the public an impression of fair play. The State made all the arrangements for Martin's legal representation. And the State paid for all that representation. So you can imagine the control the State exerted over those lawyers who were, it seems, paid through the State's Legal Aid Commission Office. The adage, *he who pays the piper calls the tune* most definitely applied. In little Tasmania, there would be few lawyers – none it seems – who would stand up to the State by vigorously defending Martin Bryant.

So first up, there was the lawyer Debra Rigby. She dutifully stood by as Martin's rights were ignored during the corrupt process of charging him with the Broad Arrow Café murder of Kate Elizabeth Scott – during which it seems Martin said he never went there on Sunday 28 April 1996.⁴⁵ But Rigby ignored this. He was conscious she said. She was quite content with his mental state and level of comprehension of what had gone on and what was going on. Martin Bryant had third degree burns and was either in great pain, or was doped with painkillers – but let's forget all that. Rigby the lawyer said he was *compos mentis* so it was on with the bedside show.

Eight days later Graham Derek Collyer described the gunman who shot as some other person, **not Martin Bryant**. Eleven days later James Laycock swore in his *Witness Statement* that the gunman was **not Martin Bryant**. But Martin had a lawyer and her name was Debra Rigby. She was protecting all his legal interests. (ha, ha, ha) So no, don't ever think he was charged prematurely or that the gunman's identity was not accurate. And so the set-up continued.

Then Rigby dumped Martin – or was she dumped because she was starting to ask too many troubling questions? Was she content that she had done the right thing by letting him be charged with murder without her raising one objection? She never saw any need to mention the fact Martin had been entirely without his legally required guardian since he arrived at the hospital. Maybe legally required guardians are considered an *extra frill* which the Legal Aid Commission Office does not cover. But the supreme court of Tasmania had, pursuant to the *Mental Health Act*, placed Martin Bryant under a guardianship order in April 1994. It was this *legal* process that took all Martin's money from him and gave it to the Perpetual Trustees. And it was this order that required Martin Bryant to have a guardian as Martin was considered **legally incompetent**.

⁴⁵ It seems Martin kept stating this for months. But it was not what officials, who then had complete control over his life, wanted to hear. All they wanted was for him to agree. Officials did not give a damn about where Martin Bryant was, or was not. There was no videoed re-enactment of the crime to be used at a trial, which tells us there never was going to be a trial. Officials knew Martin was innocent which means he could never have gone through any re-enactment as he had no idea what had happened at PAHS and enroute to Seascap. As soon as **Martin the patsy** nodded his head, or said yes, or the word guilty he was **dead meat** and everyone of those corrupt officials, and all those who were involved with the **killing** and **wounding** at and near Port Arthur, were free and laughing. And it was John Avery and Damian Bugg who took Martin through their plot about which he had **no** fully informed understanding as he had **no** legal representative defending him. A lawyer whose job it is to defend a client, but who coerces that client to plead guilty so he/she will be **imprisoned for life**, is not a defence lawyer. In fact, this editor believes such a lawyer most probably has characteristics of a psychopath. No human being with a conscience would do such a thing – but, **John Avery and Damian Bugg did**.

JUST A FEW JOHN AVERY QUOTES

■ "I think there is a case where the rights of this community may have to be considered to be more important than the rights of an individual."

■ "I had nothing to offer in the legal sense. I never let him think I had anything to offer.... I regularly said to him, 'You're going to jail for life and you are never going to get out'."

■ "The evidence was absolutely overwhelming. [*sic*] He was entitled to have his guilt proved so it was my job to explain to him the implications – on himself and the families of the victims – of pursuing the not-guilty."

John Avery

in Inside the mind of a mass murderer

smh.co.au

29 March 2006

■ "Bryant's change of plea in 1996 avoided a longer and more harrowing trial over the shooting in which 35 people died. Avery later said he brought Bryant to the decision partly by encouraging the shooter to draw pictures of what he had done." (see Part 10)

Andrew Darby

Port Arthur lawyer jailed for stealing

smh.com.au

18 September 2008

■ "No forensic evidence of Bryant's physical presence at the Broad Arrow [Café] was ever established. Because Bryant's face was plastered throughout Australia, all eyewitness identification was contaminated. Why didn't Avery pursue the discrepancies in the descriptions of clothing Bryant was reported to have worn at different stages during the carnage?"

Joanne L. Eisen, Paul Gallant, Andrew S. MacGregor

A shortcut to Australia's civilian disarmament?

keepandbeararms.com

18 May 2013

■ "It is also important to note while DDP Bugg told this whopper to the Court Martin Bryant's [third] lawyer, John Avery, the man who allegedly persuaded him to plead guilty, **sat back and did nothing to correct this false statement** – or point out the true facts which give Martin Bryant an ALIBI in respect of the Martins' [David & Sally] murders – and thereby also cast **extreme doubt** about what else went on that day at the Port Arthur Historic Site - **namely that he acted alone.**" (amended; added emphasis)

flathead

debaterelate.com

17 May 2013

■ "The former Moonah-based lawyer [John Avery] stole more than \$500,000 from clients and his former practice over more than five years to pay for his lavish lifestyle and love of art, until he was busted by an employee in 2006."

Sally Glaetzer

Avery sentence increased

The Mercury

1 May 2009

(cont.)

■ "It took lawyer John Avery 14 visits to Martin Bryant to convince him to change his plea to guilty from not guilty. Bryant, a **mentally-disabled person**, was by law supposed to plead NOT guilty to criminal charges. This didn't matter to the corrupt Tasmanian government. Avery was jailed in 2008 for 4 and a half years for stealing \$512,000 from his clients. He's been struck off the lawyers' register."

■ "Avery still claims he was justified in changing Bryant's plea. **Bryant deserves a proper trial.**" (added emphasis)

GoCo77

*A Question of Guilt:
The Massacre at Port Arthur (6 of 7)*
16 May 2013

■ "Why did Bryant's lawyer – John Avery – convince his client to plead guilty when he knew Bryant had no memory of the crimes, and while Bryant had maintained his innocence for months?"

Elissa Hawke

Please look again at the Port Arthur massacre
elissahawke.blogspot.co.at
1 Jan 2013

■ "At Avery's initial trial, his counsel, David Gunson SC, said that the pressure from the Bryant [set-up] contributed to his later acts of fraud." (amended)

Lawyers Weekly

Martin Bryant's lawyer to flog art collection
9 November 2010

■ "Martin Bryant was forced to plead guilty, and that was the **ploy to remove the trial**. All we ever got was a 'Sentencing Hearing,' which was then conveyed to the people as a *trial*. And **John Avery was part of that deception!!!**" (added emphasis)

Andrew S. MacGregor

email to editor
14 October 2012

■ "Martin Bryant's solicitor John Avery is **a criminal and a liar**. He is currently serving time in prison for fraud – non-related to the Bryant case. Avery took the case from David Gunson who failed to get a guilty verdict from Bryant." (added emphasis)

Narcosynthesis

truthnews.com.au
25 February 2011

■ "And it was John Avery who pressured this *boy* to change his plea because Avery was, as he said, sensitive to the needs of the community. To get Martin to change his plea in 1996, this *11-year-old boy* was illegally kept in solitary confinement and he was denied a personal guardian (required by law as per a 1994 court decision based on his mental incapacity) and an ethical lawyer. Not only did Avery let all this happen, **he ensured it happened by not defending his client**. Martin was told it was for his own good that he plead guilty." (added emphasis; added italics)

Keith Allan Noble

Martin Bryant is innocent
forumjar.com
16 November 2012

(cont.)

■ "A disgraced lawyer [John Avery] is blaming the pressure of representing Port Arthur serial killer Martin Bryant for a stealing spree stretching almost five years."

Marie Rae

Helping Martin Bryant made me steal says lawyer Avery
adelaidenow.com
8 September 2008

■ "But for those from whom Avery stole to fund his obsession, he is little more than a callous man who **preyed on the vulnerable to feed his own selfish needs**. Former client Tony Moore, from whom Avery fleeced more than \$30,000, will never get over the betrayal by a man he thought he could trust. 'He has ripped the heart out of my family,' he says." (added emphasis)

■ "Avery indulged his every whim for the finer things in life. From the luxury E-type Jaguar to the Mont Blanc pens, his taste for the expensive was legendary. Even the object he hung his coat on at work was a treasured art piece."

■ "His Christmas parties, at the Mt Stuart mansion he later sold for \$850,000, provided local luminaries with tables of gourmet food and booze. Avery would work the guests, back-slapping, telling dirty jokes and outrageously flirting with women. It was all part of advertising himself, says one former colleague – just like the flashy suits and bold ties."

Marie Rae

The two faces of Martin Bryant's disgraced lawyer
marierae.com
26 February 2012

■ "Read again the words in the newspaper article [The Mercury; 22 Nov 1996], see what Avery said; then imagine someone with an IQ of 66 and a psychological age of 11 (and who was in solitary confinement for more than 6 months) sitting there listening to the soothing words of **his smooth-talking lawyer**. Bryant never admitted that he did it, he just did what his lawyer wanted." (original & added emphasis)

Terry Schulze

email to editor
3 October 2012

■ "[Avery] played a key role in the Port Arthur affair. His persuasive skills were deployed to head off the need for a full trial – **a trial that could have been extremely embarrassing for the prosecution**, to say the least." (added emphasis)

SydWalker.info

The Port Arthur Massacre
16 May 2013

■ "In an interview with Avery for the Bulletin by Julie-Anne Davies she wrote that, 'Avery also needed to persuade Bryant not to press with his not guilty plea.' Avery told her, 'I had very little I could offer him in terms of legal solutions.' That's probably because **he didn't even try to build a case for Martin**. Even with all of the evidence he should have had at his disposal to prove Martin innocent his only plan was to get him to plead guilty so everyone could go home and forget about him." (added emphasis)

Ned Wood

*The Port Arthur Massacre:
10 Years On The Secrecy Continues*
iinet.net.au
17 May 2013

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

It was a real coup for the State. It ignored its own legal guardianship order. It gave Martin a say-nothing lawyer to make it look good. It charged Martin with the indictable offence of murder before the criminal investigation had seriously commenced. It got Martin strapped down onto a bed, in pain, for all the world to know the gunman had been captured and charged, and would soon be convicted. Let's not play word games, his conviction was a foregone **must happen**.

But after the hospital bed-side charade the State parted ways with Debra Rigby who was replaced with David Gunson. He was another lawyer funded by the Legal Aid Commission Office, and it seems he came with a State agenda. His job was not to defend Martin Bryant during a trial. No. His job was to get Martin to make a guilty plea which would completely negate having a trial. So contrary to what the majority of thinking people probably believed, Gunson acting as Martin's defence lawyer was not to conduct a defence but to ensure Martin was **never defended**. And we are to believe this is ethical lawyering. Well it certainly isn't. But, that is exactly what went on **in Tasmania in 1996**, for innocent Martin Bryant.

And this really does seem to be the truth. There are words in the literature about Gunson terminating his involvement with Bryant – we cannot say defence – over the missing video camera, but that does not seem credible. On 30 September 1996, Martin submitted a NOT GUILTY plea. Note it was not during a trial, it was a hearing set up to accept a plea of guilty. But after he said he was NOT GUILTY, things went officially and wilfully awry.

Firstly, Gunson quit on 2 October 1996 and he would not say why: "Media reports that I no longer represent Martin Bryant are correct." and "I will make no further comment as to the reasons or circumstances surrounding this development."⁴⁶ What exactly was behind Gunson's decision is not known by the general public. But we do know that Secrecy is the twin of Corruption. So without any doubt, something corrupt was playing out in backrooms of official offices in Hobart (and probably Canberra too). Note that this same lawyer is alleged to have stated the following over nine years later:

"Many expressed the belief that experienced and skilled lawyers have a special professional obligation to take on high profile, unpopular cases. One of the lawyers [David Gunson] who represented Martin Bryant – the notorious Australian who was convicted of killing 35 people in Port Arthur, Tasmania in 1996 – was matter-of-fact: 'Somebody had to do it. Somebody competent. I like to think I'm competent. I [take] the view that if you're a senior practitioner...you ought to take these kinds of cases'."⁴⁷ **WHAT?!**

What a deceptive mongrel. Gunson was Martin's lawyer, but he fed him to the wolves – "I no longer represent Martin Bryant" are his words. But when it came to getting his own name in an academic journal, Gunson was sprouting the right words for all to read hoping no one would recall that he abandoned his client. Martin, who Gunson was supposed to defend, pleaded NOT GUILTY. So Gunson said to himself, *I'm out of here*. The hypocrisy of it **SCREAMS OUT**.

⁴⁶ news.google.com (Reuter); 20 October 1996.

⁴⁷ in Abbe Smith. *Defending the unpopular down-under*; Melbourne University Law Review (vol 30); 2006: p. 506.

Officials refused to accept the NOT GUILTY plea Martin submitted. So they brought in John Avery to get the much needed guilty plea – to, **pervert the course of justice**. The sickest illegal processes in all of Australia then took place. Instead of having a trial which was Martin's legal right, Avery pressured him for another five weeks. This corrupt lawyer badgered Martin (some say he was also drugged and/or psychiatrically manipulated) into accepting the guilty plea **pushed onto him by the unsavoury John Avery**.

This is how John Avery approached his own client – a “monster,” is what Avery called him: “I needed to establish some sort of rapport with this person. I needed to go out on a limb, offer an olive branch if you will, **to this monster** to try and show that there was some communication between us.”⁴⁸ (added emphasis) Recall the opening words of this article about being *innocent until proven guilty*? Martin Bryant did **not** have ethical legal representation. **NEVER!**

It is said Avery made 14 visits to Risdon Prison to convince Martin to accept **Avery's plea** of guilty. As Terry Schulze states in the Insert *JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY*: “Finally, in the last paragraph Mr. Avery states that it took him a few weeks of gradual work for Bryant to ‘adapt’ the course of the guilty plea. (Which is a bit ambiguous and I expect the article meant ‘adopt,’ however the word ‘adapt’ does mean to modify or alter.) However, the last sentence is a beauty – ‘and it would have been worthless to bully or coerce him into pleading guilty.’ Yeah right – can’t use thumbscrews, so we will have to be a bit more subtle about it.”⁴⁹

On 7 November 1996, **Avery's plea** of guilty was conveyed to the court. This stopped the trial before it began. It is the worst contrived injustice in the history of modern Australia. On 22 November 1996, Martin Bryant was sentenced to **slow death at Risdon Prison**.

In an article written ten years after this corrupt and highly unethical process Martin Bryant was put through, a columnist with the Hobart Mercury and a member of The Tasmanian Bar wrote the following: “Mr. Bryant has the same legal rights as any other citizen in our democracy. He is entitled to the same privileges that the law accords any other individual.”⁵⁰ No normal thinking decent person would disagree with Greg Barnes. But where was Mr. Barnes in 1996 when Martin Bryant was put through the legal process described above? Where were the other members of The Tasmanian Bar and The Law Society of Tasmania then? And the lawyers around Australia?

Look hard, but you will **not** find any article or statement from any lawyer (includes judges) reported in the public media. There might have been mutterings off the record in back rooms. But if there were, it would just confirm the law profession was more than content to let their legal colleagues in Tasmania **pervert the legal process**. Yes, Martin Bryant was entitled to the same privileges that the law accords all other individuals (includes you). *But only if the lawyers allow it*. And they didn't for Martin Bryant. Not one of them spoke out in 1996. This editor suspects the very worst about lawyers, who he believes were saying to themselves – *everyone knows he did it*.

⁴⁸ John Avery. in *Inside the mind of a mass murderer*; smh.com.au; 29 March 2006.

⁴⁹ See Insert *JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY* in Part 5.

⁵⁰ Greg Barnes. *Martin Bryant*. tasmaniantimes.com; 13 April 2006.

LETTER TO JOHN AVERY
Martin Bryant is Innocent

John AVERY, disbarred barrister
Hobart, Tasmania, AUSTRALIA

30 September 2012

ARE YOU REMORSEFUL?

BASED on Internet articles prepared by the ABC, The Mercury, and other Australian news disseminators, you have just been released from prison.

So international readers of this letter will have some information about your despicable barristerial behaviour which put you behind bars, this is what David Killick of The Mercury, 28 September 2012, wrote about you:

"Avery pleaded guilty in 2008 to 130 counts of stealing and dishonesty between December 2001 and March 2006. He admitted stealing more than \$500,000 from his clients and his former law firm at Moonah to support his obsession with art and luxury. His victims included those who had won personal injury or workers' compensation claims and a survivor of the 1964 HMAS Voyager disaster."

And ABC News, 28 September 2012, reported this in a related report:

"Avery used more than \$500,000 he stole from his clients and former law firm, to fund a lavish lifestyle which included buying expensive artwork and watches.... Avery told the Parole Board he was truly remorseful and had been on a course to assist with his addiction to acquiring artwork."

Well, your alleged remorse is doubted – methinks you curse being caught. How many watches with unpronounceable Swiss-French names does a man of greed need? Of course people are now wondering if you have any regrets over your unethical behaviour re the innocent Martin Bryant.

He said many times he did not kill anyone at Port Arthur or at Seascope, and there is not a shred of hard evidence proving he did. **You failed to conduct any significant investigations, but you took his artwork. And without his guardian being present, you persistently pressured this disturbed mentally-handicapped 11-year-old, IQ 66, then being broken in illegal solitary confinement, to plead guilty.** Maybe you obtained another expensive watch by doing that. Martin, however, is now being slowly murdered at Risdon Prison with the consent of Australian officials past and present.

But if you are remorseful, please let me know so that can be added to the section on you in my forthcoming book. If you fail to reply, it can only be interpreted to mean you are one of those murderous officials. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Keith Allan NOBLE

google: indymedia martin bryant is innocent

NOTE The Tasmanian Bar has, in writing (25 January 2013), informed Noble that this mongrel Avery "thankfully was not a member of the Tasmanian Bar." – **ed.**

COPY of the letter directed to Avery four times c/o The Tasmanian Bar then The Law Society of Tasmania. At the last time of downloading (15 Nov. 2013), Avery had still not contacted Noble to express remorse for his crimes. – ed.

And if any reader of this is thinking to her/himself, *I've had enough of this*, then please bear with us for just a few more insights into this character called Avery, an ex-lawyer of Tasmania.

As was widely reported, Mr. Avery got himself into a spot of bother when someone in his office blew the whistle about funds being misappropriated. Yes, a bit of filching had gone on. Call it what you will – pilfering, plundering, sticky-digits, or good old stealing – the trail led right to that connoisseur, the said one John Avery. And for those who have forgotten their French, connoisseur means this: *A person with informed and astute discrimination, especially concerning the arts or matters of taste*. How apropos. Avery had the taste for other people's money, over half a million dollars worth of lip-smacking taste. Knowing the refined things in life, Avery put his criminally-acquired assets toward a pathetic and morally bankrupt lifestyle.

Then it gets even richer. Because when the whistle blew, Avery knew what to do. Get a good lawyer. One who would argue the charge and dig in and fight for him. **He had every right to a trial** and the best lawyer he could hire with the money of those he screwed – oh, ever so smoothly. So he called in his big-gun mate, none other than senior counsel Gunson.⁵¹ Yes. That's right. The David Gunson who never argued any charge for Martin Bryant, and who dumped Martin when he was in dire straits. And as we know, when gutless Gunson dumped his client Martin Bryant, there waiting in the wings was his mate the larcenous lawyer John Avery who put Martin into prison. What a despicable duo disgracing all of Tasmania.

⁵¹ What a top-gun this Gunson is. Read these details about how he has behaved in Hobart. You will find the article (*Gunson v Howes*) by Angela Leary on thepushtasmania.tripod.com: "A Hobart lawyer being sued for defamation and assault and battery agreed yesterday that he had been involved in **fist fights** with other members of the legal profession." (added emphasis) Some profession. And there is more: "David Gunson, a barrister of Battery Point, told the Civil Court in Hobart, **he did not deny fighting**, on one occasion with a former legal partner and on another with a lawyer at a legal practice course dinner. Mr Gunson said he did not recall **a fight** over a cigarette at another law dinner." (added emphasis) Only in Tasmania? Or Hobart? Or is it just this boorish fist-cuffs David Gunson? The lawyer who **did not have the guts to defend Martin Bryant**, but who seems to have no qualms about fighting over a cigarette. What chance did Martin have with a legal lout like this? None whatsoever. And Gunson and his fellow brawlers call themselves professionals..... Gunson even uses the initials S.C. after his name, as if Senior Counsel actually meant something. **Gunson is human scum**.

Then, and this is hard to stomach, Gunson blamed Martin Bryant for Avery's self-made situation. The following appears in the Lawyers Weekly: "At Avery's initial trial, his counsel, David Gunson SC, said that the pressure from the Bryant [set-up] contributed to his later acts of fraud." (amended) This is called good lawyering. Of course there was no mention of the artwork Avery took from Martin Bryant. Avery told everyone he coaxed Martin to do some art to get the truth out of him. But, **the truth is Avery would not know the truth**. However, he did realize the potential value of artwork done by Martin – so Avery *kept* Martin's crayon creations for his own art collection.

John Avery is no doubt an intelligent person. As a lawyer, he should have dug in and defended Martin Bryant as a defence lawyer is supposed to. For him to state that the case against Martin Bryant was overwhelming reveals two things: **i.** John Avery was corrupted before he accepted the position of defence lawyer for Martin Bryant; and/or, **ii.** John Avery failed to conduct any significant investigations into the case. It is this editor's belief that both things about Avery are correct. **He was corrupt before he started**, and he wilfully refused to engage with all the evidence exculpatory for a *boy-man*. Avery took advantage of a person whose mental age was 11 years.

This editor's life experience (62 years) tells him that intelligent people who do not use their intelligence for human good, but rather for themselves, are evil. And the facts of the Port Arthur case most definitely confirm the evil character of this unsavoury John Avery. ■

ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO

Andrew S. MacGregor⁵²

Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur; 2001-4

*The amount of evidence that
denies the government version of the event
has become so overpowering that
it cannot be ignored.*⁵³

THE Port Arthur story does not stop at the conclusion that Martin Bryant was framed as the perpetrator of the Port Arthur Massacre. The first question that must come to mind is, if Martin Bryant didn't commit the massacre then who did? The initial answer is that whoever did commit the various acts of murder and mayhem, he was not some maniacal individual. The media was required to focus on the contrived *lone-nut* gunman theory for each of the four massacres that occurred within Australia.

The four events I refer to are the Hoddle and Queen Street Massacres of Melbourne in 1987, the Strathfield Massacre in Sydney in 1992, and the Port Arthur Massacre in 1996. There were of course other massacres **outside** Australia that also come into the picture, but I am not able to deal with them at this stage. Once it becomes established that the named alleged culprit was not the offender, we must then examine all the various clues and establish just who would benefit from all the lies and deceit. This includes those who must be considered accessories before, during and after the criminal act, and this aspect of consideration must include not only the political aspect but also the ideological aspect of these criminal acts.

After the 1987 massacres, there were two meetings called in Hobart: a meeting of the Australian Police Ministers Council; and, a special premiers meeting which was addressed by the then prime minister Bob Hawke. It was at the premiers meeting that the Tasmanian premier, Robin Gray, and the South Australian premier refused to cede the states' constitutional powers in relation to firearms to the federal government. This caused Barry Unsworth, then the premier of New South Wales, to show his pique with the utterance of: **"There will never be uniform gun laws in Australia until we see a massacre in Tasmania."**⁵⁴

From 1987, it appears that the political aspiration was for the state constitutional powers in relation to firearms to be ceded to the federal government. Two acts immediately after the Port Arthur Massacre demonstrate this connection. The New South Wales premier, Bob Carr actually presented legislation to the state parliament to assist in the handover of his state's constitutional powers to the

⁵² Former senior constable, Victoria Police (1968-85); author; investigator.

⁵³ From opening paragraph of the article *ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO*.

⁵⁴ Barry Unsworth. Conference at Hobart, Tasmania; *Prophecy or Planning?* 1987. The Sun Herald (5 May 1996) reported the 1987 words of Barry Unsworth.

55 *Mass Murder in Australia: Tavistock's Martin Bryant*. members.iimetro.com.au. 1 May 2013.

56 For those who have forgotten, or who prefer to forget, the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya is a good example of how a State will kill, torture, and maim to administer (a good word) control over people. What the State (loyal to the bloody British Crown of course) did in Tasmania has a long **evil path** leading to it. On 6 June 2013, the following appeared on the guardian.co.uk website: "During an eight-year conflict in which Britain sought to restore order on its prized African possession, amid a vicious insurgency fuelled by land shortages...an estimated **90,000 people were killed or injured**. More than 100,000 people were detained, many of them Kikuyu, Kenya's largest ethnic group. Although some were Mau Mau guerillas, many were victims of collective punishment that colonial authorities imposed on large areas of the country. Thousands suffered beatings and sexual assaults during *screenings* intended to extract information about the Mau Mau threat. Later, prisoners suffered even worse mistreatment in an attempt to force them to renounce their allegiance to the insurgency and to obey commands. [obey! just like in school] Significant numbers were murdered; official accounts describe **some prisoners being roasted alive**. One of the high-court claimants, Wambugu Wa Nyingi described how he was detained in 1952, held for nine years, much of the time in manacles, and beaten unconscious during a particularly notorious massacre at a camp at Hola in which 11 men died. Among the detainees who suffered severe mistreatment was Hussein Onyango Obama, the grandfather of Barack Obama [war criminal]. According to his widow, British soldiers **forced pins into his fingernails and buttocks and squeezed his testicles between metal rods**. Two of the original five claimants who brought the test case against the British government were **castrated**." (added emphasis) *Kill a few at Port Arthur? No worries. Kill those nogs in Vietnam, blow some ragheads in old Bagram, Do it now then Drone 'em well, Make their lives a living hell*. See Tedder in *NAME INDEX* to learn how the Crown/State **rewards its own murderers**.

federal government prior to that act being required by the prime minister, John Howard. This very line was pushed by the former labor party strongman and powerbroker, Graeme Richardson on the **Today** show on Channel 9 prior to the announcement by the prime minister of his requirements in relation to the states' constitutional powers regarding firearms.

Why is this so important? Because the federal government can only legally sign and adopt treaties and papers pertaining to its constitutional powers, especially those signed with the United Nations. Our federal government cannot sign away the state constitutional powers, regardless of our politicians' endeavours. We must also consider that in 1987, the major government players were from the labor party, which was tied to the International Labor Organization, a part of the United Nations. Later we would see the liberal federal government leaders meeting with George Soros and Henry Kissinger, to receive their instructions on how to govern Australia – but, back to the Port Arthur Massacre.

Now the first deviation from the previous massacres that occurred in Australia with the Port Arthur Massacre was the fact that there was the possibility that Martin Bryant was not the gunman surfaced in an article by Joe Vials in 1997, after the Citizens Electoral Council released an article⁵⁵ by Douglas and Sharpe which refers to the Tavistock Institute of London. Tavistock has been strongly connected with psychiatry in not only Britain and Australia, but also throughout the British Commonwealth and the United States of America, as well as its connections with the CIA, the Rand Corporation being the Washington CIA think tank, and the Rockefeller consortium. Tavistock created the British **counterinsurgency** ideology that was used in Burma and Europe during World War 2 and the Mau Mau uprising in Kenya and the Malayan Emergency campaigns which followed.⁵⁶

Today those same strategies are being used against Australians, British, Canadians, New Zealanders and the American people. One of the basic fundamentals of counterinsurgency is to create fear within the community, and cause the majority of people to follow a created thought pattern. For the ten percent of people who realise that something is amiss, they then either create a movement or infiltrate and then take over a functioning movement, and lead those people down a path where they can be ambushed. Articles that appeared in both the Melbourne Age and Herald Sun newspapers in October 1997 informed us that this infiltration had indeed taken place, mostly by the state police special branches under the direction of the Protective Security Coordination Centre (PSCC), exactly the same as what was used in Kenya and Malaya.

We can also link psychiatry with all of the Australian labelled *lone-nut* gunmen as these persons were all stated to have been sufferers of schizophrenia in the initial media reports, and all linked as being under psychiatric care. This link goes back to Australia's first attempted political assassination. In 1966, Arthur Caldwell was shot in the face by an apparent schizophrenic law student after an anti-Vietnam War meeting at Manly in Sydney. It was this attempted

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

assassination that caused Caldwell to retire as the leader of the opposition. His replacement was Gough Whitlam, who was viewed by many of the old time Labor Party politicians to be untrustworthy.

Again, if we consider the plots involved with the first of the anti-gun massacres, that of Julian Knight, when he suddenly went out to save the world from invading Martians, in Hoddle Street, at Clifton Hill in Melbourne, and the fact that he placed a bullet in his shirt pocket to use on himself if he was to be captured by the Martians, or if he ran out of ammunition. The reason Julian Knight did not commit suicide was that when the time came for him to die, he suddenly found that he had lost his bullet, and so whilst still holding his rifle he surrendered to police. Had Mr. Knight had a real death wish, all he had to do was to point his then empty rifle at the arresting police constables, and they would have obligingly shot him dead.


The plot surrounding the Queen Street massacre Frank Vitkovic is not so clear. He was reported to have said during his enactment certain comments including: "how do they expect me to kill people with this gun?" The really interesting aspect of this massacre (also in Melbourne) though was the fact that two of the anti-gun campaigners, the Victorian state politicians Race Matthews minister for police and the arts, and the state attorney-general Jim Kennan, were in the building diagonally opposite and were actually able to watch Vitkovic fall to his death.

In the Strathfield Massacre in Sydney, Wade Frankum ran rampant through a shopping centre. He then went to the car park and got into the front passenger seat of a car driven by a little old lady, who drove him a couple of hundred yards whilst he apologised to her and then got out of the car and shot himself. Now this gives us a couple of problems. How did Wade get into this little old lady's car, as she was by herself and just leaving a car park, where she would have had all the doors locked except for the driver's door? I mean carrying the large knife and the rifle, he would have had his arms full, and I can just imagine the little old lady reaching across to unlock the front passenger door to let him in, as he looked so harmless. (Oh, by the way, I have been told that this little old lady was a detective sergeant.)

Now it can be seen that all the scenarios in regard to these massacres were fairly simplistic. They did however suffer from two deficiencies. One was that in each of these acts the perpetrator was not able to deliver the required effect **to create absolute shock and horror**. In other words, they were not able to kill enough victims, or to create enough community outrage to force the governments to act. This was why the Tasmanian premier Robin Gray told the special premiers meeting in December 1987, that Tasmania had no reason to cede their firearm laws to the federal government, as their laws were adequate – Tasmania did not have any problems with firearms. The second problem was that the anti-gun movement in Australia still did not have enough clout – they had to call in the big boys.

Without bloggers like Daniel Baxter, Michael Moore, and Syd Walker, Australians would continue to get the mainstream media's regurgitation of the corrupt official narrative about Port Arthur – all lies and lickspittles.

57 Since 1999, Sydney dentist John Wilson has battled the corrupt legal system for his and our legal and human right to trial by jury. See **Fully Informed Jury Association** [fija.org], and Clay S. Conrad. *Jury Nullification: The Evolution of a Doctrine*; 1998. In the UK, jury nullification is known as **jury equity**.



bookfinder.com

Officials in New South Wales cannot counter Wilson's persistent and consistent arguments and have resorted to persecution and violence in attempts to silence him. In 2008, his dental surgery was entered. Equipment was smashed and confidential patient records and his research data were stolen. On rightsandwrong.com.au you will find details of these shocking criminal acts against him. John Wilson is taking a Eureka-Stockade stand* against appalling injustices that banks, corporations, courts, judges, and governments inflict on Australians. He inspires just as Dolores Ibarruri did with her rallying words to republicans during the civil war (1936-39) in Spain: "Better to die on your feet than to live on your knees." Around Australia, contempt is growing for judges and their adversarial legal system which serves lawyers and judges (former lawyers) but not the people who seek **Truth** and **Justice**. There is a better way. In continental Europe, the superior investigative system seeks the truth without which there is no justice. In his book *Serial Liars*; 2005 (see *BIBLIOGRAPHY*), Evan Whitton exposes criminal corruption associated with the adversarial system in Australia. And in *The Evil Deeds of the Ratbag Profession in the Criminal Justice System*; 1998 (see *BIBLIOGRAPHY*), Brett Dawson knocks the horsehair wigs right off the neighing numbskulls. (* see ballarat.com/eurekastockade.htm)

JUDGES AND JUSTICE ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS⁵⁷

■ "[Judges] are rarely able to hear both sides of a case with an open and unjaundiced mind."

Clay S. Conrad
Jury Nullification
1998: p. xxiii

■ "The judiciary attracted confidence from just 15% of people."

Daniel Dasey
Sydney Morning Herald
4 May 2003

■ "Beneath the robes of many judges, I have seen corruption, incompetence, bias, laziness, meanness of spirit, and plain ordinary stupidity.... The courtroom oath – 'to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth' – is applicable only to witnesses. Defense attorneys, prosecutors, and judges don't take this oath – **they couldn't!**" (added emphasis)

Alan M. Dershowitz
The Best Defense
1982: p. xix

■ "Perhaps the most common failure of judges in maintaining impartiality, however, is where they appear to **lead the jury in a particular direction through prejudice, bias, or simply personal opinion**. It is one thing to allow information masquerading as evidence to be led, and leaving jurors to make up their own minds about it, it is quite another still to actually make direct suggestions to the jury regarding ways in which information should be interpreted." (added emphasis)

■ "Judges quoting specific laws, or precedent from other cases, appear to be applying logical, rational and impartial interpretation of 'the law.' In too many instances, however, they are simply sifting through data to find that which agrees with their own opinion or interpretation, and applying their findings selectively. Because **we still allow the nonsense of 'legal speak' to dominate our courts**, much of the time, it is almost impossible to understand exactly what these judges are actually saying, and once again, ordinary people are left to believe, by default, that the judges 'know what they are talking about'." (added emphasis)

Sandra Lean
No Smoke!
2008: pp. 199, 201

■ "The danger to justice lies not, however, in the challenging of some of its findings, but in **not** challenging them.... The test of a legal system is not whether it makes mistakes, for all such systems do. The real test is the willingness of the system to correct errors when they are brought to the attention of officials." (original emphasis)

Robert N. Moles
A State of Injustice
2004: p. xxi

(cont.)

■ "We mustn't be put off by wigged arrogance. How much longer do we wish to live in a world where lying⁵⁸ is to be considered an art form favoured by the state? For how much longer are...people prepared to be set up for judgement by arrogant liars?"

■ "An independent body ought to be able to monitor the performance of each individual judge and sack him or her for incompetence just as occurs in virtually every other profession."

L.A. Naylor

Judge For Yourself

2004: pp. 255, 264

■ "[Professor] Derrick Pounder has told us, judges deny things: 'Allegations of injustices committed by the justice system are inevitably contentious. Outright denial and barely concealed anger are the predictable reactions from some who perceive the raising of this issue publicly as an assault on the criminal justice system as a whole.' Haughty judges would rather *shoot messengers* than amend their behaviour. But the question judges in Australia should ask themselves is this: What are we doing that deprives us public respect? However given their outrageous salaries and conditions (includes private thrones), judges will probably opt for the status quo over **truth** and **justice**." (original italics & emphasis)

Keith Allan Noble

CORRUPT TO THE CORE

2010: p. 512

■ "The problem with miscarriages of justice is not just that they occur, but that the legal system tends to be unable or unwilling to rectify them on an individual basis, and unwilling to review procedures that facilitate them."

Janet Ransley

in *Police Reform*

2002: p. 32

■ "[N]ever have I seen a judge be totally fair."

Geoffrey Robertson

The Justice Game

1999: p. 386

■ "Every innocent person who has been wrongly jailed means that a truly guilty person remains at liberty perhaps to offend again."

Satish Sekar

in *The Death of Justice*

2008: p. 174

■ "Although judicial work is the **most error-riddled industry**⁵⁹ there is, some judges insist on being treated as if enveloped in a Christ-like blaze of glory." (added emphasis)

■ "[T]he European investigative system, which seeks the truth and is controlled by trained judges is necessarily better than a system which does not seek truth and is controlled by trained liars."

Evan Whitton

Serial Liars

2005: pp. 76, 77-78

58 Lying is a standard of the Anglo-American adversarial legal system.

Naylor's book is published in Britain. Whitton's book (last listed in adjacent Insert) is published in Australia. Both refer to the same thing. **Lawyers are trained liars**, judges are appointed* from those perjurers, thus judges are **lying criminals**. Until the citizens of Australia have control over judges – by electing them and firing them – such outrageous practices will continue. (* About such appointments, Shane Dowling states this [kangarocourtofaustralia.com]: "Australia is quite unique in Western Society in that there is no independent body to investigate complaints about judges and magistrates nor is there an independent body for the appointment of judges and magistrates. Subsequently the **corruption is rife** as they are accountable to nobody and the politicians appoint their own boys and girls to the judicial positions." [added emphasis])

59 Every error of every judge has a direct negative bearing on the lives of people as well as their family and friends. People are victimized, humiliated, wrongly imprisoned, incorrectly fined, bankrupted, broken, *etc.*, all to keep up the **charade of justice** being served. With no input from the people, judges are appointed, paid fat salaries, given excessive benefits including international travel, and they expect to be addressed *Your Honour*. It is beyond shameless. Sit in on a court case in Australia. One of these criminals will enter the room then **fail** to introduce her/himself, **fail** to reveal her/his qualifications, and **fail** to confirm that her/his appointment is not in accordance with the law of the land. (For the latter failing, see proof on rightsandwrong.com.au.)

*In the case of
Port Arthur,
a corrupt legal
process was
put forth as
a trial and
justice
being served.*

In the document put out by the Information and Research Service (IRS) of Canberra's parliament house in relation to John Howard's moves on the firearm debate of May 1996, this paper had advice in reference to the prime minister using his external powers to implement the required national firearm laws. In part, the IRS paper stated this: "However, the dicta on using the existence of an 'international concern' as a basis for Commonwealth legislation under the external affairs power have never been directly tested. Furthermore, it has often been Australia (or a trio of Canada, New Zealand and Australia) which raised the issue of gun control at international fora."

What this means is that the United States of America has not been pushing its agenda in regard to overcoming its second amendment on the international forum. However the evidence of American involvement within the Port Arthur Massacre becomes quite clear. It was the unusual amount of attention that was given to the gunman's remarks pertaining to wasps at the Port Arthur Historic Site that raised some concern. The gunman used the term "**WASPs**" when he was talking about tourists. He also used the term "Japs," which corroborated that the inference was on the human form rather than the *European Wasp* that our media would have us believe. **WASP** is an American acronym and has no connection with Australia whatsoever.

However, at Port Arthur the **WASPs** were the passengers from two tourist coaches that arrived at the Historic Site at about 12:30 p.m. and would have been boarding the ferry *Bundeena* at 1:30 p.m., except that the ferry's schedule had altered from the summer schedule to the winter schedule two weeks before the massacre. But what is most significant was that the gunman mentioned the term **WASPs** to witnesses Gaye Lynd and her friend Vicki after their vehicle had broken down outside the Seascope cottage. The gunman had stopped to enquire about their problem, purchased some marijuana from Lynd, and assisted in restarting their vehicle when they had problems with the electrical system of their vehicle.

The question that must be asked is just how did the gunman know about the American tourists before he even attended the Port Arthur Historic Site? Then there was the American tourist, James Balasko, and Cynthia Zahorcak his fiancée. Balasko was, all Australians were told, the only person to capture the Port Arthur gunman on video. That was not correct, as the Wilkinsons also were able to video the gunman standing beside the Volvo sedan, prior to it leaving the car-park area. However, Balasko, when interviewed by Tasmania Police used certain Australian vernacular, which most Americans would not have known, and repeated the same language when interviewed in America on the 1st August 1996 at the police station at East Windsor in New Jersey.

The most telling American influence though was Rebecca Peters, who joked that her father whilst working in Costa Rica was most probably working with the CIA. Peters came to Australia, attended university in Sydney, and was then granted Australian citizenship. She became the spokesperson for Coalition for Gun Control Australia,

WHAT THE IGNORANT OVERLOOK

FOR all those investigators who have studied the Port Arthur case, some of the most irritating things are the **glib comments** made by those who have not. Stupid comments blurted out to explain an incident, which took so many lives and injured so many, then and later to this day – stupid comments so irritatingly nonsensical.

They saw him there! This, and its variations, is one of the favourites. The point being that because some people claim to have seen Martin Bryant at Port Arthur on 28 April 1996, we are to believe he was the gunman. The whole critical matter of proper identification is ignored and Bryant's presence is to be accepted based solely on some people saying they believe/heard/know it was him. But, what is overlooked is the fact that other people who were at and near Port Arthur on that date – who were real eyewitnesses – have stated in writing that **the gunman was not Martin Bryant**.

They found his passport. This alleged find has to be the forerunner of the fluttering passport that allegedly fell down to the street from one of the twin towers in New York after alleged terrorists miraculously flew jetliners into them in 2001. Officials used that passport – and another passport plus an ID card found at other 9/11 locations – as proof that *Moslems* had attacked America and murdered over 3000 people. What is always overlooked though is that the names on those passports and the ID card do not appear on the passenger lists prepared by the airlines. And what is overlooked with the alleged passport that allegedly bears Martin Bryant's name is that finding it anywhere **does not prove** Martin was the gunman. Martin's home had been entered and personal things belonging to him were stolen. His passport might have been in a (*sic*) yellow Volvo at the tollbooth – but this does not prove Martin drove that vehicle there. Nowhere within all the documents this editor has obtained, or in the many websites he has searched, has he found any details related to this alleged passport: **no** image; **no** dates of issuance and expiry; **no** visas; **no** point-of-entry stamps; **no** address; *etc.* It has been hyped as proof that Martin Bryant was at the Port Arthur Historic Site where, it is illogically concluded, he perpetrated the shooting.

He said he did it. In the legal (not justice) systems of Australia, those accused of having committed crimes are required to plead either guilty, or not guilty. If they refuse to plead, not guilty is entered and the trial process then commences. But for Martin Bryant, things did not go according to these standard procedures. No. Martin was required – not by law, but by the needs of the State – to plead guilty. That would ensure there would be **no trial**. So after months of pleading not guilty, the maltreatment and badgering at Risdon Prison finally broke Martin. Then, he conceded to a guilty plea insisted on by **unethical John Avery** – a lawyer who was supposed to *defend* Martin, but who **betrayed** him. People overlook the fact that Martin, who had the mind of an 11-year-old boy, was forced to accept a guilty plea to stop his **mental torture**.

Anyone can squeeze a trigger. Said by those who overlook all the planning for the incident: the large meetings; the 22-body truck; the embalming equipment; *etc.* What happened at and near Port Arthur exceeded the intellectual, physical, and emotional competence of Martin Bryant. He never had the brains to plan it, or the physical skills to perpetrate it, or the soul to kill, and kill, and kill. Martin never had it in him to murder 35 people and to wound 23. There is **not a shred of hard evidence** contradicting this.

If he didn't do it, then who did? It is not up to those who reveal that Martin Bryant is innocent to determine the name of the gunman. No innocent person should be kept in prison – *he'll do* – because the real perpetrator of some crime is not known publicly. On the Internet, it is stated that a **Benjamin Overbeeke** might be one gunman/killer. He should be thoroughly investigated. But to maintain the cover-up, he won't be. – **ed.**

*In 1996,
35 people
were killed and
23 people
were wounded
at and near
Port Arthur
– but the
planners and
perpetrators
have still
not been brought
to justice.*

with Roland Browne, the spokesperson for Gun Control Tasmania, employed by the federal justice department under the Tasmanian politician, Duncan Kerr. (Browne later became the head of Legal Aid in Tasmania.)

After the implementation of the national firearm laws, Rebecca Peters returned to America as an Australian citizen. She enrolled at the Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore), but based herself in Washington (DC) to become the program director of the Funders' Collaborative for Gun Violence Prevention. This particular body being financed by the Soros Foundations via the Center on Crime, Communities and Culture of the Open Society Institute. In May 2000, Peters was reported as a **Soros Senior Justice Fellow** at Johns Hopkins Centre for Gun Policy and Research, and she completed her postdoctoral fellowship at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health.

Peters was reported as being involved with the Million Moms March on the Washington mall in the summer of 2000, with its close affiliations with Hillary Clinton. George Soros was part of the Kissinger-Rockefeller consortium. Peters' role in Australia was initially filled by another American, Randy Marshall, and then in 2000 by Roland Browne. Roland Browne's position as head of Legal Aid in Tasmania was then filled by the former head of the PSCC [Protective Security Coordination Centre], Norman Raeburn.

Further American influence can be judged by CNN's John Raedler of Sydney, and their other agent Hugh Williams of Sydney but based in Berlin. Both these persons are believed to be CIA, but it was CNN's preparedness to use the Port Arthur Massacre for three to four days straight as a tool for the anti-gun movement that is another telling factor. Since when does an event in Australia warrant such attention in the United States of America?

Now consider the situation with president Bill Clinton and his wife Hillary, who was patron to the American anti-gun movement (aka: Brady Bunch) if about 100 American tourists had been massacred at little Port Arthur in Tasmania. Clinton would have had sufficient clout to instruct his **underling John Howard** just what to do with Australia's gun laws. But then the question would have arisen as to whether it was possible that the American anti-gun movement would have been able to use such a situation to override the American second amendment?

If we consider the various American connections with the Port Arthur Massacre, and then think about the use of the American acronym WASP, then there must also be some consideration of the possibility that the gunman may also have been American. What Australia experienced immediately after the Port Arthur Massacre was duplicated after America's September 11th 2001. The media ran all the *right* stories, truth was totally ignored, and every proper investigation was **impeded**. From 1996, Australia's politicians were totally inept at even mentioning the Port Arthur Massacre and its so-called conspiracy theories. No trial, no inquests, **nothing but fraudulent lies**. (This must remind many in the old Labor Party of the American

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

ambassador Marshall Green's arrival in Australia, and the again so-called CIA involvement in Gough Whitlam's sacking by John Kerr on the 11th November 1975.)

There is one more clue to the American involvement at Port Arthur. A U.S. Navy vessel⁶⁰ [allegedly] berthed at Hobart for the duration. So what? One of the methods used by the US to transmit top-secret operational messages has always been via the U.S. Navy. It may have been coincidental, but in such cases as the murder of 35 persons, **all coincidences should be clarified**. It has been stated by the IRS of the federal parliament that Canada was another player within the anti-gun movement. That Canadian high commissioner (Brian Schumacher) visited Port Arthur approximately ten days prior to the massacre, and the day before the new political head of Port Arthur Ray Groom MHR made a similar visit, must be acknowledged, but viewed as circumstantial, along with the fact that the Canberra based Canadian diplomat Simon Williams and his wife were targets for the gunman as they drove past the Seascope cottage, and that Mrs Williams received wounds from flying glass that caused her left little finger to be amputated.

Alright, back to the main subject, and that is what if the Port Arthur Massacre was a contrived event. If the Port Arthur Massacre was to be used to implement the required changes to our Constitution-based state laws and the ceding of those laws to the federal government, then the massacre had to be, as in Roland Browne's words bigger than all previous massacres in Australia. Browne prophesied that little bit in November 1995, when he was working with the department of justice under his political boss Duncan Kerr.

There would also be a need for reliable witnesses who would be able to positively identify the gunman, as Martin Bryant. Such vital information could not be left to chance. Let us see who those main witnesses were.

There were the Masons, who were the last people to visit Seascope, and they both positively identified Martin Bryant as the person they saw at that cottage. There is no lie within their statements, but what we must look at is that their testimony was a prerequisite of **the contrived event**. Another prerequisite was the filming of the gunman at the carpark, and that role was filled by the valiant James Balasko, as he positioned himself to take [so-called] authentic videos of the gunman. The Port Arthur Massacre was a planned event, so the planners **could not rely on good fortune**, they had to have someone there to capture the event.

Again, the Seascope cottage was and always had been an intrinsic part of the planning. The cottage had to be prepared and secured well in advance of the main play, which is why David Martin was shot at 10:40 a.m. when **Martin Bryant was over 58 kilometres away from the scene** and didn't arrive until at least an hour later. Witnesses actually saw Bryant at Eaglehawk Neck at 11:30 a.m. that day, but were not required to give that evidence. This places Donald Gunn's evidence and his position into question. Gunn's state-

⁶⁰ This editor has been unable to confirm if any such vessel was berthed at Hobart in April 1996. Regardless, the point that the author makes in his paragraph is a good one. All things that on first impression are coincidences "should be clarified" to be certain they are coincidences. Things are not always what we too quickly conclude they are.

ment that he and his wife stayed at the cottage overnight and were the last guests to leave the premises at 11:15 a.m., which conflicts with evidence from other witnesses who heard two shots fired from Seascope at 10:40 a.m., and the series of rapidly fired shots just before 11:00 a.m. Retired security force members have informed me that **ASIO lost two of its operatives** within the Broad Arrow Café, and that one of those operatives had been classified as a local. If that information is correct, then those operatives were Mills and Nightingale. Since they were killed inside the Broad Arrow Café, then that adds to the scenario that the ferry the *Bundeena* was to be the main target.

If the *Bundeena* was to be the main target, then we must look at who would have been the actual victims of the attack. The answer is those very people who had gathered outside the PAHS information centre in preparation for the coming tour, the American tourists with any other tourists that accompanied them.⁶¹ This would then also assist in explaining the two containers of fuel, or petrol if you wish, which were found in the boot of the Volvo, but later were deliberately and **incorrectly stated** to have been used to set fire to the BMW and to Seascope cottage.

The two containers of petrol, poured over the water near the ferry, or thrown onto the ferry, or even the jetty, then ignited with the packets of fire starters that were also found in the Volvo sedan would have created mayhem. Also consider all the loose .308 rounds that were also found in the boot of the Volvo. Had they been thrown into the burning jetty, or ferry, then they would have exploded and created even more panic amongst not only the victims but also anyone else at the site who would have attempted to save them.

With all this mayhem, the dead and injured, the catastrophic conditions had to be demonstrated without creating any blemish on the government. Thus the preparations to contain the disaster and put on such a good show to all the world. All our volunteer organizations were duly trained. The last exercise, being a supposed aeroplane disaster at Hobart, was just the week previous. Our hospital units were also bolstered with the addition of twenty-five specialist doctors from all over Australia in Hobart for the weekend. Royal Hobart Hospital even had Dr Bryan Walpole, the President of the AMA (Australian Medical Association) and an extreme anti-gun campaigner in charge of the emergency unit.

Walpole's association with the Australian Intelligence body ASIO became clearer when it was reported in *The Mercury* in May 2002 that Walpole was given a posting at Australia's ASIO base on Macquarie Island in March of that year. Then the gunman would have retreated back to Seascope cottage where he and his associates would have waited for the police response before setting off the next stage of the plan, much of which actually occurred, except that Martin Bryant actually was able to emerge from the burning building.

Now let us again consider the effects of such a scenario, covered, as it was to be by at least three days on CNN and all the other media,

⁶¹ See Insert *TWO BUS LOADS* in Part 4.

JUDICIAL CORRUPTION AND IGNORANCE

*ON 7 November 1996, the guilty plea John Avery forced on his client, who he was supposed to defend, killed the last legal right Martin Bryant had – trial by jury; **no ethical lawyer, no rights, no trial, no jury, no justice.** On 22 November 1996, William Cox, bearing the presumptuous title of Justice and wearing a horsehair wig symbolizing wisdom, stated the following comments recorded in R. v Martin Bryant:*

...The prisoner has shown no remorse for his actions.* Though he has ultimately pleaded guilty, it has clearly been done in recognition of the undoubted strength of the evidence against him and amounts to little more than a case of bowing to the inevitable. That his change of plea has saved considerable distress, inconvenience and cost to those who would have had to be called as witnesses and to the victims and community at large by the prolongation of the proceedings is a factor which should be considered in his favour when weighing all the relevant considerations, but in the overall scheme of things, it is, in my view, overwhelmingly outweighed by the factors mitigating against him.

Having regard to the nature and extent of his conduct, I cannot regard it as anything other than falling within the worst category of cases for which the maximum penalty is prescribed. Taking account of the medical evidence and of his lack of insight into the magnitude and effect of his conduct apparent in all his appearances before this Court, I have no reason to hope and every reason to fear that he will remain indefinitely as disturbed and insensitive as he was when planning and executing the crimes of which he now stands convicted. The protection of the community, in my opinion, requires that he serve fully the sentences.... That consideration, as well as my belief that service of the whole of such sentence is the minimum period of imprisonment which justice requires that he must serve having regard to all the circumstances of his offences, leads to the conclusion that he should be declared ineligible for parole.

MARTIN BRYANT – on each of the thirty-five counts of murder in this indictment you are sentenced to imprisonment for the term of your natural life. I order that you not be eligible for parole in respect of any such sentence.

On each of the remaining counts in the indictment, you are sentenced to imprisonment for twenty-one years to be served concurrently with each other and with the concurrent sentences of life imprisonment already imposed. In respect of each sentence of twenty-one years, I order that you likewise not be eligible for parole.

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN & SCREW MARTIN BRYANT

* This strongly suggests Martin was coerced to accept the guilty plea of his unethical lawyer John Avery. Martin showed no remorse because he was/is innocent.

*AFTER Cox' disgusting display of corruption and ignorance, feigned or factual, Martin was returned to a cage at Risdon Prison near Hobart. You can go there, but you will not be allowed to visit him. He's kept isolated. It helps them send him insane. Martin is dying – **slowly, alone, in pain and anguish** – from almost 2.5 decades of slow torture. Do you really accept that this boy-man who had an IQ of 66 (what is it now?) was responsible for the entire incident at and near Port Arthur in 1996? Do you believe he ordered that **embalming box** (see SUBJECT INDEX) to be made ready for the incident? Do you believe a mentally-handicapped person, or any person for that matter, should be made to die for the crimes of others? Do you believe justice has been served? And, do you believe the family, relatives, and friends of those killed and wounded have been told the whole truth? – **ed.***

and with 50–100 American tourists amongst those killed, injured and or badly burned at the Port Arthur Historic Site. America's President Bill Clinton would have demanded that John Howard immediately take control and remove all those nasty little firearms. Our prime minister would have had no say in the matter, he would have had to obey Clinton. America's second amendment would have received its greatest threat, and the NWO (New World Order) its greatest gain. However, the planners did not envisage the alteration of the ferry's schedule.

Now the ferry's timetable change was not the only mishap that occurred within the planning of the Port Arthur Massacre. We know that there were originally two hostages, David and Sally Martin, the owners of Seascope cottage. We are aware that David Martin was shot twice, and two shots were heard by neighbours at 10:40 a.m. We are also aware from police statements that Sally Martin was seen alive and naked at Seascope during the initial stage of the SOG siege at Seascope.⁶² Now, if Mrs Martin was a hostage, why did the gunman need to take another hostage?

62 Three police (P. Allen; P. Hyland; G. Whittle) who were in attendance at Seascope cottage on the afternoon of 28 April 1996 reported a naked female with **black hair** screaming, yelling, and running on the yard of Seascope. This editor has studied two images of the late Sally Martin and it seems very much so that she had grey **not black hair**. So who was this black-haired female at that cottage? After being reported by the cops, no further mention appears in the literature. Why did Martin's so-called defence lawyer Damian Bugg never mention the sighting of this **naked black-haired woman at Seascope**? Her being seen and reported, in writing, by cops **up-ends the official narrative** – which no doubt is the reason why the devious Bugg did not mention it in his document to Cox. The sighting of a naked **black-haired woman** is exculpatory evidence for Bryant. If she was Sally Martin, it proves Bryant did not kill her before midday as Bryant was convicted of doing. If it was not Sally Martin, it means at least one other person was at Seascope. And, it means things went on at that cottage which the cops and Bugg have kept secret so naive people will keep believing the **corrupt official narrative**.

63 For details about what occurred at the tollbooth see Part 7, particularly the *Witness Statements* of: F. & N. Cheok; C. Prout; D. Rabe. For details about what occurred at the general store see the statements of: Y. Kateros; J. Laycock; K. Spruce.

64 *Hostages held in final siege*. The Australian; 29 April 1996.

Witnesses reported that when the gunman stopped at the tollbooth, he didn't immediately shoot the [people in the BMW] but rather had an argument with [Robert Salzmann then] the [BMW] driver Russell Pollard. Why argue with any person whom you are going to shoot? This creates a dangerous and uncontrolled situation. Why go to the boot of the Volvo, take hold of the FN-FAL rifle and then shoot [Robert Salzmann then] Russell Pollard, and [then the two women who had been travelling] in the BMW? This was the action of the gunman as reported to police by witnesses of this particular scene. We do know that after shooting the four people [who had been travelling] in the BMW, the gunman exchanged vehicles, from the Volvo to the BMW then drove a couple of hundred yards or metres, stopped the Corolla driven by Glenn Pears, took Pears hostage and then shot Zoe Hall.⁶³

Again, this was another dangerous and uncontrolled situation, but the gunman appeared to have some compulsion to take another hostage, so why?

That the police had radio communications outside Seascope was later denied, but this normally radio dead spot was working very clearly from the start of the police siege at the cottage. This created some problems as various persons especially among the SES [State Emergency Service], and the media monitor the police channels. Thus SES manning police roadblocks heard various reports on the police radio, and one police radio communication was reported by Bruce Montgomery of The Australian newspaper: "He's got some police officers down there and he's shooting at them, and we also believe that the people in Seascope are returning fire at the offender."⁶⁴

In other words there were two gunmen at Seascope. The next interesting consideration is that these two gunmen were shooting whilst Martin Bryant was on the telephone talking to the Police negotiator, sergeant Terry McCarthy, so we can dismiss the argument that one

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

of the shooters was Martin Bryant. So we have two shooters and Martin Bryant, or two hostages and Martin Bryant, if we believe the government spin. The police at the siege were even fortunate enough to have the SAC-PAV's thermal imaging unit from Canberra to use at the siege, and it would have given the Tasmania Police SOGs an image containing three persons, but the dead hostages would have left no thermal image and thus would not be visible to the police via this equipment. This is the only link I can find to demonstrate the requirement for two hostages.

TERRY McCARTHY



Negotiator, Tasmania Police; 1996

So who were the other two persons inside Seascapes cottage with Martin Bryant? The gunman has to be one of those persons. We know from the initial reports from witnesses that the gunman was 18–23 years of age with blonde hair – **a Martin Bryant look-alike**. However whilst on the telephone with the police negotiator, Bryant continually referred to his companion "**Rick**." So who was Rick? The police and government line has always been that Martin Bryant was referring to Glenn Pears when he was talking about Rick. If that was the case then Martin Bryant must have done some pretty good interviewing of Glenn Pears, whilst Pears was a hostage, between the times Bryant was looking after the other hostage, Sally Martin, and talking to the police negotiator, and all the other chores, besides shooting from the attic windows of Seascapes cottage. Martin Bryant would have also had to have a better IQ than the 66 reported by Dr. Ian Joblin to gather and retain that information.

So let us consider some of the information Martin Bryant gave to the police negotiator regarding **Rick** as pertinent to Glenn Pears.

Jamie: Yeah yeah, I got him and managed to get him his wife she he wanted to participate um in the kidnapping in instead of his wife, I thought alright quick get in get into the car and I've got him as a hostage.

Now this is not correct. Glenn Pears was with a work companion, Zoe Hall, not his wife.

*Audio transcripts
prepared by cops
have
zero credibility
without the original
recording tape(s)
– and even
the original
recording tape(s)
can be
corrupted by cops.*

*Martin Bryant
could not converse
logically and
clearly with
Terry McCarthy
– yet you are
to believe
he had the brains
and the skills
to hold off
a SOG siege for
nearly 18 hours,
overnight, and
ALONE.*

Jamie: Well the chap that I've got here um **Rick** he's got um he's from Melbourne so uh um I mean you could drop Rick off but

Now this is not correct. Glenn Pears worked in Sydney and resided in Neutral Bay Sydney. [believed to have been from Tasmania]

Jamie: "Yeah but Rick wants to be Rick had twenty past oh 7 o'clock flight home you see tonight with his wife and um I mean Rick has to get back to Melbourne."

So Rick according to Martin Bryant comes from Melbourne.

Jamie: But er um he's understand that I'm gonna phone his parents up in Lauderdale.

Did Glenn Pears' parents reside in Lauderdale? There are no Pears listed in the telephone directory at Lauderdale.

Jamie: Lauderdale. Um Rick's 34.

So just how old was Glenn Pears? He was 35 years of age.

McCarthy: Well you talked about you talked about ah his wife and er his child and um we're having difficulties locating his wife and his child.

Jamie: Yes, she's only 12 months old the little child I found out from him.

McCarthy: Right. What about his wife. Do you know anything about his wife?

Jamie: Um sh yeah I do.

McCarthy: Can you tell me something about it?

Jamie: I know how high up in things she is. Yeah.

McCarthy: 'm sorry.

Jamie: I know how high up she is in the different areas.

McCarthy: How high up. What do you mean by that Jamie?

Jamie: In work, higher than what you are

McCarthy: the

Jamie: the intelligence and everything, university and everything

McCarthy: Oh right, is she, she's only she er a university er

Jamie: Oh she's passed that she's got full time work but I'm not going to let you know.

McCarthy: We're having real problems finding out about Rick. You prepared to tell me Ricks surname.

Jamie: Well he's a lawyer if you want the truth.

McCarthy: If Ricks there would you mind asking him what his surname is if you don't know.

Jamie: Apparently she's had a pretty hard life until she met thing a ma bob here.

Jamie: Rick and um he's great she's a great lady they're both professional people.

McCarthy: Right wha do what does ah what does she do?

Jamie: Um well I cant tell you that.

McCarthy: Why not?

Jamie: 'Cause I don't know.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

There is a secrecy here that is not related to a kidnapper and a hostage. However, if Rick was a friend of Martin Bryant, and Bryant was working in conjunction with Rick, then we can understand not only the secrecy but also the fact that Martin knows a fair bit about Rick, his occupation and his family life.

If we consider page 321 of the court document⁶⁵ where the DPP, Damian Bugg, informs the Hobart supreme court: "That is excluding his interstate travel and there are four pages of details of interstate travel over the period of time – sorry, three pages, your Honour, over the period of time after Miss Harvey's death." If we then go to page 349 of the same document where Bryant's solicitor John Avery read the report by Prof. Paul Mullen to the Hobart supreme court we have: "Mr Bryant made the majority of his trips to Melbourne where he was fond of riding on the trams and of going to the Zoo."

In the police interview of the 4th July 1996 we are informed that Martin Bryant purchased his Zodiac boat in Melbourne, the same boat that he apparently sold just three months later to purchase his AR-15. An identical AR-15 that had once been in the possession of the Victoria Police Special Operations Group, and reportedly destroyed at the Sims Metal Furnace. But it was found at Seascope after the police siege, whilst all the other AR-15s that had been issued to the police Special Operations Group were sold to a Bendigo firearms dealer for sale overseas.

It would be interesting to learn just what Martin Bryant's experiences were during his many forays into Melbourne, and of the various friends and acquaintances he established there. Undoubtedly, one of those acquaintances was **Rick**, Martin Bryant's companion during the siege at Seascope in the aftermath of the Massacre.

There are even more interesting aspects of Martin Bryant's travel when we consider his international trips, which started in December 1993. There has been some reports of Bryant's first trip to the United Kingdom in April 1994 relating to his stay in a hotel at Hereford, where the SAS (Special Air Service) is based in England. That Bryant visited Britain four times has not been made public knowledge, or the fact that he visited the United States of America three times and Germany three times. In America, Bryant frequently landed at Miami, which just happens to be the closest international airport to Fort Bragg, the American special forces base. On his trips to Germany, Bryant flew to Frankfurt, again where both the American and German special forces bases are located. What is extremely interesting is that both the Australian SAS and police SOG units also have exchange programs with Britain, Germany and America, and complete their training at these very same bases.

In the court document on page 319, the DPP, Damian Bugg: "Your Honour, in 1995 – in June, that is, only one fortnight later, he flew from Hobart to Melbourne then Melbourne, Bangkok, Frankfurt and then two weeks later he flew Frankfurt to Singapore to Sydney. Then three weeks later he flew Hobart, Sydney, Los Angeles, six days later he flew Los Angeles, Tokyo and two days later, Tokyo to Melbourne."⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Page numbers within the text are from: *R/The Queen v Martin Bryant*; 1996. The term court document is not to be interpreted to mean a document produced during or after the trial. Numerous documents were officially prepared during or after bureaucratic *legal* processes involving Martin Bryant, processes undertaken at or through a court house. The identified document is not a trial transcript – there was **NO trial for Martin Bryant**. The State denied him a trial.

⁶⁶ Melbourne seems as if it became a significant place to Martin Bryant. In the case literature it says that he liked to go to Melbourne then visit the zoo. Innocuous? Many of his international flights departed from and returned to Melbourne. In her book *My Story*, Carleen Bryant names that city seven times in relation to international trips which Martin made. Innocuous? In a *Witness Statement* (28 April 1996), Petra Willmott says this: "When I arrived at Carleen's house, she said there was no need to worry, she thinks Martin has gone to Melbourne." In another of her statements (8 May 1996) she states this: "I remember Martin BRYANT saying to me about four weeks ago, not to come over on Saturday until he got a phone call from Melbourne. I asked him 'What phone call' and he said he was waiting to hear about a German TV'." Innocuous? And Willmott also revealed Martin was fearful of a person who, it seems, Martin only identified as **Tiger**. Now the police did **not** determine or declare who **Tiger** was. And the DPP did **not** determine or declare who **Tiger** was. So where did he live? Was **Tiger** a resident of Tasmania? Or, did he reside in Melbourne? And could **Tiger** have taken Martin to the zoo, in Melbourne? With no trams in Hobart, Martin had no experience with trams in that city. So he would have needed assistance to help him get his tickets and to find tram stops for Tram 55 which goes directly by the Melbourne zoo. Maybe **Tiger** helped Martin with his international travels. By jet aircraft, this requires people to be attentive in relation to airports, flight times, visas, passport control, tickets, directions, ground transport, hotels, boarding gates, money, customs, security, etc. So this editor wonders how Martin (**cont.**)

So Martin Bryant spent two days in Tokyo, Japan. However during his police interview on the 4th July 1996, we have this:

- Q. Have you ever been to Japan?
A. No never.
Q. But.
A. I'd like to go, 'cos the people are very polite and.
Q. How do. Sorry I didn't hear you?
A. The people are very polite and always speak to you when they see you and....

So how is it that Martin Bryant, who loved travelling and meeting people has forgotten that he spent two days in Tokyo? Don't put it down to bad memory as the Risdon Prison psychiatrist, Dr Wilf Lopez states quite strongly that Martin Bryant has a good comprehension and a good memory. So could his memory lapse have been induced? If so, then what else has Bryant been induced to forget?

EVERYONE KNOWS HE DID IT

"THE **most common element in all wrongful convictions** later overturned by DNA evidence has been eyewitness misidentification.... Misidentifications don't only threaten the innocent, they also derail investigations. While police focus on finding evidence against an **innocent person**, the perpetrator can get away.... Most law enforcement agencies use the same methods they have used for decades – live and photo lineups, usually conducted without a blind administrator or proper instructions. It is stressful for victims and eyewitnesses to identify a perpetrator, and they **make mistakes**. Sometimes these mistakes are triggered by a gap in memory or the desire to make an identification at all costs. In other cases, subtle cues by police – intentional or not – lead to a **false identification**." (added emphasis)

Innocence Project

Eyewitness misidentification

innocentproject.org

4 February 2013

(amended; added emphasis)

66 (cont.) coped with all this given his very low IQ of 66. (Recall that Petra Willmott said he would lose the plot at times.) His mother Carleen Bryant said one trip that Martin took lasted **three weeks** and it included Melbourne. Martin told the cops that he had **no credit card**. This means Martin **travelled with wads of cash** – or, did some person go with Martin and take care of all those travel details? **Tiger** perhaps. Finally, Paul Mullen the questionable psychiatrist lived/s in Melbourne.

67 The Mercury. 26 November 1996.

Now if Martin Bryant was induced to forget this stay in Tokyo then there is evidence of mind control. This means that he could also be induced to remember things that never occurred, such as his story of the kidnapping of Glenn Pears at Fortescue Bay Road. Again, if Bryant was given the story of Fortescue Bay and the kidnapping, then who actually gave Bryant that concocted story? The answer has to be either the gunman or Rick. However, we can discount the gunman, as throughout the whole episode of the siege at Seascope, there is only mention of Rick, and the two Martins, David and Sally.

We then go back to the words of the police negotiator, sergeant Terry McCarthy, who described Martin Bryant's behaviour as follows: "He completely contradicted all of our expectations and all of our training, which tells us the kind of response we're likely to get."**67**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

And: "He was quite calm, almost rehearsed."⁶⁸ To demonstrate just what McCarthy meant consider this part of the negotiator tapes:

McCarthy: *Jamie*
Jamie: Oh hello how are you?
McCarthy: It's Terry again are you?
Jamie: I'm fine.
McCarthy: How's things going in there mate?
Jamie: Fine couldn't be better just like on a Hawaiian holiday.
McCarthy: Hawaiian holiday?
Jamie: Yes that's correct sir.
McCarthy: Oh, sorry I don't understand what you mean by that.
Jamie: Uh I don't know myself no.

There is no mention of Martin Bryant ever having had a Hawaiian holiday, so just exactly where did this idea come from? Then there were the continual statements of Bryant regarding just how he was taking good care of the Martins and of Rick, the other supposed hostage. But David Martin was already dead, shot at 10:40 a.m., so **how could Bryant be looking after him making them meals and cups of tea, taking them to the toilet, moving them to the double bed and all the other actions Bryant described to the police negotiator?**

Then there was the supposed cache of gelignite found under a double bed:

Jamie: I've got some explosives um it's actually not nitroglycerine um what's that other one round plastic um gelignite is it? With wicks on it that floats.
McCarthy: Where did you, can I ask you where you got that from *Jamie*?
Jamie: Under the bed upstairs here um

And then there was this little beauty:

McCarthy: *Jamie*
Jamie: Yes. Hello. How are you?
McCarthy: I'm very well thanks Jamie. Yourself?
Jamie: Uh well I'm well up til now and the past few twenty seconds. What I've actually found out man is that one of you boys is right outside North East I'd say, with an infra-red scope.⁶⁹ I've got one up here that I've found from this persons own um owns this property, he's shining right towards me. If he doesn't leave can you just ask him to move on.
McCarthy: Alright, we'll do that, we'll do that. Now
Jamie: cause he's gonna shoot he's trying to shoot he's gonna shoot **your main man**, I mean
McCarthy: Oh, oh I can guarantee
Jamie: I'll blow this um these you know you know what's gonna happen if
McCarthy: I don't want to see anybody hurt, alright.
Jamie: You, you move him on.

⁶⁸ The Mercury. 26 November 1996.

⁶⁹ This is one of the many things which, suggestively, was not found at Seascapes cottage after the SOG siege was over. See Insert *MISSING EVIDENCE* in Part 9.

McCARTHY: Okay, I'm organising that now somebody's organizing now
now
Jamie: If that light. I mean I've got one here would you like me to name the sort, I'll just get the um infra-red of this blokes
.....Inaudible
McCarthy: Okay, okay.

The problem is that there is no mention in any of the police statements regarding the Seascope cottage siege of any police SOG creeping up to the front of the cottage. Also the bushes at the front door where the SOG gunman was supposed to be were southwest, not northeast. Like the box of gelignite, this action was fictitious. So where did Martin Bryant learn to play this role? The same place he picked up the statement, "**Hawaiian holiday**" – in America.

There are two final clues to consider in regarding that Martin Bryant was acting out a role during the siege at Seascope Cottage. The first is that Bryant never reacted to any of the shooting that occurred during his conversations with the negotiator. It was as though he never heard those discharges.

The second clue is with the helicopters. Constable Pat Allen tells us about the helicopters: "**There were helicopters going around; you couldn't see the choppers but they were going back and forth all night and it must have been like what it was in Vietnam.**" Allen couldn't see the helicopters, but he could hear them. If Allen could hear them, then Martin Bryant should also have heard them. But these helicopters were totally ignored⁷⁰ by Bryant as he continually requested his helicopter ride to Hobart.

This should have also blown McCarthy's statements to *Jamie* or Martin Bryant that there were no helicopters available as the only helicopters at Hobart at the time were not able to be flown at night. That this charade continued can only be explained by the fact that Martin Bryant was at this time acting out a role that had been prepared for him, or in simple terms, **Bryant was being controlled.**

⁷⁰ How could Martin have ignored this flight of the light brigade. Once you've heard the *whop whop* of rotor blades, you never forget it. And the cop Allen said those choppers were operating back and forth "all night." This is highly suspect. Either Martin was so far gone under hypnosis, or drugs administered to him, or earlier psychiatric conditioning, he really did not notice. Or, what Allen said is not true and there were no helicopters *whopping* around all night. Or, the audio tape and the transcript were corrupted. **Something is wrong.**

⁷¹ Evidence strongly suggests that this Joe Vialls was/is an evil professional deceiver. Be warned.

In 1994, Nexus magazine published a three-part article called: ***The Terrorist Factory*** which described the manner by which the CIA programmed people to commit terrorist acts. This article was written as fiction and the author was **Joe Vialls.**⁷¹ Vialls ended this article with the main person of his story, Otto Jewel, executing policewoman constable Fletcher outside the Libyan Embassy. So with all his information regarding mind control why is it that Joe Vialls has not touched on this part of the Port Arthur Massacre? ■

(amended; original italics; original & added emphasis)

MISSING EVIDENCE
Port Arthur Incident
Keith Allan Noble

*If a party fails to present evidence
that would have been proper to present,
you can conclude that the missing evidence
would have been damaging to that party.*⁷²

IT is inevitable that not all significant evidence in every case will be located. This *slippage* occurs for reasons benign and sinister. Things might not be found. On being found, things might be lost, stolen (for example, cops steal seized drugs to use/sell), destroyed (DNA evidence can be destroyed during analysis), intentionally misplaced, etc. And sometimes, things declared to have been found, but which subsequently *go missing*, were never at the crime scene. Most suggestively, potentially significant evidence in the Port Arthur case has gone *missing* and **has not to this day** been credibly accounted for to the public. Officials have no right to keep evidence secret in any case. But it happens: documents *disappear*; evidence *evaporates*.

Through an excellent and dogged investigation in Queensland, former police officer Graeme Crowley, later assisted by criminologist Paul Wilson, made this statement after proving Leanne Holland was not murdered by Graham Stafford who was incarcerated for 14 years: "Unlike the system of justice in most European nations, where independent oversight is provided by a judge or non-police official, Australia's adversarial procedures allow police to **cull evidence they collect**. Unless the defence is able to pour enormous resources into their own investigation, the jury will have no idea that what is presented to them by the police and prosecution is potentially distorted. The worst case scenario is where evidence has been illegally obtained or fabricated."⁷³ (added emphasis)

In the Port Arthur case, important evidence did *disappear* and did *evaporate*. That police cull evidence cannot be denied, but that Tasmania Police were solely responsible for all the identified evidence going missing would be unlikely. The literature of the case confirms and suggests that there were other *players* in the case in addition to Tasmania Police – for example, ASIO. The New South Wales police had investigative responsibility for the Broad Arrow Café, and it seems they produced no fingerprint evidence, in fact no evidence of any kind that proves Martin Bryant was in that café. But all that exculpatory evidence has *disappeared*. As it would disappear if the evidence revealed Martin Bryant was not the gunman. Evidence that does not support an official narrative is culled by officials.

What follows is a list of some of the evidence which *disappeared*.

⁷² A paraphrase of the missing evidence rule, a rule jurors can refer to when deliberating and making conclusions about missing evidence. see legalmatch.com

⁷³ Graeme Crowley & Paul Wilson. *Who Killed Leanne?*; 2005: p. 3.

PHYSICAL

BLACK VAN VEHICLE

This black van, said to bear Commonwealth licence plates, was seen and photographed in broad daylight outside the Broad Arrow Café. In the words of incident investigator and author Stewart K. Beattie: "the **black van** remained within the precincts of the historic site, parked for most of its stay there, right out front of the Broad Arrow Café, for a minimum of 2.5 hours!"⁷⁴

COMMODORE VEHICLE (GM)

A large (4-6 passengers) red Commodore vehicle, which witnesses (Debra & Thomas Buckley) recorded they parked behind the BMW at the PAHS tollbooth. Soon after it was parked and the Buckleys strangely abandoned it, this vehicle, which was highly visible (colour, location, size), was not observed at the tollbooth by several witnesses. It is not a vehicle that was removed by any rental company on the following day, Monday. This vehicle disappeared Sunday afternoon around the time of the shooting at the tollbooth.

COMMODORE (GM) 1996



EMERGENCY PHONE NUMBER AUDIO TAPE

According to the literature, an audio tape used on 28 April 1996 to record emergency 000 phone calls disappeared or was manipulated. A note identified with the Sporting Shooters Association of Australia states: "That tape for Southern Tasmania would have recorded the call that caused local police to be lured away to the phoney drug stash that never was and any other unusual things that happened in the Port Arthur area that day. Why is the tape missing and unavailable? How could such a tape disappear? What is on that tape authorities in Tasmania don't want anyone to hear and are hiding? And how could Martin Bryant have interfered with this tape when he had been in custody in isolation since being apprehended?"

FN-FAL RIFLE PARTS

After Seascope cottage was burnt to the ground, a thorough search (including, it seems, sifting ashes of the cottage⁷⁵) of the premises did not locate the missing parts. Note that neither Martin Bryant nor the owner-occupiers of the cottage owned such a rifle.

⁷⁴ Stewart K. Beattie. In Part 6, see Insert *BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ* and *SUBJECT INDEX*.

⁷⁵ In his paper *Coroner's responsibilities at Port Arthur*, which is in Port Arthur Seminar Papers; 1997: p. 94, then coroner Ian Matterson states: "I spoke with the officer in charge and the police fire investigator and ascertained they intended to have an **electric sifter** brought on site the next morning [Tuesday 30th] to enable them to properly sift through the wreckage."

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

HANDCUFFS (Smith & Wesson)

It is alleged Martin had two pairs of handcuffs and used them to restrain Glenn Pears inside the cottage. Yet these alleged handcuffs just disappeared and are not listed by the DPP. And it seems there are no photographs of them. If there are, they are missing too.

HANDGUN

Several police declared in their *Witness Statements* that a handgun was fired/heard/seen at Seascope cottage. Being members of SOG they are competent shooters and they are armed with handguns. They know a handgun when they see/hear one. But, a thorough search (including sifting ashes it seems) found no handgun, or any remains of one. Martin Bryant never did own a handgun.

HOMICIDE STATISTICS

An Australian Institute of Criminology report (Monitoring Report 13), compiles national homicide statistics. There are a series of tables at Appendix C, and Table A1 shows incidents of homicide **by state** and territory, by year, for the time period 1989-90 to 2007-08. For the year covering the **Port Arthur incident, 1995-96**, the number of homicides listed is 6. **This number does not include the homicides which occurred at Port Arthur in Tasmania.** Of the 35 alleged deaths at Port Arthur, 12 of those deaths are listed in the *Port Arthur Deceased Persons Profile* as **residents of Tasmania.** Why have these 12 homicides not been listed?⁷⁶

INFRA-RED LASER SCOPE/SIGHT⁷⁷

During the siege at Seascope cottage, there was dialogue between police negotiator Terry McCarthy and one of the *Jamies*. And during that dialogue there is a specific reference to an infra-red sight being used within the cottage. That sight was not found inside or outside the cottage after the siege.

NIGHT VISION DEVICE/SCOPE⁷⁷

During the siege at Seascope cottage, there was dialogue between police negotiator Terry McCarthy and one of the *Jamies*. And during that dialogue there is a specific reference to a night vision device/scope being used within the cottage. This device/scope was not found inside or outside the cottage after the siege.

PSYCHIATRIC RECORDS

In *My Story*, Carleen Bryant declares medical records *disappeared*: "Doctor Parker informed me he was there to reassess Martin as Martin's earlier records had disappeared from around the time the prison psychiatrist, Doctor Lopes, had left the prison. This was a great shock and I had to wonder why records would disappear? Doctor Lopes denied any knowledge of the whereabouts of these records."⁷⁸ How many psychologists and psychiatrists damaged Martin's brain?: Terence Craven; Eric Cunningham-Dax; Fred Emery; Ian Joblin; Ivor Jones; Wilfred Lopes; Bernard Mather; Paul Mullen; Gordon Parker⁷⁹; ? Rushton; Ian Sale; *Etc.* This is over 10. Was Martin that abnormal? Or, was it all the drugs pushed into him over the years by these shrinks? That psychiatric records disappeared, strongly suggests something was done to Martin that had to be kept secret.

⁷⁶ Over the 19-year period covered by the table, the average number of homicides per year in Tasmania is 6.1. In the year period before the one in which the Port Arthur incident occurred, there were 5 homicides, and in the year after the number of homicides was 3. Clearly, the 12 additional **homicides are missing** from the year 1995-96. Why are the 12 murders at/near Port Arthur not listed?

⁷⁷ see *SUBJECT INDEX*; scope/sight, infrared/laser

⁷⁸ Carleen Bryant. *My Story*; 2010: p. 154.

⁷⁹ Carleen Bryant reveals a suspicious happening which took place in 2009. In *My Story*; 2010: pp. 153-154 she writes: "On 7 May 2009, which was Martin's 42nd birthday, I had pre-arranged a visit. Several days prior to the visit, I received a phone call from the hospital asking if I would come an hour earlier than the time previously arranged, as Doctor [Gordon?] Parker wished to speak with me about Martin. The doctor introduced himself and told me that he was visiting Tasmania **from New Zealand** for several months. Doctor Parker started asking questions, including some about Martin's early life. I asked what it was he needed to know and told him that he should be able to find this in Martin's records, as it had all been covered previously." (added emphasis) Now who asked this Dr. Parker to reassess Martin Bryant? And what was the real reason behind this alleged reassessment? And why was a visiting psychiatrist from New Zealand going to do this alleged reassessment? (Recall the murderous incident at Aramoana, New Zealand. see *SUBJECT INDEX*) There seems to be much more behind this alleged reassessment. It is too *suspect* to be for Martin's benefit. This editor thinks that whatever Parker did, he did it for himself and/or some other party, not Martin. Which do you think was more likely? **i.** Parker conducted a reassessment then stated Martin could not have committed the Port Arthur incident; or, **ii.** Parker conducted a reassessment and announced Martin might benefit from some experiment in which he be given some/another type of mind-bending drug – whether he wanted that drug or not.

*Evidence
was not collected,
was ignored, and
important things
disappeared
– it was
an investigation
typical of those
conducted by
incompetent and
corrupt cops.*

SHOTGUN PELLETS

Shotgun pellets were located, preserved, and described by at least one surgeon at the Royal Hobart Hospital. Shotgun pellet wounds were described by an ambulance attendant, and by a witness who was inside the Broad Arrow Café. But officials deny these pellets and the wounds because in the official narrative no shotgun was discharged by the gunman. Officials assert there are no shotgun pellets and those located in a victim, which were preserved and labeled as such by the surgeon, will most assuredly have disappeared.

SKK RIFLE MAGAZINE

An SKK rifle, which was not owned by Martin Bryant or by the owners of Seascope, was found at the cottage. That it was found without a magazine (holds cartridges/rounds to be discharged), suggests that the magazine was removed from the cottage by the gunmen when they fled prior or during the deliberate incineration of the cottage.

TRAY & ITEMS THEREON

The gunman went to the Broad Arrow Café and purchased items of food and drink then carried those items to a balcony table. After handling all the associated utensils (cutlery, drink can, plate, etc.), he carried the tray back inside the café putting it on a table on which he also placed the video camera (see below) he had with him. This tray with the items still on it is visible on the police *training video*. This tray and the items thereon, which would have furnished fingerprints and forensic evidence, have disappeared. This physical evidence was not listed by the DPP and it seems no fingerprints were collected, and no laboratory analyses were ever undertaken. Why?

VIDEO (28 April 1996)

The witness Ronald Clarence Edwards was inside the Broad Arrow Café during the shooting. He had his video camera with him and made a video, which he "past on to a local Uniform Police Officer." (*sic*) Well, it seems this video has just disappeared. No one this editor contacted knows anything about it.

YELLOW VOLVO

Martin Bryant clearly said that he took/stole the gold-coloured BMW belonging to Mr. and Mrs. Nixon. He never denied doing that. The story he told was a strange one, but he was adamant that he car-jacked it at Fortescue Bay north of PAHS and north of Seascope cottage. Martin knew nothing about a/the BMW being carjacked at the tollbooth. He described how there was a woman with a baby in the BMW, and how he drove it at speed to Seascope cottage leaving his yellow Volvo at Fortescue Bay from where it disappeared.

VIDEO CAMERA (large grey/black; *Handicam*)

This camera was deliberately left in the Broad Arrow Café by the gunman when he exited that building then walked to a yellow Volvo where he placed a sportsbag in the boot of that vehicle. The gunman also left a second sportsbag immediately adjacent the video camera, and both things can be seen on the police *training video*. Very quickly this camera disappeared and there is no mention of it or the images it contained by the police or by the DPP. (see *SUBJECT INDEX*; video camera, gunman's missing)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

PEOPLE

DYSON, Michael Charles

Inexplicably, this person who at the time was a senior officer with Tasmania Police seems to have been AWOL during the entire incident at Port Arthur. In the literature, there are no references to him being involved in police duties at Hobart, or at the command posts near Port Arthur, or at any other location.

As a member of the Tasmania Police carrying out his sworn duties, Dyson receives no corroboration in the literature. Nor are there any references to him within the *Witness Statements* prepared by police (NSW, TAS, VIC) and which have been reviewed by this editor. Dyson does not seem to exist in any official document dating from 28 April 1996 to 18 August 1996. The latter being the stand-down date of the Port Arthur Taskforce according to a Tasmania Police memo issued by superintendent Jack Johnston.

But then Dyson appears in his statement dated 12 September 1996, which the investigator Andrew S. MacGregor urges us to consider: "[L]ook at the time that Michael Charles Dyson, be he a sergeant or an acting inspector adopted this statement. This statement was adopted by Dyson on 12 September 1996, **4½ months [139 days]** after the incident. Now this is not only extremely sloppy, but it is the first sign that **this statement is a fabrication**. In any normal court procedure, this statement by Dyson would be thrown out as **completely unreliable**."⁸⁰

And in his statement, Dyson says his title during the Port Arthur incident was: "Criminal Investigation and Intelligence Liaison Officer at the Major Incident Room." Now with a title and placement like this, it would be reasonable to conclude Dyson would have had a stream of information passing through him, in both directions. But this editor has not heard of one document, or seen one document referred to, with which Dyson was involved. Nor has this editor seen any images of Dyson taken during the incident.

No media statements, no sightings, no words to or with anyone which were recorded. Nothing. And recall, Dyson is the man who declared he had a **passion to work with violent incidents** and had been very much involved with SOG. But for the Port Arthur incident, the biggest incident in Tasmania, poor Dyson was demoted to a liaison officer – a message boy, if you believe him. Other Port Arthur case-related literature presents another scenario involving Dyson as the **"main man"** inside Seascope cottage during the so-called siege there (28 & 29 April 1996). You are referred to the *SUBJECT INDEX*; "main man".

ILES, Mick

Unexpectedly, Iles arrived at the PAHS exit. He interacted with the witness James Laycock and took him in his police vehicle across the highway to the general store. There a short time earlier, the gunman had shot Zoe Hall and kidnapped Glenn Pears. Then Iles asked Laycock to get out of the police vehicle before he (Iles) drove north in the direction of Seascope, the same direction the gunman went.

⁸⁰ See Insert *FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT* in Part 7.

NAKED BLACK-HAIRED WOMAN

IF you believe the official narrative of the Port Arthur incident, you must believe this: Martin Bryant drove the BMW to Seascapes where inexplicably he parked it some distance from that cottage. He then alighted and opened the trunk in which Glenn Pears had been transported from the local store. Then, being wary with Pears who would have been in a desperate mental condition, Bryant urged Pears toward then inside the cottage. Bryant would have had to open the cottage door, but the cottage keys were found inside a yellow Volvo at the PAHS tollbooth. So how Bryant managed to open that door is not known. You are not supposed to ask as it will just spoil the narrative.

SALLY MARTIN



Seascapes Owner-Occupier
(grey hair)

Without any proof, officials assert Bryant restrained Pears to something immovable inside the cottage. What object, officials have never said. There is a lot they have not been specific about. Again, you must not ask as it spoils the narrative. How Bryant did all this while keeping a rifle pointed at Pears who by now must have been prepared to fight is not known. But you must unquestioningly believe the klutz Martin Bryant did everything flawlessly. Then the mastermind *lone-nut* gunman went outside and started a fire inside the BMW. Other than by foot, that vehicle was the only way he could have escaped. So why he burnt it makes no sense at all. Regardless, you are to believe that Bryant did. Some say the BMW was bogged in soft wet soil.

Maybe. But that too does not explain why Bryant burnt the BMW which he said gave him a thrill to drive. No sense there. But you must believe and not question anything.

The he returned back inside the cottage, where Pears was restrained – with those two pairs of Smith & Wesson handcuffs which have never been seen since; don't ask – and the two owner-occupiers, David & Sally Martin, were dead having been killed before midday according to the official narrative. (There is no proof Bryant killed them, but it's in the narrative so you have to blindly accept it.) It was about 2:30 in the afternoon. Bryant was then the *lone-nut* gunman at Seascapes. And with Pears looking on, and the Martins dead somewhere inside, he started shooting wildly out the windows, except for when he was on the telephone speaking with the negotiator Terry McCarthy. He spoke with McCarthy many times over several hours, and why the mighty SOG did not storm the house at some time, well don't ask. That's not in the narrative.

In addition to those many telephone conversations, and toilet breaks, and preparing snacks for himself presumably and Glenn Pears (recall both the Martins had already been murdered) it was full on just wild, insane, unrestrained, *lone-nut* shooting at its very best out the windows into the trees any which way you damn please. The mighty SOG was completely powerless and never did a thing – **because it had to happen.** (ssssh, that's not in the official narrative). Then later in the afternoon, constable Patrick Allen said he heard: "the sound of a high-pitched yelling and screaming coming from the direction of Seascapes. And his cop mate Gary Whittle said he: "saw a female running around the back yard naked. Yelling and screaming." And their copper mate Paul Hyland said she: "appeared to have **black hair** and appeared to be **naked.**"

But officially Sally Martin was dead. And she had grey hair. So who was this woman? Where did she come from? And why was she running naked and screaming? Now this editor does not know what you really believe. But if it is the official narrative, then you have to deny this police sighting of this naked black-haired woman. You have to keep telling yourself she did not disappear because she was not there. No. You have to keep telling yourself that Bryant was the only criminal at Seascapes. – **ed.**

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Iles knew the gunman was driving a gold-coloured BMW. He must have seen it between the general store and Seascope as there are no exit roads in between the two. Then Iles disappeared and he is not mentioned in any official case-related documents. What did he do on that Sunday afternoon of 28 April 1996? And where is he now?

JAMIE

This name is associated with phone conversations between someone inside Seascope cottage and persons outside. Calls of which the public is aware involved *Jamie* having conversations with: Maree Baker; Merran Craig; Terry McCarthy; and, Alison Smith. It seems no voice analyses were undertaken, and based on statements allegedly made by the people mentioned and the transcripts of the calls between a *Jamie* and the negotiator, it seems there were at least two people inside Seascope who identified themselves as *Jamie*. This does not fit the official narrative, which has Martin Bryant as the solitary *lone-nut* gunman inside Seascope. But analyses of sounds, dialogue, and declared activities inside the cottage confirm Bryant was not alone at Seascope. On several occasions, he was speaking on the phone while shots were being fired from other locations inside the cottage. And it was not the hostages firing those shots. This means, the other person or persons who used the name **Jamie** when on the telephone inside Seascope has/have *disappeared*.

JOHNSTON, Jack/John

The following is an extract from the article *Mass Murder in Australia*. "The chief police official for Tasmania until his recent retirement was Commissioner of Police John Johnston, who was also the head of the Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence. Johnston commanded the police team which carried out a 15-week investigation of the Port Arthur events, and somehow managed to miss all of the anomalies recorded above. Who is Johnston? Among other things, he was the first prominent Australian police official to call for the legalization of drugs, which he did in 1995. As a series of articles in the *The New Citizen* in 1996 demonstrated, those pushing the decriminalization of drugs in Australia – whose major funder is George Soros – are precisely those London-linked financial circles who are already benefiting from drug-money laundering. Right after the Port Arthur investigation, Johnston retired, and has seemingly disappeared. Some police source said this to *The New Citizen*: "You can't find him, because he doesn't intend to be found."⁸¹

Why would the ex-commissioner of Tasmania Police just disappear not wanting to be found? Might it be because he knows that the Port Arthur incident was official. Maybe he knows Martin Bryant was set up. By disappearing, John Johnston is obviously protecting himself. And where is he now?

O'BRIEN, Kerry

Wikipedia says: "Kerry O'Brien is an Australian journalist based in Sydney. He is the former editor and host of *The 7.30 Report* on the ABC and the present host of the current affairs show *Four Corners*. O'Brien is one of Australia's most respected journalists, having been awarded six Walkley Awards during his career." Impressive record.

*With so many
significant things
missing
– and others
not investigated
– justice
could never
have been served
even if there
had been a trial.*

⁸¹ Allen Douglas & Michel J. Sharp. *Mass Murder in Australia: Tavistock's Martin Bryant*; 1 May 2013; members. iimetro.com.au.

OFFICIALLY KILLED – PORT ARTHUR, TASMANIA; 1996

ALL information here was extracted from official documents and websites. Whether all bodies were IDed by physical examination, and by whom, has never been made public.

APLIN, Winifred F ^a Banksia Park, ^b SA	59 ^c	S ^d	2 ^e	Y ^f	Y ^g	South Australia Adelaide ^h
BENNETT, Walter M Diamond Creek, VIC	66	S	1	Y	Y	Victoria Heidelberg
BURGESS, Nicole F Koonya / Nubeena, TAS	53	?	1	?	?	Tasmania ?
CHUNG, Sou Leng F Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	31	S	1	Y	Y	Victoria Kew East
GAYLARD, Elva F Geelong, VIC	48	?	2	Y	Y	Victoria Grovedale
HALL, Zoe F Kangaroo Point, NSW	29	?	5	Y	Y	New South Wales Sutherland
HOWARD, Elizabeth F Eaglehawk Neck, TAS	26	?	1	?	?	Tasmania ?
HOWARD, Mary F Dunnstown, VIC	57	M	1	Y	Y	Victoria North Ballarat
HOWARD, Mervyn M Dunnstown, VIC	55	M	1	Y	Y	Victoria North Ballarat
JARY, Ronald M Red Cliffs, VIC	71	M	1	Y	Y	Victoria Mildura
KISTAN, Tony M Summer Hill, NSW	51	M	1	Y	Y	New South Wales Sutherland
LAUGHTON, Sarah F Ferntree Gully, VIC	15	S	1	Y	Y	Victoria Ferntree Gully
LEVER, Dennis M Red Cliffs, VIC	53	?	1	Y	Y	Victoria Mildura
MARTIN, David M Port Arthur, TAS	72	M	7	n.a.	N	Tasmania ? (cremation)
MARTIN, Noelene/Sally F Port Arthur, TAS	69	M	7	n.a.	N	Tasmania ? (cremation)
MASTERS, Pauline F West Ivanhoe, VIC	49	?	1	Y	Y	Victoria Melbourne
MIKAC, Alannah F Nubeena / Triabunna, TAS	6	S	3	Y	Y	Victoria Kew East
MIKAC, Madeline F Nubeena / Triabunna, TAS	3	S	3	Y	Y	Victoria Kew East
MIKAC, Nanette F Nubeena / Triabunna, TAS	36	M	3	Y	Y	Victoria Kew East

(cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

MILLS, Andrew	M	Mornington, TAS	39	?	1	Y	Y	Victoria Kew East
NASH, Peter	M	Hoppers Crossing, VIC	32	?	1	Y	Y	Victoria Footscray
NEANDER, Gwenda	F	Parafield Gardens, SA	67	M	1	Y	Y	South Australia Adelaide
NG, William	M	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	48	?	1	Y	Y	Victoria Kew East
NIGHTINGALE, Anthony	M	Keysborough, VIC	34	?	1	Y	Y	Victoria Fawkner (burial)
NIXON, Mary Rose	F	Crabtree, TAS	60	?	4	?	N	Tasmania Kingston (burial)
PEARS, Glenn	M	Neutral Bay, NSW	35	?	7	?	N	Tasmania Howrah (burial)
POLLARD, Russell James/Jim	M	Brunswick Heads, NSW	72	?	4	Y	Y	New South Wales Beresfield
QUIN, Janett	F	Bicheno, TAS	50	M	2	?	?	Tasmania ?
SALZMANN, Helene (?)	F	Ocean Shores, NSW	50	M	4	?	N	Tasmania ? (cremation)
SALZMANN, Robert (?)	M	Ocean Shores, NSW	54	M	4	?	N	Tasmania ? (cremation)
SCOTT, Kate Elizabeth	F	Balga, WA	21	S	1	Y	Y	Western Australia Scarborough Beach
SHARP, Kevin	M	Kilmore, VIC	69	M	1	Y	Y	Victoria Kilmore
SHARPⁱ, Raymond	M	Kilmore, VIC	67	S	1	Y	Y	Victoria Kilmore
THOMPSON, Royce	M	Kingston Beach, TAS	59	?	2	?	N	Tasmania Kingston (burial)
WINTER, Jason	M	Lenah Valley / New Town, TAS	29	M	1	Y	Y	New Zealand Auckland

a sex; F – female, M – male
b last permanent address; not necessarily original home or body disposal address
c age in years
d marital status; M – married, S – single
e scene: 1 café; 2 buspark; 3 Jetty Rd; 4 tollbooth; 5 store; 6 highway; 7 cottage
f body embalmed; Y – yes, N – no, or ? (not known)
g body transported out of Tasmania; Y – yes, N – no, or ? (not known)
h destination of body for disposal, or destination for further ground or air transportation to disposal destination
i name not on plaque listing those officially killed at Port Arthur Historic Site

NOTE The spelling of personal names and the places of residence are inconsistent in the literature and the plaque listing those officially killed at PAHS, Tasmania. – **ed.**

And this is how the ABC describes its long-running (over 50 years) program Four Corners: "Investigative journalism at its best." So where is the Four Corners episode on the incident at Port Arthur? Has it disappeared? Or, was one never made? This editor has been told one was produced but it was not aired. If this is true – Why not? Are we to believe this iconic Australian television program of investigative journalism at its best, succumbed to the lie-based deceit and political interference of John Howard and Co.?

And with due respect to (Dr.) Kerry O'Brien and his justified awards, this editor doubts Four Corners could now produce the long-overdue exposé. It now seems that things might have slipped at the ABC. Here is that never-proved assertion expressed yet again in a recent episode (10 June 2013) of Four Corners. It certainly does not reflect investigative journalism: "It's 17 years since Martin Bryant gunned down 35 innocent people at Port Arthur, and Prime Minister John Howard introduced some of the most stringent gun controls in the world." It's a boot in the guts of a mentally-handicapped *boy-man*. It was **never proved in a jury trial** that he fired a single shot. And, he has never had one journalist (investigative or otherwise) give him a fair go. NOT ONE! *You can do a lot better Kerry.*

OVERBEEKE, Benjamin

Over the years, quite a few websites have identified a person, some have even included an **image** (see below), of a young man who is described as being the/a Port Arthur gunman. It is said his name is **Benjamin Overbeeke**. It has also been suggested that his brother, **Warren Overbeeke** was involved in the incident.

BENJAMIN OVERBEEKE(?)



This editor has not found copies of any cease-and-desist orders, disclaimers, retractions, reports, or anything related to this person in which it is denied Benjamin Overbeeke was the gunman. One would think that given the heinous nature of the crimes at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania Police would have expressed keen interest in locating this person Overbeeke, interviewing him, then making a public

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

announcement. But this has not happened. It seems as if this Overbeeke has disappeared, or maybe the cops do not want to find him because they have no interest in anything which does not support the official narrative.

It is said Benjamin and Warren are sons of Hans Overbeeke. If you look at Part 7 which addresses *Witness Statements* never presented to a jury during a trial, there is one from Jenny Moors. She says this: "I think there was another man which I believe might have been a Mr OVERBE[E]KE, marked (12) & he was attending to a body close by." Now that might have been an act of assistance, but other people have **not** described it as such to this editor. The Port Arthur case literature contains several articles in which this Hans Overbeeke is connected with Joe Vialls and Justin Noble, both questionable people. There are considerable related comments – **negative comments** – about them on the Internet. It is said these three were part of the official incident at Port Arthur.

The connection between Hans and Benjamin Overbeeke, plus the fact there seems to be no denials of negative involvement from any of the four people mentioned, raises concerns. The alleged involvement of Overbeekes in the incident, particularly that of Benjamin, should be thoroughly investigated and the findings made public in a report. Given it was a horrific incident, the State has legal and moral obligations – to Martin Bryant, to the family, relatives, and friends of the victims, and to the general public.

POLLARD; Russell James/*Jim*

We have been told he was from Brunswick Heads (NSW 2483). And we are also expected to believe the body was embalmed then returned to the mainland, it seems to White Lady Funerals at Beresfield (NSW 2322) for the Irwin family (family/relatives?). Based on the police *training video*, the position and clothing on the bodies at the PAHS tollbooth do not correspond with the content of the statements given by eyewitnesses. Questions arise about the identity of the body. **Who identified the body? And how?** It is said the wristwatch Pollard usually wore was not returned. So was this watch stolen, or was the body sent to Beresfield not that of Mr. Pollard?

RUSSELL JAMES POLLARD(?)




*The
truthful tale
of the
Port Arthur
Historic Site
tollbooth
– what really did
take place there
– has to date
not been told.*

*Bodies here,
bodies there,
and some not
there as revealed
by witnesses,
some with the
faces covered
(who did that?),
and some reported
to be mannequins
by nurses at the
Royal Hobart
Hospital.*

SALZMANN, Robert

Was it really Robert Salzmänn who was shot at the PAHS tollbooth? Around the time of that alleged death there are many unanswered questions. In his statement (24 July 1996), Mr. Nixon said Helene Salzmänn arrived at his home on 22 April 1996. Nixon also said there was a Robbie with her. Was that male person really Robert Salzmänn? Verification of these identities and of both Salzmänn does not appear in the available literature. It is wrong to accept everything about the identities of those two people is 100 percent correct because the State says so. Officials lie. At some time during those six days, Robert Salzmänn would have had to arrive (from where?) if he really was the passenger in the BMW, with Helene Salzmänn, Mary Rose Nixon, and Russell James/*Jim* Pollard. Records suggest unembalmed bodies, allegedly the Salzmänn from **Ocean Shores** (NSW 2483; it seems she was originally from Switzerland), were cremated in Tasmania. But note the bodies of all other mainlanders were returned to the mainland or were buried in Tasmania. So were they really the two Salzmänn bodies? Or were they the bodies of two other people? And who identified the two Salzmänn bodies? (A physical identification of the body – not by a sighting of some personal belongings/effects.)

ROBERT SALZMANN(?)



HELENE SALZMANN(?)



SHARP, Raymond

Below is an image of the PAHS plaque. Both Raymond and Kevin Sharp were said to have died inside the Broad Arrow Café. But the name Raymond Sharp is not on the plaque. Why? Did both Sharp brothers, allegedly from Kilmore, Victoria, really die at Port Arthur?

TIGER

According to Petra Willmott, her boyfriend feared a man called Tiger. But within all the literature which the editor has studied, he has not been able to find any details of Tiger being identified and interviewed. It seems the cops did not find Tiger. Either that or they knew who he was and wilfully ignored him. This defies common sense and cautions listed in investigation texts. This person called Tiger might have been the **key person** for the entire Port Arthur incident, yet it seems Tasmania Police did not want to know. So we must ask questions: Who was this person called Tiger? What control did Tiger have over Martin? Where was Tiger during the incident? Where is Tiger now?

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

VICTIM (unidentified)

At least one wounded victim disappeared without giving a name. Were there others? The following is from Carl Wernerhoff: “[T]here is the intriguing case of a Taiwanese man injured in the shooting who would not tell anyone his name, and whose identity in fact has been suppressed by the DPP, even to the point that Bugg referred to an ‘Asian gentleman’ rather than a ‘Taiwanese gentleman.’ It seems that planning for the massacre drew upon the expertise of intelligence agents from around the world.”⁸³ ■

⁸³ See Article *THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE* by Carl Wernerhoff at Part 5.

INACCURATE UNEXPLAINED PLAQUE PORT ARTHUR



AN INACCURATE PLAQUE is fixed to a plinth at the Port Arthur Historic Site near where the Broad Arrow Café was located in April 1996. There are only 34 names on that plaque – not 35, the number of people officially killed at the official massacre on 28 April 1996. Note the name **Raymond Sharp**. The official narrative says he was shot in the café. Strangely, his name does not appear on the new plaque (above). But that name Raymond Sharp did appear on the old plaque (left) attached to a wooden cross. It is said that Raymond Sharp's family **had his name kept off the new plaque**. Now why would they want that? If it is true, the reason for this highly suggestive request has not been made public. Also note that no body-disposal record for this Raymond Sharp (age 67), from Kilmore in Victoria has been located. His brother **Kevin Sharp** (age 69) is also said to have been killed in the café. He too was from Kilmore, and his name does appear on both the old and the new plaques. But no body-disposal record for him has been located. At the Kilmore Golf Club, there was (now?) a plaque showing the names of three people who officials say were shot at Port Arthur: John Bennett; Kevin Vincent Sharp; and, Raymond John Sharp. If you have any information related to either of the brothers Sharp, to any of the other Port Arthur victims, to any of the commemorative plaques, etc. please email: martinbryantisinnocent@gmail.com ■

ENDING

BEING innocent in prison has been described as real torture, and a lasting kind of trauma. Well this terrible torture and trauma has been Martin Bryant's life since May 1996. Think about it. He is still alive, but for how long? The judge who put Martin in Risdon Prison without ever having one bit of evidence presented in a trial must be content with all this. He said Martin was to be put in a cage for the term of his natural life. **This is (in)justice Tasmanian style.**

Three corrupt officials (Avery, Bugg, Cox) willingly took it upon themselves, without any legal or moral reservations, to have a *boy-man* tortured to death. For this unconscionable act, they were rewarded by the State. And all this happened in beautiful sunny Australia – not at Abu Ghraib in Iraq, or Bagram in Afghanistan, or Guantánamo in Cuba, or Stare Kiejkuty in Poland, places where **evil Americans** (includes psychiatrists & psychologists) have physical and mental horrors inflicted on their victims – *for democracy*. As we know, many things start small. So with Martin going first, other “social misfits” will follow – if they are not already there unbeknown to us, caged like Martin in a restricted part of Australia to be tortured to death. Don't ever expect to be told. If the Australian State allows bombs to be dropped on the country, fallout tests to be conducted, highly-toxic chemicals to be dispersed, endless violence and deaths in custody, *etc.*, then killing people in a US-inspired/operated torture centre is not improbable. Never forget, **you are an enemy of the State.**

How telling that a **Black** American gave us these words: “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.” And Martin Luther King (1929-1968) knew of what he spoke. He knew about the State wrongly imprisoning people. He knew about violence being condoned and blind-eyed by the State. And, he was definitely aware of how dangerous and corrupt the State is. People in Australia can fool themselves by saying this is not true, that the government would not kill its own people. Well, the facts are there and have been ever since the first Europeans arrived uninvited on the shore of *Terra Australis*.

That the State did everything necessary to stop a trial from taking place, tells us the total lack of confidence the State had in proving guilt. If, as the State insists it is, the case against Martin Bryant was so strong, then justice should have been easily done and it would have been seen to be done. But the exact opposite happened – **justice was not done, and it has been seen not to be done.**

In the Port Arthur case, a gross injustice has been inflicted on not just Martin Bryant, or on the family, relatives, and friends of victims. A gross injustice has been inflicted on the people of the nation. The truth has not been told, and as Joseph Raz (1939-) warns us: “There can be no justice without truth.” So given we know that we do not know all the significant truths of the case, the conclusion can only be justice has not been served. Anyone who still believes the 1996 process in Hobart was a legal one which delivered justice has not studied the facts of the case. These many facts, some of the most significant ones having been included in this compilation, confirm beyond reasonable doubt that **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT! ■**

BACK MATTER

10



**BIG
WORM
BOOKS**

CONCERN

Much of what has been stated about the Port Arthur incident and its many components – particularly by media – has been without any form of referencing which can be verified, studied, and reflected upon.

CONTENTS	PAGE
■ <i>EPILOGUE</i>	647
■ <i>WHAT YOU CAN DO</i>	649
■ <i>DEFINITIONS</i>	650
■ <i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	658
■ <i>WEBSITES</i>	664
■ <i>AUTHOR ARTICLES & INSERTS</i>	665
■ <i>ARTICLES & INSERTS</i>	669
■ <i>IMAGES & MAPS</i>	672
■ <i>NAME INDEX</i>	674
■ <i>SUBJECT INDEX</i>	687
■ <i>DRAWING BY MARTIN BRYANT</i>	696
■ <i>HUMAN RIGHTS</i>	697
■ <i>UNETHICAL LAWYERS</i>	697
■ <i>RESISTING CHANGE</i>	698

COUNTS

Images 3, Inserts 2, Pages 54

EPILOGUE

TRUTH BREEDS HATRED – an ancient Greek sage, Bias of Priene in Ionia, noted this c.2500 years ago. And it is as true today as it was then. Questioning any official narrative prompts self-righteous and self-serving officials to sally forth and defend the spurious nonsense which the State promotes as truth. Mindless hatred quickly comes to the fore. *Ad hominem* attacks are hurled. However, it is obvious to thinking people that a State and its apologists do not address the many troubling facts. No. They insist on repeating, yet again, the official narrative and ridiculing all those who rightly question it. But the troubling facts remain – they never go away, and they never will.

And as is revealed by the 25 major authors whose writing is compiled in this book, the Port Arthur incident is no exception. Major questions raised by these good authors have remained unresolved since 1996. And the points that they raise are not insignificant. They are very troubling questions the answers of which can destroy the State itself.

As this work records, mainstream media, particularly print media, continues to promote the official narrative of the Port Arthur incident. This narrative has been repeated *ad nauseam*. But not once in that repetition has the media addressed any single matter of substance in an in-depth report. An example of this avoidance is The Mercury newspaper which is published in Hobart, the capital of Tasmania: editor Chris Jones; publisher Davies Brothers, News Corp Australia.

The Mercury has never published a serious report on the incident at Port Arthur. A report detailing findings of investigative journalists. A report with references which could be checked then assessed for credibility. Reader, think about this telling fact.

And it is not because all the facts of the incident have been dealt with in a national document. There is NO comprehensive report on the Port Arthur incident of April 1996. NO coronial inquest was ever held. NO public inquiry was conducted. Even though 35 were killed and 23 were wounded, there is NO detailed report on why or how. All that the people of Australia have been told is what the State wants them to unthinkingly accept – A mentally-handicapped person with a 66 IQ (school grade 6) premeditated, planned, and perpetrated the entire incident **alone and at seven crime scenes**. And this included holding back overnight the heavily armed and highly trained Tasmania Police *Sturmtruppen* – the Special Operations Group, aka Sons of God. If you accept this Reader, you'll accept anything.

The State does not want you to question these boldfaced LIES. And be assured, The Mercury is never going to provide you or anyone else with credible answers to the many unanswered troubling questions.

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

All 58 victims of the Port Arthur incident were approved by the State. Nothing confirms this more than the following two actions purposefully completed before the official killing: i. The constructing of a 22-body refrigerated truck to transport all the bodies to the mortuary in Hobart; and, ii. The making of special embalming equipment for Nelson Brothers of Footscray, Victoria, equipment which these funeral directors used in the Hobart mortuary. (see *NAME INDEX*; Parry, S.)

To accept the official narrative requires people to believe these accoutrements for the killing at and near Port Arthur were ordered and paid for by Martin Bryant. A *boy-man* whose girlfriend said he would forget what he was doing. A *boy-man* whose mother confirms he did not have the brains to do it. A *boy-man* who eyewitnesses say in writing was not the gunman. A *boy-man* who did not carjack the BMW from the tollbooth, because he could not drive any car with manual gears. (He could only drive vehicles with automatic gears.) A *boy-man* who officials broke with 6 months of isolation in prison. A *boy-man* who was forced to accept the guilty plea of an unethical defence lawyer, criminal John Avery. The State could not prove any thing incriminating to a jury – so this *boy-man* was denied a trial.

That officials approved the killing and wounding at Port Arthur, and that the media in Australia – The Mercury is just one example – has **covered up mass murder**, proves to all moral people that State corruption in that nation is out of control: police are corrupt; the legal (not justice) system is complicit; and, the media are complaisant.

Next time you hear those oh so joyful strains of the national anthem *Advance Australia Fair*, think about Martin being killed in Risdon Prison. **Being tortured to death slowly for crimes he did not commit – officially approved crimes.** Think about the State and media covering up the truth. Think about the suspected killers (evidence suggests there was more than one shooter) remaining free out there. ■

Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!

MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com

17MAR2019

WHAT YOU CAN DO

■ **TAKE A STAND**

At every opportunity communicate what it is that you believe. Do not accept an official narrative if you believe it is corrupt. Being official does not mean a narrative is complete or truthful. Join or form politically active groups which increase your strength.

■ **NEVER TRUST LYING THUGS**

Police have no legal right to act as the law. They can ask, but not tell you what to do. Australian cops are undereducated and under-trained. These incompetent deceitful thugs initiate and aggravate negative situations, bungle investigations, and kill innocent people.

■ **ACKNOWLEDGE AMERICAN FASCISM**

You are now a terrorist until you prove yourself innocent. Freedom and democracy are being denied to feed the fear of everything. American fascism is flourishing in Australia. *Stars & Stripes* wave over the land. Pine Gap is Droning. And you are being watched.

■ **ADMIT THE LEGAL SYSTEM IS CORRUPT**

Do not meekly accept what cops and courts tell you is the truth. Challenge everything they say. Get others involved. Demand credible answers, which you pay for with your taxes. Never address presumptuous judges as *Justice* – none of them can assure justice.

■ **DO NOT ACT SUBSERVIENT TO ANY OFFICIAL**

Officials are public servants, nothing more. Remind them of their job description in life which is to serve, not dictate. Treat them with respect but never with subservience. Don't tolerate crap. Remember that politicians are responsible for all public servants.

■ **BOYCOTT TASMANIA & TASMANIAN PRODUCTS**

Because justice has not been served for any of the victims* of the official killing at Port Arthur, Australia, boycott Tasmania and all Tasmanian products. Inform officials and others of your actions. (* 35 killed; 23 wounded; unknown suicided; countless pained)

■ **PUBLICIZE THE STATE'S PORT ARTHUR CRIMES**

Print messages on posters, t-shirts, yellow safety vests, as well as anywhere else eye-catching and appropriate. Messages such as:

FREE! Martin Bryant **Killing Martin is NOT Justice**
Martin Bryant Had NO Trial **Martin Bryant is INNOCENT!**
PRAY For Martin Bryant **STOP Killing Martin Bryant**
Tasmania is KILLING Martin **Etc.** ■

DEFINITIONS

Below are the meanings of words/phrases as used by the editor in *MASS MURDER* and elsewhere to describe the Port Arthur case.

ability. emotional, intellectual, physical, and psychological demands which a would-be perpetrator must be able to satisfy before he/she can commit some specified act

adversarial legal system. not a system of justice seeking truth; lawyers control evidence and process, untrained judges control rules and court; also called Anglo-American system and lawyer-based system; see investigative justice system

aka. abbreviation for – also known as

Asperger syndrome. also known as Asperger disorder is an autism spectrum disorder characterized by significant difficulties in social interaction and nonverbal communication, alongside restricted and repetitive patterns of behavior and interests. It differs from other autism spectrum disorders by its relative preservation of linguistic and cognitive development. Although not required for diagnosis, physical clumsiness and atypical (peculiar, odd) use of language are frequently reported. (wikipedia)

autopsy, coronial/forensic. (Greek – seeing for oneself) medico-legal procedure; thorough external and internal examination, including tests, of a human body or of human remains by forensic pathologist or appropriately qualified physician under direct supervision of a forensic pathologist, to determine identity, and/or cause of death, and/or mechanism of death, and/or manner of death; synonymous with *coronial/forensic post-mortem* but not with *general/hospital post-mortem* which focuses on disease-related death

barrister. old British term for senior lawyer who, in addition to other legal work, argues cases in higher-level courts

belief/believe. conclusion not necessarily derived firsthand which is accepted; accept something is or might be factual or true with or without direct proof

bitumen. road surface of crushed stone bound with tar/asphalt

blond/blonde. fair hair; more accurately, the adjective blond is for males and blonde is for females

bullet. projectile discharged from a firearm; aka round

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

c./circa. (Latin – round about) word used before imprecise dates or figures; synonymous with approximately

cause of death. specified physiological change in a body, caused by some disease or injury, that led to and immediately preceded death; can have natural antecedents (*e.g.* congenital malformation, cancer) or unnatural antecedents (*e.g.* gunshot wound, fractured skull); must be determined by pathologist not detective or coroner; see manner of death, mechanism of death, type of death

chain of corruption. any sequence of corrupt actions, beliefs, or things, which are related or connected in some way

chain of custody/evidence/possession. a sequential and documented process which if properly executed suggests evidence has not been corrupted; every link of the chain must: 1. be attested to in writing; 2. be of unquestionable integrity – any doubt over any link breaks the chain; and, 3. lead from source to destination

concoct. conduct, contrive, plan, or plot with deceptive intent

constable. low-ranked member of a publicly-funded police agency; may be identified as officer, policeman/woman, cop/copper, donut

cop/copper. vernacular for any member of a publicly-funded police agency; synonymous with police officer; not necessarily derogatory

coroner. in Australia a coroner is an appointed State employee*; he/she is usually a lower-level judge (magistrate) with no medical qualifications who oversees investigations of unexpected deaths, deaths in custody, deaths in prisons and care institutions, deaths from unknown causes, *etc.*; in some jurisdictions outside Australia: 1. coroners are elected by the public; and, 2. medical examiners (physicians who are forensic pathologists) investigate unexpected deaths (* This fact means such coroners serve the State, not the people.)

corrupt. to destroy or subvert fairness, honesty, integrity; accept, bring, or tolerate anything being brought to a worse condition; be concealed, incomplete, immoral, unethical; often, but not always associated with payment and acceptance of money/privilege

corruption. anything adulterated, contaminated, or debased; anything that or person who is deceitful, deceptive, devious, or dishonest; any action that or person who accepts, conceals, disguises, distorts, or promotes anything inaccurate, incomplete, inconsistent, or perverted; any person who or anything that is immoral, unethical, or lacking integrity; anything or any action containing, creating, conceding, or leading to or resulting in unwarranted changes, discrepancies, false beliefs, inaccuracies, incompleteness, lies, misunderstandings, shams, *etc.*

cover-up. any action, verbal or written statement, or silence related to any activity, decision, evidence, fact, law, policy, procedure, regulation, truth, *etc.*, which conceals the whole truth

crime. any action that breaks any State law; any offence against morality or social order; any unjust or shameful action; *n.b.* police have no legal right to declare a crime has been committed which is the responsibility of judges and juries

Crown. in former colonies of Britain, and in Britain itself, this word is synonymous for State; also referred to as The Queen, & *R(egina)*

cui bono. (Latin – to whose benefit?; pronounced KWE.bono) question investigators must pose during all homicide investigations; also incorrectly written as *qui bono*

death. cessation of life in a human body resulting from natural or unnatural causes

default. qualifies a possible cause; though it might be based on logic the default cause has not been proved thus other possibilities exist; a default cause of death might be associated with a natural or an unnatural type of death and with any one of the four manners of death; see cause of death, manner of death

detective. member of a publicly-funded police agency responsible for investigating criminal matters; a person who investigates criminal and other matters as a business is called a private detective/investigator or private enquiry/inquiry agent; see investigator

document. piece(s) of paper on which there is writing/printing and which may or may not have an official imprint, signature, stamp, *etc*; includes photographs and photographic images

et al. (Latin – and others) in full, *et aliae* (f), *et alii* (m), *et alia* (n)

evidence. anything that makes clear, elucidates, or reveals a fact or point being argued, considered, discussed, *etc.*; might be either testimonial (verbal) or physical (sensorial); might be either direct or circumstantial (evidence from which, in the ordinary course of human affairs, the existence of some fact might be reasonably concluded)

expert. person knowledgeable on some specific subject which he/she has studied to a higher recognized level; might also be identified as consultant or expert-witness

fact. anything that is done or has happened; anything that exists or did exist or is believed to have existed intellectually or physically; any statement; *n.b.* a fact might or might not be the truth; see true/truth

faction. book genre; writing containing facts and fiction (includes contrived imaginary dialogue) which can be dangerously deceptive

false. anything that is not accurate or not original; anything that has been developed/derived through any unscientific or non-standard method or procedure; anything corrupt or which lacks integrity

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

false flag. covert military or paramilitary operations designed to deceive in such a way that the operations appear as though they are being carried out by other entities, groups or nations than those who actually planned and executed them; operations conducted during peace-time by civilian organisations, as well as government agencies, may by extension be called false flag operations if they seek to hide the identity of the real person(s) behind an operation

forensic. (Latin – marketplace [*forum*]) specific matters, people, or things pertinent to a court, or legal proceedings, or public disputation (which in ancient Roman times were conducted at the public marketplace); commonly understood to mean evidence determined and/or evaluated via scientific analyses/deliberation/examination/*etc.*

foul play. unfair or treacherous action involving violence; any intended direct or indirect act which could or does result in death or injury; covers the criminal acts of assault, homicide, manslaughter, murder; can involve brow beating, coercion, harassment, intimidation, psychological pressure, *etc.*; can involve complicity, concealment, deceit, deception, fraud, scams, secrecy, shams, subterfuge, *etc.*

GSR/gunshot residue. extremely fine particulate matter projected as an aerosol from a firearm when discharged

gunman. person who fires/discharges a firearm; shooter

hard evidence. consistent, indisputable, unequivocal evidence

hate-warped. negative characteristic/behaviour arising from a lack of objectivity and/or an unrestrained desire for retribution/vengeance

hypothesis. an untested proposition; often used synonymously but incorrectly for thesis

image. subject reproduced onto paper; requires digital camera (still/video) and printer; can be stored, manipulated, and/or transferred using memory devices; not a chemically-developed photograph

incompetence. incapable; without adequate abilities and/or skills; evidenced by contravention of the norm(s), rules, standards, *etc.*

inside job. a crime perpetrated by, or with the help of, a person or persons working for or trusted by the victim

investigation. a planned and thorough process based on standardized procedures which can and where possible must include scientific analyses and which an investigator directs and/or undertakes to answer significant questions (how, what, when, where, who, why) related to crime or suspected crime

investigative justice system. truth-seeking system; lawyers are restricted; trained judges control evidence, process, and court; also called Continental-European system, truth-based system, inquisitorial system; see adversarial legal system

investigator. person who investigates something; can be categorized as official (*e.g.* police investigator) or unofficial (*e.g.* private investigator, friend/relative); subsumes detective

inquest. legal process, usually headed by a coroner or medical examiner, who (with the aid of jury if legislated) investigates the cause of violent death or death accompanied by suspicious circumstances; normally involves coronial post-mortems which should be performed by qualified forensic pathologists not local physicians

judge. publicly paid court official in adversarial systems of justice who receives legal expositions of proof (but not necessarily truth) associated with guilt/innocence of some identified act(s), and who, in lower-level (non-jury) courts is permitted to pass judgement on parties found guilty of criminal acts; see coroner, justice

justice. the protection of rights and the punishment of wrongs; process and desired end result of the State's systems to address and resolve criminal/legal matters; *n.b.* it is haughty and presumptuous of judges to use the word as an honorific as they cannot assure justice will be served in every case, thus no judge should be addressed as *Justice*

kangaroo court. sham proceeding denying truth & justice by: having no jurisdiction; using unqualified judge(s); hearing false charge(s); having predetermined outcome(s); refusing jury empanelment; curtailing jury considerations; disallowing proper defence; rejecting/ignoring evidence; accepting corrupt evidence; imposing inappropriate sentence(s); *etc.*

lie. any verbal or written statement, or silence, intentionally presented as, suggestive of, or implying truth; anything intentionally declared or not declared which deceives or leads to an inaccurate or incomplete belief, impression, or understanding

literature. all documented, recorded, stored (print and computer), written work produced by authors, investigators, researchers, scholars, scientists, *etc.*, in a given discipline/matter/subject or component of a discipline/matter/subject

location of body. place at which a dead body is found, it being benign or sinister in cases where the place does not correspond with the manner of death and/or associated evidence; location of body might not be place of death; see position of body

manner of death. also identified as mode of death; one of four possibilities: natural; accidental; suicidal; homicidal; an unidentified manner of death is one of the four and must not be assumed to be natural; see cause of death, mechanism of death, type of death

marker. anything which acts as evidence confirming presence or movement at some time

mechanism of death.
altered human physiology leading to death

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

minder. person who watches over, assists, and/or guides another who is involved with a criminal action

motive. that which leads/prompts/tempts a person to commit an act or acts to achieve a desired benefit which might go to the perpetrator and/or other party(ies) – such benefit(s) being: real or perceived; emotional, material, physical, psychological, social, or spiritual; immediate or delayed; small, large, or of seemingly no worth to any other person

murder. intentional, pre-meditated act of foul play which intentionally causes the death of a person or persons; see homicide

narrative. description of actual (truthful) and/or fictional (not truthful) events each being part of a whole happening/incident/story; when narrated, verbally or in writing, by an official (see below), such a description can be described as an official narrative

official. person usually employed by an agency, governmental or private, vested with some controlling responsibility

opportunity. combination of circumstances advantageous to the perpetrator(s) during which he/she/they can initiate some specified foul play resulting in death of victim(s) at some time

pathologist, forensic. a physician with additional higher education and experience qualifying her/him to specialize in detecting and detailing changes in tissues associated with natural and unnatural deaths and who is thus qualified to perform coronial post-mortems

patsy. person who is cheated, victimized, or made the butt of a joke; also means a person who is setup to appear guilty of a crime he/she did not commit and who is charged with that crime

pellets. small (millimetres) metallic (usually lead) ball, also called shot, which are projectiles discharged by firearms usually shotguns

police. publicly-funded agency responsible* for preventing and investigating crime as well as lesser non-criminal matters; member(s) of such an agency; (* responsibility not necessarily fulfilled)

police officer. member of a publicly-funded police agency; person may not hold officer rank; synonymous with vernacular cop/copper (With few exceptions, cops are lying, brainless thugs. Never trust them.)

projectile. bullet or shot discharged by a firearm

psychopath. person with a chronic mental disorder involving abnormal or violent social behaviour; person with an organic personality disorder involving aggressive anti-social behaviour; person who is callous and lacks empathy; person incapable of feeling deep emotions; has been differentiated into, i. primary psychopaths – genetic causes, ii. secondary psychopaths – environmental causes; as this word has been used interchangeably with sociopath, care needs to be taken

psycho-political operations/terror. devious contrived operations to convey information to and/or terrorize some public to influence emotions and reasoning, and ultimately the behavior of governments, organizations, groups, and individuals; also called **psyop/psy-op**

reasonable. fair; moderate; not excessive, illogical, or irrational; within the bounds of common sense which is judgement based on good natural assessment, not academic principles/theories/etc.

rifle. firearm with a rifled barrel

rort. deceitful action, plan, scheme leading to some advantage

scam. confidence trick, fraud, rort, swindle

set-up (n) & set up (v). outcome of or arrangement and execution of plan to make a person appear guilty of an illegal act

sham. false act meant to deceive; pretense; spurious imitation

shooter. person who shoots/discharges a firearm; gunman

shot. projectiles discharged from a shotgun; see pellet

shotgun. firearm with a smooth (not-rifled) barrel

show trial. pejorative description of a manipulated trial; defendant is considered guilty by officials before trial which serves as a high-profile forum to declare that person guilty and to impose a harsh sentence in line with political needs; truth and justice are irrelevant

sic. (Latin – thus/so) used in written work to indicate the anomaly, error, grammatical flaw, misspelling, etc. is not a mistake made by author; indicates error/s appear/s in original document/statement/transcript/etc; within brackets [...] means inserted by author, within parentheses (...) means inserted by writer being quoted

so-called. qualifies anything purported to be genuine but which is of: doubtful integrity, dubious origin, unknown provenance, or questionable validity; in some ways synonymous with alleged, purported, unauthenticated, unverified, etc.

solicitor. old British term for a lawyer who, in addition to other legal work, argues cases in lower-level courts

spook. slang word first used in the US to define a spy; has evolved to mean any person who, full-time or part-time, is engaged by a government or other significant entity to covertly gather information or assist with actions related to matters kept secret

stage/staged/staging. deceptive precautionary act, including partial or complete creation of crime scene or altering of existing crime scene to confuse, corrupt, hinder, divert, stop, and/or thwart an investigation and thus end or deflect suspicion

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

State. official supreme public power within an independent political entity; *n.b.* capitalized to differentiate the meaning from condition, geographical-political area, and verb; see Crown

statement. verbal or written expression by a person or persons

suspicious. feeling or belief based on intuition or reason associated with something thought to be criminal, immoral, or negative

theory. explanation designed to account for all related factors, said design arrived at through the scientific testing of hypotheses; often used synonymously but incorrectly for hypothesis which is an untested proposition

things. attributes, characteristics, components, objects, *etc.* that can be expected at or not expected at crime scene

tollbooth/tollgate/tollhouse. area, place, or small building where some transit fee (toll) is collected

true/truth. completeness; fidelity; genuineness; honesty; integrity; fact widely accepted as morally correct; *n.b.* all truths are facts, but not all facts are truths; see fact

type of death. differentiation of death into one of two categories – natural or unnatural; one type is an outcome of natural processes (*e.g.* old age, chronic disease), other is an outcome of unnatural processes (*e.g.* accidental, suicidal, homicidal)

unknown. used where cause of death or manner of death cannot be identified; cause of death and/or manner of death qualified with unknown might be natural or unnatural; also identified as indeterminate; see cause of death, default, manner of death, mechanism of death, type of death

unnatural. covers three (accidental, suicidal, homicidal) of four manners of death which are not natural

verbal/verballing. practice in which an accused person's confession, or any other statement is concocted (falsely worded) by police or by person involved after he/she is intimidated and/or assaulted by police, to fit a version of events desired by those police

victim. person who in some way suffers or dies from an act of foul play perpetrated against her/him

wilful. act or statement that is done/made deliberately

witness. any person who has information or who can interpret information relevant to a case or legal matter, regardless of whether he or she is aware of that relevance; seeing some part of a case or matter (being an eyewitness) is not an essential requirement; person with a high level of knowledge and/or experience with a specific subject may be identified as an expert witness; see expert ■

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annotations do not detail all components of each item. Read the works and form your own conclusions. Do not, without questioning them, accept beliefs and opinions expressed in any book (including this one), and never fail to question officials. That parts of the Port Arthur case official narrative were presented to a judge does not mean those parts are truthful. The corruption of the legal system, the imprisonment of an innocent person with no trial, and the failure to have justice served are very serious. Objective analytical thinking is needed, not unthinking acceptance of what is officially presented. **Question everything.**

AVAILABILITY

Out-of-print books were obtained via: abeboks.co.uk, abebooks.com; amazon.co.uk, amazon.com; bookfinder.com; vialibri.net, etc., etc.

BOOKS

Adams, SH. *Statement Analysis: What Do Suspects' Words Really Mean?*; FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin October; 1996.

Paper by FBI instructor and special agent revealing how statements are analyzed to detect deception.

Barker, T; Carter, D. *Fluffing Up the Evidence and Covering Your Ass/ [Arse]: Some Conceptual Notes on Police Lying*; Deviant Behavior vol. 11; 1990: pp. 61-73.

"Police officers are trained to lie." WARNING: If you want to continue believing police agencies have integrity and their members are genuinely concerned about you, do not read this revealing paper which exposes inherent entrenched corruption in such agencies. Nothing suggests Tasmania Police are an exception.

Beattie, SK. *A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur*; DVD book; 2006.

A seminal work on the Port Arthur case which gives particular attention to the firearms, alleged and actual.

Bowles, R. *Rough Justice: Unanswered Questions From the Australian Courts*; Rowville: The Five Mile Press; 2007.

Rattle-the-bars writing which draws attention to contemporary miscarriages of justice. Damning and distressing.

Brookman, F. *Understanding Homicide*; London: Sage; 2005.

Ideal book for those involved with, working in, or writing about: criminal justice; criminology; forensics; psychology; or, sociology.

Brown, M; Wilson, P. *Justice and Nightmares*; Kensington: New South Wales University Press; 1992.

Summary of cases in which evidence was flawed but accepted. Includes: Azaria Chamberlain (Northern Territory; *dingo-baby*); Kelvin Condren (Black man set up by criminal Queensland cops and wrongly imprisoned seven years); etc. More proof Australian legal systems are dangerously corrupt.

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Bryant, C. *My Story*; Hobart: Ludeke Publishing; 2010.

The back cover reads: "There were a large number of direct and indirect victims as a result of the Port Arthur Massacre. Many have spoken out, but one of them has remained silent: Bryant's mother Carleen." This 19-chapter book tells her story without any glossing over of the accusations, facts, and truths.

Bryson, J. *Evil Angels*; London: Penguin Books; 1988.

Story of Azaria the *dingo-baby* and Lindy Chamberlain her mother who was corruptly prosecuted and imprisoned – this cruel legal fiasco will forever haunt the so-called justice officials in the Northern Territory. (This case was badly bungled by officials. This later influenced the Falconio case in which a kangaroo court wrongly imprisoned Bradley Murdoch in 2005.)

Crowley, G; Wilson, P. *Who Killed Leanne?*; Burleigh: Zeus, 2005. (Republished with the title *Who Killed Leanne Holland?* in 2007.)

Queensland murder (Leanne Holland) investigation and miscarriage of justice (Graham Stafford; wrongly imprisoned over 14 years). Researched 10 years by former detective (Graeme Crowley) later assisted by criminologist (Paul Wilson). Same story titled *Body of Evidence* featured on *Australian Story* (ABC) in 2007. Corrupt cops hindered Crowley's search for truth and tried to maintain cover-up of Stafford's innocence. (see Karam; O'Brien & Lewis)

Dawson, B. *The Evil Deeds of the Ratbag Profession in the Criminal Justice System*; Woombye: Dawson; 1998.

Writer has 30 years experience with many parts of the legal system. Exposes unethical, self-serving, evil behaviour of jaundiced judges and lying larcenous lawyers. Back cover: "[T]he book may be the spark that ignites a revolution against a bloated, greedy, and corrupt legal profession in Australia and New Zealand."

Day, B. *Hey Cop!*; Mitchell, Manitoba: P. Schmitt Graphics; 2008.

Unvarnished insights by Canadian (Winnipeg) cop of 20 years. Disturbing revelations about corrupting truth in courts and insidious lying by police: "Lying gets easier the longer you stay on the police force"; & "Actually, the lies go far deeper than even I realized...everything internal is built on an intricate system of lies."

Dershowitz, AM. *The Best Defense*; New York: Random House; 1982.

Details 10 cases in which this uncompromising defense lawyer was involved. Introduction reveals this: "[L]ying, distortion, and other forms of intellectual dishonesty are endemic among judges." (His support of torture condemns him.)

Dixon, D (ed.). *A Culture of Corruption: Changing an Australian Police Service*; Leichhardt: Hawkins Press; 1999.

Though focused on police service in New South Wales (1997 investigation determined this service was in a "state of systemic and entrenched corruption"), this scholarly compilation addresses police-related issues and themes causing problems in every state and territory in Australia.

Douglas, JE; Burgess, AW; Burgess, AG; Ressler, RK (eds.). *Crime Classification Manual* (2nd edit.); San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2006. (1st edit. 1992)

This book "classifies the critical characteristics of the perpetrators and victims of major crimes – murder, arson, sexual assault, and nonlethal acts – based on the motivation of the offender." (Note this classification system is not used in Australia.)

Douglas, J; Munn, C (crimeandclues.com/92feb003.html). *Violent Crime Scene Analysis: Modus Operandi, Signature, and Staging*; FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin February; 1992.

Elaborates on crime scenes. Assists investigators identify who, what, how, and why associated with staged scenes.

Douglas, J; Olshaker, M. *The Anatomy of Motive: The FBI's Legendary Mindhunter Explores the Key to Understanding and Catching Violent Criminals*; Sydney: Pocket Books; 1999.

Douglas was an FBI profiler who has studied deadly offenders. Importance of identifying and of understanding criminal motive is emphasized. Paperback with punch.

Fisher, BAJ. *Techniques of Crime Scene Investigation* (7th edit.); Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2004. (1st edit. 1949; *Crime Detection*) Must-study volume for investigators. Covers all major types of crimes. Places emphasis on competent crime scene processing. Includes many instructive colour images.

Geberth, VJ. *Practical Homicide Investigation: Tactics, Procedures, and Forensic Techniques* (3rd edit.); Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2015. Geberth, who has assessed, investigated, supervised, and consulted on over 8000 death investigations, combines theory with practice in comprehensible style.

Gilovich, T. *How We Know What Isn't So: The Fallibility of Human Reason in Everyday Life*; New York: Free Press; 1991.

Reveals why people hold dubious beliefs and how they arrive at faulty conclusions. Has psychological and sociological foundations making truth focal.

Grayling, AC. *The Meaning of Things: Applying Philosophy To Life*; London: Phoenix; 2002.

Compilation of philosophical insights on over 60 life-relevant subjects by British philosopher. Words on lying and perjury are particularly thought-provoking.

Green, A. *Power, Resistance, Knowledge: Epistemology of Policing*; Sheffield: Midwinter & Oliphant; 2008.

In-depth work detailing how cops produce knowledge in accordance with their needs, knowledge which is not always truthful and which is therefore unjust. Strong focus on erroneous convictions.

Karam, J. *David and Goliath: The Bain Family Murders*; Auckland: Reed Books; 2007.

True and numbing story of David Bain, a New Zealander falsely tried for murder then wrongly imprisoned for 13 years. Eventually freed through love and super efforts of justice seekers. Karam says: "The sad fact is justice is a game to be won or lost."

Karam, J. *INNOCENT!: Seven Critical Flaws in the Wrongful Conviction of David Bain*; Auckland: Pohutakawa Productions; 2001.

A 38-page booklet detailing how the corrupt legal system convicted then imprisoned an innocent person.

Karam, J. *Bain and Beyond*. Auckland: Reed Books; 2000.

Staggering exposé of the adversarial legal system which convicts the innocent and frees the guilty. An indictment of the unjust legal system in New Zealand, Australia, Canada, etc.

Kick, R. *50 Things You're Not Supposed to Know*; New York: The Disinformation Company; 2003.

A good book for those having the bad habit of accepting official accounts of events. Though US-oriented, it is universally (cont.)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Disturbing. Makes thinking readers wonder what is being covered up in their own countries. (Pine Gap in Australia, for example.)

Lean, S. *No Smoke! The Shocking Truth About British Justice*; West point: CheckPoint Press; 2008.

back cover: "Innocent people are being locked up in our prisons, convicted of the most horrific crimes, on a regular basis. These are not one-off, tragic mistakes, but rather, a routine, everyday occurrence. For every high-profile miscarriage of justice that we hear about, there are dozens more that never make the news."

MacGregor, AS. *Deceit and Terrorism – Port Arthur*; DVD: 2001-4.

A seminal work on the Port Arthur case which gives particular attention to the analysis of specific elements of the case. Written by a former cop, it details the dishonesty and deceitful corruption incorporated within the official narrative.

Maxwell, MW; McLachlan D. *PORT ARTHUR: enough is enough: Australians Speaking Out*; Melbourne: Gumshoe News; 2016.

A free 288-page book downloadable from gumshoenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/enough-is-enough_29mar_low-res.pdf. Thirty chapters with appendices and index, it presents exculpatory facts pertinent to the wrongful gaoling of innocent Martin Bryant and which previously have not been published in book format.

McDonald, N. *A PRESENTATION ON THE PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT: Prelude to a royal commission*; Victoria: COA Press; 2001.

back cover: "This book presents many previously undisclosed facts about the Port Arthur Incident of 28th April 1996. Vital information about the Incident and Martin Bryant has been withheld from the public. It is very clear that Bryant did not act alone, there is ample proof and evidence of another person* who was present at Seascapes on that day." A second edition of this book, with an index, should be published. (* believed to be Mick/Rick Dyson of Tasmania Police; see details related to false siege at Seascapes)

McLaren, C. *Southern Justice*; Sydney: Hachette Australia; 2019.

Exposes how innocent Sue Neill-Fraser was falsely found guilty of murder and is now wrongly imprisoned in Tasmania. That there was no body, no motive, and no witnesses makes it similar to two Northern-Territory cases: the missing Peter Falconio case in which Bradley Murdoch is now wrongly imprisoned; and, the *dingo-baby* case in which Lindy Chamberlain was wrongly imprisoned.

Moles, RN (netk.net.au/home.asp). *A State of Injustice*; Melbourne: Lothian Books; 2004.

Foreword by professor of forensic medicine Derek Pounder reads: "This is a book about bad science and a flawed criminal justice system. Its setting is South Australia, but the challenge it presents is directed to the entire criminal justice system in Australia." Unsettling must-read book exposing institutionalized injustice.

Morgan, K. *Gun Alley: Murder, Lies and Failure of Justice*; Sydney: Simon & Schuster; 2005.

Cover: "[R]iveting story of how botched police work, trial by media and lynch-law hysteria spawned a staggering conspiracy to convict and hang an innocent man, and reveals...the vital clues – missed in the original investigation – that point...to the true killer." Includes pre-execution letter of wrongly convicted Colin Campbell Ross which will make feeling readers weep. Details of his horrible hanging (State murder) in 1922 are soul-searing.

Naylor, L. *Judge For Yourself: How Many Are Innocent?;* London: Roots Books; 2004.

Explains how people are falsely imprisoned: "I recommend that every law student, solicitor, barrister, QC and judge should be made to read it. I have no doubt that if they did, we would not have as many miscarriages of justice as we have now." (Paddy Joe Hill)

Newburn, T; Williamson, T; Wright, A (eds.). *Handbook of Criminal Investigation;* Cullompton: Willan; 2007.

Experts (38) contribute to "comprehensive, authoritative and accessible overview" to "enable practitioners, students and others to explore the salient issues of criminal investigation."

Noble, KA. *FIND! FALCONIO: Concealing Crimes in Northern Territory, Australia;* bookfinder.com: Big Worm Books; 2nd edition 2012.

Documents background and legal case associated with the disappearance of British drug-runner Peter Marco Falconio on 14 July 2001 in Northern Territory, Australia. Confirms official corruption associated with setting up of Bradley Murdoch who was imprisoned with concocted evidence presented by evil Joanne Lees. (Evidence strongly suggests Falconio was not killed as the State claims.)

Noble, KA. *THE WORST OF BRITISH JUSTICE: Readings Related to Injustice in Australia c.1825-2015;* bookfinder.com: Big Worm Books; 2nd edition 2015.

Readings for academics, students, and all parties seeking insight into the many appalling cases of injustice in Australia – injustice which is not rare in that legally-corrupt country.

Noble, KA. *OMEGA Human Killing;* bookfinder.com: WAM Books; 2018.

Details over 50 different types of killing. Contains extracts, images, as well as details related to practical and moral considerations.

O'Brien, M; Lewis, G. *The Death of Justice;* Talybont, Ceredigion, Cymru: Y. Lofla; 2008.

Revelation of incompetence and corruption of BR police (Wales) and courts which set up innocent Michael O'Brien, gaoling him for life for a murder he did not commit. His superhuman resolve and supporters got him out after he served 11 years of living hell. Mongrel Judge (never Justice) Davies commended police for their good work. Engaging and enraging. (see Crowley & Wilson; Karam)

Porter, C. *THE CONVICTION OF THE INNOCENT: How the law can let us down;* North Sydney: Random House; 2007.

Mind-opening work for those inclined to think. By a famous Australian barrister. "It is the founding principle of Western legal systems than an accused person is presumed innocent until their crime is conclusively prove."

Prenzler, T; Ransley, J (eds.). *Police Reform: Building Integrity;* Leichhardt: Hawkins Press; 2002.

Cover: "Police work is plagued by corruption and other abuses of authority.... This compilation reports on the latest research about causes and prevention of the many different types of misconduct that can beset policing."

Quinn, MW. *Walking With the Devil: The Police Code of Silence.* Minneapolis: Quinn and Associates; 2005.

Unvarnished insights of American (Minneapolis) cop of 25 years. Concentrates on police lying – aka code of silence. Exposes serious problems it causes innocent people, police, and legal systems. Gives shocking examples of wrongful convictions. (see Day)

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- Rachlin, H.** *The Making of a Detective*; London: W. W. Norton; 1995.
Account of new detective and his transformation into a death investigator. Discusses corruption and professional/unethical bad habits of detectives. Lying and fabricating of evidence by detectives are described, as too is their dealing with death.
- Reid, R** (robreid.com.au). *Under a Dark Moon*: (2nd edit.); Mareeba: Blue Heeler Books; 2006. (1st edit. 2003)
Compilation of over 12 murders and mysteries written in gripping prose. Includes cases of wrongful arrest and imprisonment, plus unsolved case of young Cairns woman evidence strongly suggests was killed by Queensland cop never charged with homicide.
- Reid, R** (robreid.com.au). *Third Party to Murder: The Sequel*; Mareeba: Blue Heeler Books; 2004.
Hard hitting account of horrific Arnold-Leahy double-murder case which was grossly misinvestigated by incompetent local cops then covered up by corrupt officials and coroners of Queensland Courts. Forensic pathologist Michael Zillman stated: "This is the most important case, perhaps, in the whole of Australian forensic history."
- Richards, C.** *Coroner's Death-Defying Decisions*; The Law Report transcript; ABC Radio National; 10.10.2000.
Disturbing insights into corrupt coronial systems in Australia: inadequate funding; cover-ups; secrecy; etc. Discusses coronial system in Ontario, Canada. Confirms why States oppose coronial investigations: "Coroners' inquests can unlock closed doors and the system failures hiding behind them."
- Rigoli, E.** *FROM MAN TO MONSTER*; BA (hon) thesis; School of Social Sciences, University of Tasmania; 2013.
Study of coverage given to Martin Bryant by The Mercury newspaper which illegally published his name and image. Confirms Bryant was framed negatively, but states wrongly there was a trial.
- Roleff, T** (ed.). *Police Corruption*; Farmington Hills: Greenhaven; 2003.
Compilation of 15 articles, chapters, papers, reports published within preceding 10 years. Short, sharp, sickening revelations with some prescriptive comments and praise.
- Rummel, RJ.** *Death by Government*; New York: Routledge; 2008.
"In total, during the first eighty-eight of this century, almost 170 million men, women, and children have been shot, beaten, tortured, knifed, burned, starved, frozen, crushed, or worked to death; buried alive, drowned, hung, bombed, killed in any other of the myriad ways governments have inflicted death on unarmed helpless citizens and foreigners."
- Tapp, P.** *Disquiet*. Orford, Tasmania; 1998 & 2007.
Over a three-year period, Tapp researched and documented the State-condoned killing of Joe Gilewicz by the Special Operations Group of Tasmania Police in July 1991.
- Turvey, B** (ed.). *Criminal Profiling: An Introduction To Behavioral Evidence Analysis* (2nd edit.); London: Elsevier; 2001. (1st edit. 1999)
Solid reference work by renowned criminal profiler.
- Uttley, S.** *Dunblane Unburied*; Bristol: BookPublishingWorld; 2006.
Author has meticulously researched the evidence and presents a different and disturbing version to what officially happened at a Dunblane school on 13 March 1996. (18 killed; 15 injured) One focus is on the persistent efforts of the Scottish Crown Office to keep case details buried.

- Vickers, MH.** *Australian Police Management: A Comment From 'Outside' the Cave*; in *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* vol. 23, no. 4; 2000. (cont.) Highlights "anti-intellectual subculture and emphasis on practice and experience" within training. Reveals problem police have admitting their errors (commission and omission). Supports overdue organizational change valuing critique, reflection, and theory.
- Whitton, E.** *Our Corrupt Legal System: Why Everyone is a Victim (Except Rich Criminals)*; Sydney: Book Pal; 2010. Reveals inanities & inequalities of corrupt adversarial legal system. Provides proof European investigative system of justice is superior. Should be compulsory study for high school students in AU, BR, CA, NZ, US, etc. so they can learn how corrupt lawyers and politicians, too many of whom are former but forever corrupt lawyers, are ruining their courts and countries.
- Whitton, E.** *Serial Liars: How Lawyers Get The Money and Get The Criminals Off*; abetterlegalsystem.info (ebook; free); 2005. New edition republished as *Our Corrupt Legal System* – see annotation above. (hardcopy & CD versions – different pagination)
- Whitton, E.** *Can of Worms II: A Citizen's Reference Book to Crime and the Administration of Justice*; Sydney: Fairfax; 1987. Looks at crime and corruption as well as maladministration of justice in Australia. Provides evidence on well-known people, police, and politicians who were or are involved in criminal activities.
- Williams, K.** *Our Enemies in Blue*; 2004; Soft Skull Press; Brooklyn. American work on militarization (weapons, tactics, etc.) and increasing violence against the people by police. A take-action call for all residents of Australia where cops are headed in the same wrong direction. ■

WEBSITES

amnesty.org.nz	kangarocourtsofaustralia.com
cairnsnews.org	lindychamberlain.com
cla.asn.au/News/	netk.net.au/home.asp
conspiracyoz.com	prisonplanet.com
countercurrents.org	realnewsaustralia.com
fija.org	rightsandwrong.com.au
gerrygeorgatos.com.au	smithforensic.blogspot.com
ifamericansknew.org	stitcher.com/podcast/fairdinkum-radio
independentaustralia.net	thestringer.com.au/about-us
infowars.com	whatreallyhappened.com
innocenceproject.org	wikileaks.org/wiki/Deborah_Locke
johnpilger.com	wikipedia.org/wiki/Eureka_Rebellion
justinian.com.au	youtube.com etc.

These websites are for readers who get all their information from the mainstream media – magazines, newspapers, radio, television, etc. Until it is realized such media can and do **withhold, distort, and/or censor** information, understanding the Port Arthur case is impossible. Unthinking recitations of the official – **incomplete** and **inaccurate** – narrative, **stops** the determination of truth. Without that truth, there can never be justice for the many victims and for Martin Bryant. ■

AUTHOR ARTICLES & INSERTS

- AVERY, John
LETTER OF INTIMIDATION
- BAINBRIDGE, Alex
COP SHOOTING COVER-UP
- BASSI, Raul
TJ HICKEY
- BAXTER, Daniel
WAS MARTIN BRYANT FRAMED?
- BEATTIE, Stewart K.
BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ
LETTER TO KEN MORONEY
MIND MANIPULATION BY STATE
PERVERTING JUSTICE
PRIMARY FIREARMS & AMMUNITION
SEARCH OUT, ASSEMBLE, PUBLISH
SUMMARY
- BRYANT, Carleen
MY STORY - CHAPTER 16
- CHITTS, Hamish
AUSTRALIA'S AGENT ORANGE CRIME
- COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR-TEST-BAN TREATY
BRITAIN BOMBS WESTERN AUSTRALIA
- COOPER, Robyn
MY DAY - SUNDAY 28th APRIL 1996
- COULTHART, Ross
AMERICANS TO NERVE GAS AUSSIES
- DFAT
ABOUT AUSTRALIA
- DUTTON, Gerard
PORT ARTHUR SHOOTING INCIDENT
- EISEN, Joanne
OFFICIALS DECEIVING AUSTRALIANS
- EX-POLICE OFFICER
POLICE & TRUTH ILL-ASSORTED
- FLOYD, Chris
MORE MURDERS, MORE TERROR
- FREEMAN, Jane
BRYANT CHARGED WITH MURDER
- FREESTATEVOICE.com.au
UNANSWERED QUESTIONS, UNADDRESSED CONCERNS
- GALLANT, Paul
OFFICIALS DECEIVING AUSTRALIANS
- GEORGATOS, Gerry
BRUTALITY
CRADLE TO GRAVE, ONE INJUSTICE AFTER ANOTHER
- GRABOSKY, P.N.
BRITAIN TESTS NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN AUSTRALIA
- HAMISH
COPS KILL FOR BISCUITS

HEAD, Mike
THIRTY-FIVE YEARS NO ANSWERS

HOPE, Alastair Neil
IAN WARD

HORN, Allyson
KILLING KWEMENTYAYE BRISCOE

INNOCENCE PROJECT
EVERYONE KNOWS HE DID IT
EYEWITNESS MISIDENTIFICATION

JACKSONS
LETTER

JASHER TEAM, The
ANOTHER STATE MURDER
PREPARATIONS FOR KILLING BY STATE

JOHNSON, Steve
FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT
GENIUS OR PERFECT PATSY?
TRUTH ABOUT PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE

JOHNSTONE, Brian
STOPPING PEOPLE FROM LEARNING HOW MULRUNJI DIED

JONES, Charlie
TIMELINE TO APRIL 1996 MASSACRE

JONES, Ruby
KILLING KWEMENTYAYE BRISCOE

KEANE, John
MARALINGA'S AFTERLIFE

KOLLERSTROM, Nick
UNTRUTHS & TERROR

MacGREGOR, Andrew, S.
ALLEGED FIREARMS
ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO
A TANGLED WEB OF POLICE CORRUPTRION
BUNKUM, GEMS, DISCREPANCIES
DECEIT AND TERRORISM – PORT ARTHUR
DPP TAMPERS WITH & WITHHOLDS EVIDENCE
OFFICIALS DECEIVING AUSTRALIANS
SEASCAPE COTTAGE SIEGE
STATUTORY DECLARATION EXTRACTS
THAT BLOODY DOOR
THE BREAK-IN
WE FORCED THE GUNMAN TO COME TO US
WE HAVE BEEN TOLD
WHO TORCHED THE BMW & SEASCAPE – AND WHY
WITNESS STATEMENTS

MARRETT, Damian
VICTORIA POLICE SHOOTINGS

MARSDEN, John R.
WHY SOME COPS GET AWAY WITH IT

MATTERSON, Ian R.
LETTER OF MATTERSON – BRYANT NOT GUILTY

McCULLOCH, Jude
AUSTRALIA'S POLICE AND MILITARY MUST NOT BE THE SAME

McGUIRE, Amy
STOPPING PEOPLE FROM LEARNING HOW MULRUNJI DIED

McKENNA, Michael
TONY GALEANO

McNAMARA, Joseph D.
POLICE CORRUPTION

MOORE, Michael
JOHN HOWARD'S END

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

MORGAN, Kevin
GUN ALLEY
LETTER TO COLIN CAMPBELL ROSS

MORGAN, Ray
STATE MURDER/IMPRISONMENT FOR HOMICIDE

MORRI, Mark
LAUDIOSO CURTI

MORTON-THOMAS, Patricia
KWEMENTYAYE BRISCOE

NOBLE, Keith Allan
ADVANCE OBITUARY
ARTHUR H'WY SEASCAPE TURN-OFF
BANG-UP, FIT-UP, FRAME-UP, RAILROAD, SET-UP, STITCH-UP
BENIGN BLUNDERS OR SINISTER SIGNS
CAUTION WITH CLOTHING, COLOURS, CORPSES
CHAIN OF CUSTODY/EVIDENCE/POSSESSION
COP TASERS TONY TO DEATH
CRIMINAL COPS
DAEWOO SHOTGUN DENIED
DEADLY DECEPTION OF CERTAINTY
DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE
EMAILS RECEIVED BY EDITOR
EVIDENCE SET UP AT 30 CLARE STREET
FIRES USED IN COVER-UP
IGNORED FACTS
INNOCENTS IMPRISONED
JUDGES AND JUSTICE ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS
JUDICIAL CORRUPTION AND IGNORANCE
JUST A FEW JOHN AVERY QUOTES
KILLING WHILE DRUGGED
LETTER TO AUSTRALIAN OFFICIALS
LETTER TO JOHN AVERY
LETTER (CORRUPT DPP) TO WENDY SCURR
MAGNA CARTA 1215
MAJOR CONCERNS, REASONABLE DOUBTS
MARTIN BRYANT DID NOT DO IT
MARTIN BRYANT'S HOME
MASSACRES IN AUSTRALIA
MASS MURDER – EMAIL
MISSING EVIDENCE
NAKED BLACK-HAIRED WOMAN
NEITHER OWNED NOR FIRED
OFFICIALLY KILLED – PORT ARTHUR, TASMANIA; 1996
OFFICIAL KILLING COMPONENTS
PAHS MEMORIAL GARDEN BROCHURE
PETRA WILLMOTT
POLICE CORRUPTION
PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE
PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT BOOKS
RESISTING CHANGE
ROLE OF THE JAMIES
SOME STATE MURDERS – AUSTRALIA
SOME WORDS ON BOOKS
SOME WORDS ON TRUTH
SPECIAL OPERATIONS GROUP – TASMANIA
STATEMENTS BY PETRA WILLMOTT
SUBMISSION TO AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL
TASMANIA DISASTER INCIDENTS
THE MERCURY
THE TELLING TOLLBOOTH

THE ZAHORCAK STATEMENT
UNETHICAL LAWYERS
UNSAVOURY JOHN AVERY
VOLVOS, A VOLKSWAGEN, A BLUE SEDAN, A GREEN SEDAN
WHAT'S IN A WORD
WHAT THE IGNORANT OVERLOOK
YELLOW VOLVO ALLEGED STOPS
PALMER, Julian
DEMONIZING WORDS ABOUT MARTIN BRYANT
PENN LAW LLC BLOG
BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT
PERERA, Judith
AUSTRALIA'S CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS
PIKE, Don
LETTER TO SUPREME COURT
PITT, Tony
PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT
PORTARTHUR
IS THERE A SMOKING GUN?
SCHULZE, Terry
BLUE BAG & THE TRAY
JFK AND PORT ARTHUR
JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY
PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE UPDATE
SCURR, Wendy
MY EXPERIENCES AT PORT ARTHUR
TWO BUS LOADS
STANA, Richard M.
POLICE CORRUPTION
TAPP, Paul
DISQUIET
THE MERCURY
TOO HOT TO HANDLE
TOOHEY, Paul
LAUDISIO CURTI
ULTIMATE-RESEARCH-ASSISTANT.com
HILTON HOTEL BOMBING
VANCE, Lloyd T.
FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT
GENIUS OR PERFECT PATSY?
TRUTH ABOUT PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE
WALKER, Syd
A SCEPTICAL REAPPRAISAL
EYES THAT SHAME AUSTRALIAN JOURNALISM
WOLLASTON, John G.
WERE GOVERNMENT SECURITY AGENCIES INVOLVED IN...?
WERNERHOFF, Carl
NO EVIDENCE
THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE
22-BODY TRUCK USED FOR OFFICIAL KILLINGS....
WIKIPEDIA
AGENT ORANGE
IAN WARD
MULRUNJI
WIKISPOOKS
MEANING OF OFFICIAL NARRATIVE
WOOD, Ned
PLUNDERING OF MARTIN BRYANT'S ASSETS
WRIGHT, Chris
ADVERTISEMENT TEXT ■

ARTICLES & INSERTS

A	ABOUT AUSTRALIA	594
	ADVANCE OBITUARY	xxiii
	ADVERTISEMENT TEXT	302
	AGENT ORANGE	81
	ALLEGED FIREARMS	359
	ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO	613
	AMERICANS TO NERVE GAS AUSSIES	63
	ANOTHER STATE MURDER	96
	ARTHUR H'WY SEASCAPE TURN-OFF	407
	A SCEPTICAL REAPPRAISAL	46
	A TANGLED WEB OF POLICE CORRUPTION	29
	AUSTRALIA'S AGENT ORANGE CRIME	77
	AUSTRALIA'S CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	78
	AUSTRALIA'S POLICE & MILITARY MUST NOT BE THE SAME	104
B	BANG-UP, FIT-UP, FRAME-UP, RAILROAD, SET-UP, STITCH-UP	326
	BENIGN BLUNDERS OR SINISTER SIGNS?	358
	BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT	600
	BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ	348
	BLUE BAG & THE TRAY	152
	BRITAIN BOMBS WESTERN AUSTRALIA	68
	BRITAIN TESTS NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN AUSTRALIA	72
	BRUTALITY	128
	BRYANT CHARGED WITH MURDER	288
	BUNKUM, GEMS, DISCREPANCIES	194
C	CAUTION WITH CLOTHING, COLOURS, CORPSES	456
	CHAIN OF CUSTODY/EVIDENCE/POSSESSION	342
	COERCED CONFESSION	xxxvi
	COP SHOOTING COVER-UP	89
	COP TASERS TONY TO DEATH	118
	COPS KILL FOR BISCUITS	122
	CRADLE TO GRAVE, ONE INJUSTICE AFTER ANOTHER	127
	CRIMINAL COPS	33
D	DAEWOO SHOTGUN DENIED	542
	DEADLY DECEPTION OF CERTAINTY	363
	DECEIT AND TERRORISM – PORT ARTHUR	505
	DECEPTIVE BALASKO VIDEO	xxxv
	DEMONIZING WORDS ABOUT MARTIN BRYANT	256
	DISQUIET	87
	DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE	577
	DPP TAMPERS WITH & WITHHOLDS EVIDENCE	334
E	EMAILS RECEIVED BY EDITOR	544
	EVERYONE KNOWS HE DID IT	628
	EVIDENCE SET UP AT 30 CLARE STREET	323
	EYEWITNESS MISIDENTIFICATION	384
	EYES THAT SHAME AUSTRALIAN JOURNALISM	249
F	FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT	415
	FIRES USED IN COVER-UP	532
G	GENIUS OR PERFECT PATSY?	221
	GUN ALLEY	51

H	<i>HILTON HOTEL BOMBING</i>	83
I	<i>IAN WARD</i>	113
	<i>IGNORED FACTS</i>	383
	<i>INACCURATE UNEXPLAINED PLAQUE PORT ARTHUR</i>	643
	<i>INDEPENDENT MEDIA COUNCIL CODE OF CONDUCT...</i>	<i>xl</i>
	<i>INNOCENTS IMPRISONED</i>	11
	<i>IS THERE A SMOKING GUN?</i>	184
J	<i>JFK AND PORT ARTHUR</i>	371
	<i>JOHN AVERY'S PLEA OF GUILTY</i>	212
	<i>JOHN HOWARD'S END</i>	28
	<i>JUDGES AND JUSTICE ARE NOT SYNONYMOUS</i>	616
	<i>JUDICIAL CORRUPTION AND IGNORANCE</i>	623
	<i>JUST A FEW JOHN AVERY QUOTES</i>	606
K	<i>KILLING KWEMENTYAYE BRISCOE</i>	125
	<i>KILLING WHILE DRUGGED</i>	525
L	<i>LETTER OF INTIMIDATION</i>	31
	<i>LETTER OF JACKSONS SECURITY</i>	581
	<i>LETTER OF MATTERSON – BRYANT NOT GUILTY</i>	252
	<i>LETTER TO AUSTRALIAN OFFICIALS</i>	<i>v</i>
	<i>LETTER TO COLIN CAMPBELL ROSS</i>	61
	<i>LETTER TO JOHN AVERY</i>	611
	<i>LETTER TO KEN MORONEY</i>	261
	<i>LETTER TO SUPREME COURT</i>	275
	<i>LETTER (CORRUPT DPP) TO WENDY SCURR</i>	537
M	<i>MAGNA CARTA 1215</i>	602
	<i>MAJOR CONCERNS, REASONABLE DOUBTS</i>	494
	<i>MARALINGA'S AFTERLIFE</i>	65
	<i>MARTIN BRYANT DID NOT DO IT</i>	14
	<i>MARTIN BRYANT WAS INNOCENT</i>	<i>xxvi, xxxiv, xlii</i>
	<i>MARTIN BRYANT WRONGLY & CRUELLY CONDEMNED....</i>	<i>xxxix</i>
	<i>MARTIN BRYANT WRONGLY & CRUELLY HELD....</i>	<i>xxix</i>
	<i>MARTIN BRYANT'S HOME</i>	307
	<i>MASSACRES IN AUSTRALIA</i>	130
	<i>MASS MURDER – EMAIL</i>	597
	<i>MEANING OF OFFICIAL NARRATIVE</i>	8
	<i>MIND MANIPULATION BY STATE</i>	450
	<i>MISSING EVIDENCE</i>	631
	<i>MORE MURDERS, MORE TERROR</i>	64
	<i>MULRUNJI</i>	107
	<i>MY DAY – SUNDAY 28th APRIL 1996</i>	176
	<i>MY EXPERIENCES AT PORT ARTHUR</i>	157
	<i>MY STORY – CHAPTER 16</i>	285
N	<i>NAKED BLACK-HAIRED WOMAN</i>	636
	<i>NEITHER OWNED NOR FIRED</i>	319
	<i>NO EVIDENCE</i>	354
	<i>NOT PROVED BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT</i>	<i>xxxvii</i>
O	<i>OFFICIAL BRUTALITY & KILLING</i>	103
	<i>OFFICIAL IMAGES OF TOLLBOOTH CRIME SCENE</i>	556
	<i>OFFICIALLY KILLED – PORT ARTHUR, TASMANIA; 1996</i>	638
	<i>OFFICIAL KILLING COMPONENTS</i>	374
	<i>OFFICIALS DECEIVING AUSTRALIANS</i>	478
P	<i>PAHS MEMORIAL GARDEN BROCHURE</i>	242
	<i>PERVERTING JUSTICE</i>	373
	<i>PETRA WILLMOTT</i>	369
	<i>PLUNDERING OF MARTIN BRYANT'S ASSETS</i>	284
	<i>POLICE CORRUPTION</i>	93
	<i>POLICE & TRUTH ILL-ASSORTED</i>	99
	<i>PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE</i>	387
	<i>PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT</i>	19

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

	<i>PORT ARTHUR INCIDENT BOOKS</i>	36
	<i>PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE UPDATE</i>	539
	<i>PORT ARTHUR SHOOTING INCIDENT</i>	190
	<i>PREPARATIONS FOR KILLING BY STATE</i>	301
	<i>PRIMARY FIREARMS & AMMUNITION</i>	329
R	<i>RESISTING CHANGE</i>	698
	<i>ROLE OF THE JAMIES</i>	234
S	<i>SEARCH OUT, ASSEMBLE, PUBLISH</i>	141
	<i>SEASCAPE COTTAGE SIEGE</i>	169
	<i>SOME STATE MURDERS - AUSTRALIA</i>	58
	<i>SOME WORDS ON BOOKS</i>	35
	<i>SOME WORDS ON TRUTH</i>	7
	<i>SPECIAL OPERATIONS GROUP - TASMANIA</i>	104
	<i>STATEMENTS BY PETRA WILLMOTT</i>	308
	<i>STATE MURDER/IMPRISONMENT FOR HOMICIDE</i>	55
	<i>STATUTORY DECLARATION EXTRACTS</i>	317
	<i>STOPPING PEOPLE FROM LEARNING HOW MULRUNJI DIED</i>	110
	<i>SUBMISSION TO AUSTRALIAN PRESS COUNCIL</i>	xlv
	<i>SUMMARY</i>	599
T	<i>TASMANIA DISASTER INCIDENTS</i>	166
	<i>THAT BLOODY DOOR</i>	563
	<i>THE BREAK-IN</i>	305
	<i>THE MERCURY</i>	589
	<i>THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE</i>	205
	<i>THE TELLING TOLLBOOTH</i>	545
	<i>THE ZAHORCAK STATEMENT</i>	442
	<i>THIRTY-FIVE YEARS NO ANSWERS</i>	85
	<i>TIMELINE TO APRIL 1996 MASSACRE</i>	566
	<i>TJ HICKEY</i>	105
	<i>TOO HOT TO HANDLE</i>	570
	<i>TRUTH ABOUT PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE</i>	22
	<i>22-BODY TRUCK USED FOR OFFICIAL KILLINGS....</i>	303
	<i>TWO BUS LOADS</i>	144
U	<i>UNANSWERED QUESTIONS, UNADDRESSED CONCERNS</i>	13
	<i>UNETHICAL LAWYERS</i>	697
	<i>UNSAVOURY JOHN AVERY</i>	603
	<i>UNTRUTHS & TERROR</i>	26
V	<i>VOLVOS, A VOLKSWAGEN, A BLUE SEDAN, A GREEN SEDAN</i>	468
W	<i>WAS MARTIN BRYANT FRAMED?</i>	251
	<i>WE FORCED THE GUNMAN TO COME TO US</i>	267
	<i>WE HAVE BEEN TOLD</i>	149
	<i>WERE GOVERNMENT SECURITY AGENCIES INVOLVED IN...?</i>	311
	<i>WHAT'S IN A WORD</i>	171
	<i>WHAT THE IGNORANT OVERLOOK</i>	619
	<i>WHO TORCHED THE BMW & SEASCAPE - AND WHY</i>	280
	<i>WHY SOME COPS GET AWAY WITH IT</i>	114
	<i>WITNESS STATEMENTS</i>	314
Y	<i>YELLOW VOLVO ALLEGED STOPS</i>	434 ■

IMAGES & MAPS

A	<i>ADVERTISEMENT ON INTERNET</i>	302
	<i>AFTERMATH OF OFFICIAL BOMB</i>	84
	<i>ARTHUR H'WAY SEASCAPE TURN-OFF</i>	407(x2)
	<i>AUSTRALIA</i>	138, 249
	<i>AVERY</i>	xvi, xxxii, 249, 603
B	<i>BARNES</i>	xxxii
	<i>BEARD</i>	xxxii
	<i>BLACK VAN AT BROAD ARROW CAFÉ</i>	348
	<i>BLAKE</i>	lxiv
	<i>BLUNDSTONE BOOT</i>	388
	<i>BROAD ARROW CAFÉ</i>	162
	<i>BRISCOE</i>	123
	<i>BRYANT</i>	ix, xxiv, 249, 271(x4)
	<i>BUGG</i>	xvi, xxxii
C	<i>COMMODORE (GM) 1996</i>	632
	<i>COX</i>	xvi, xxxii
D	<i>DAWTREY</i>	591
	<i>DISQUIET</i>	95
	<i>DON'T BLAME DUNBLANE</i>	577
	<i>DRAWING BY MARTIN BRYANT</i>	696
	<i>DUNBLANE UNBURIED</i>	577
	<i>DUTTON</i>	317
	<i>DYSON</i>	238, 597
F	<i>FIRES USED IN COVER-UP</i>	533, 534
	<i>FRANCIS, Pope</i>	ix
G	<i>GOODWIN</i>	xxxii
	<i>GUNMAN'S TRAY, BAG & CAMERA</i>	17(x2)
	<i>GUNSON</i>	xxxiii
H	<i>HICKEY RALLY, SYDNEY</i>	105
	<i>HICKEY RALLY POSTER</i>	106
	<i>HOWARD</i>	xvii, xxxiii
	<i>HURLEY</i>	109
I	<i>INJUSTICE</i>	586
J	<i>JURY NULLIFICATION</i>	616
L	<i>LAMBIE</i>	xliv
M	<i>MARTIN</i>	636
	<i>McCARTHY</i>	625
	<i>McGREGOR(?)</i>	37
	<i>MULLEN</i>	515
	<i>MYLES</i>	117
	<i>MY STORY</i>	285

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

N	NELSON BROS LOGO/SIGN	..lxv
	NIKE RUNNER	388
O	OTTAVI	xviii
	OUR CORRUPT LEGAL SYSTEM	217
	OVERBEEKE(?)	640
P	PAHS TOLLBOOTH	546
	PARRY	xiv
	PLAQUE, COMMEMORATIVE	643(x2)
	POISONED FOREVER	75
	POLLARD(?) R.	641
	POLLARD(?) R, SALZMANN(?) H, NIXON(?) MR....	556
	PORT ARTHUR HISTORIC SITE	387
	PORT ARTHUR SHOOTER?	467
Q	QUEENSLAND POLICE	111
R	RAMAGE	li
	RIGBY	xxxiii
S	SALE	505
	SALZMANN(?), H.	642
	SALZMANN(?), R.	642
	SALZMANN(?) NEAR A VOLVO	557
	SARRE	xxxiii
	SEASCAPE COTTAGE c.1996	155
	STATE MURDER	55
T	TASMANIA	138
	TASMAN PENINSULA, AUSTRALIA	139
	TENNENT	xxxiii
	22-BODY TRUCK USED FOR OFFICIAL KILLINGS	303
	22-BODY VEHICLE FOR SALE	15
W	WEISBROT	xvii, xxxiii
	WHITE	xvii, xxxiii
	WILLMOTT	369 ■

NAME INDEX

MAJOR mentions only; if appearing more than 20 times the name is, with some exceptions, indexed *passim*; every page can have several mentions of each identified name on that page; pseudonyms used on the Internet are listed at the end with incomplete name sources.

- A** Abdallah, G. 119
Adams, M. 301
Adams, P. 47
Alexander, G. 274, 357
Alison, B. 428
Alister, P. 86
Allen, P. 135, 154, 170, 174, 178, 179, 185, 385, 426, 482, 494, 630
Allen, W. 154
Allison, L. 64
Alpers, P. 536, 538
Altmann, C. 36, 39
Anderson, T. 83, 86
Andrews, J. 277, 365, 387
Andurrahman Wahid. 26
Anthony, C. 600
Antinozzi, G. 379
Amiel, HF. 3
Aplin, W. 638
Aristotle. 3
Armstrong, D. 147
Arnold, L. 71
Ashby, N. 14
Assange, J. *xix*, 136
Atkins, K. 206, 247, 451
Atkins, R. 247, 248, 276, 451, 457
Atlee, C. 72
Avery, J. *passim*
Axelrod, A. 379
- B** Bacon, J. 570
Bacon, R. 3, 9, 40
Bain, D. 604
Bailey, S. 307
Bainbridge, A. 89
Baker, M. 385, 494, 637
Balasko, J. *xxxv*, 240, 290, 315, 351, 385, 387, 425, 442, 488, 494, 618,
Ball, G. 386, 389, 494 621
Barclay, Gov. 54
Barling, D. 501
Barnes, G. *xxxii*, *xlvi*, *lxiv*, 610
Barnett, G. *xxxvii*, 386, 494
Barry-Walsh, J. 509
Barton, A. 76
Bassi, R. *xii*, 42, 103, 106
Baxter, D. *xii*, 251, 489
Beadell, L. 65
Beard, M. *xxxii*, *xliv*
Beattie, SK. *passim*
Beavis, L. 161, 247, 277, 365, 387, 389, 399, 494

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- Beazley, K. 142
Beekman, M. 209, 248, 352, 388, 389, 433, 448, 494
Begg, Moazzam. 11
Begley, S. 492
Bellotti, R. 127
Ben-Menashe, A. 36, 102, 476 (see Vialls, J.)
Bennett, B. 180, 181, 191, 477, 479
Bennett, W. 638
Bentham, J. 599
Berkovic, N. 151
Besters, A. 487
Bias or Priene in Ionia. 3, 647
Bingham, M. xxxix, 37, 174, 182-184, 192, 274, 307, 359, 361, 507
Birmistriw, P. 83
Bittner, B. 442
Bittner, M. 442
Blainey, G. 87
Blair, Tim. 101
Blair, Tony. (war criminal). 26
Blake, S. xlvii, lxiv
Blake, V. 501
Bliss, D. 288
Bloomfield, A. 404
Bolt, S. 338, 487
Bonde, Sgt. 579
Bonney, Cherri. xi, xxiii, xliiv
Borchard, E. 384
Boskovic, C. 345
Boskovic, J. 345
Bosworth, T. 77
Bowles, R. 11
Boyce, J. b
Brain, Dr. 91, 98, 100
Branch, J. 174
Breen, P. 11
Brennan, TC. 60
Briggs, M. 159
Briscoe, K. 123-126
Brooks, A. 387
Broom, G. 388, 494
Broom, M. 388
Brophy, Ilaria. xxiii
Browne, R. 19, 34, 145, 147, 355, 541, 566, 620
Browning, H. 366, 367, 386, 389, 429, 494
Bryant (née Cordwell), C. *passim*
Bryant, L. xxviii, 286, 287, 598
Bryant, Mar. *passim* (see *SUBJECT INDEX*; animals, Martin Bryant's....)
Bryant, Mau. xxviii, 406, 518, 537
Buckley, D. *passim*
Buckley, T. *passim*
Bugg, D. *passim*
Bull, T. xlix
Burch, N. 501
Burgess, N. 160, 162, 638
Burgess, S. 158
Burke, S. lx, lxiv
Bush, GW. (war criminal). 26, 71, 513
Butement, AS. 75
Byrne, J. 268, 278
- C** Cameron, R. 86
Campbell, G. 501
Cantor, C. 536, 538
Cardwell, A. 614
Carmichael, S. 165

Carr, B. 613
Carter, Ale. 83, 85
Carter, Ann. 394, 494
Caulfield, C. 247, 277, 387
Caulfield, P. 174, 185
Chamberlain. L. a, xxxix, 201
Chan, T. 394, 399, 431, 494
Chapman, S. 269, 336, 337
Charlton, R. *lxvi*, 301, 303
Cheok, F. 159, 393, 395, 462, 472, 494, 553, 554, 560
Cheok, N. 159, 393, 396, 462, 472, 494, 553, 554, 560
Chie, D. 352
Chin, A. 398, 494
Chisum, W. 297, 342
Chitts, H. *xii*, 42, 49, 77
Chossudovsky, M. 698
Chung, S. 510, 638
Churchill, W. 72
Clayton, S. 416
Clements, C. 108, 112, 115
Clinton, W. 18, 620, 624
Coates, D. *b*
Cochran, J. 376
Cole, Dr. 57
Cole, J. 394, 399, 431, 494
Collier, F. 399, 400, 494
Collier, V. 400
Collyer, G. *xxvi*, 16, 161, 206, 207, 208, 236, 290, 298, 300, 400, 443,
Conrad, C. 616 494, 605
Conte, L. 33
Cook, B. 163, 401, 464, 494
Coombs, C. 165, 181, 182, 570, 573
Cooper, P. *xxxvii*, 163, 401-404, 468, 494
Cooper, R. 140, 164, 177, 242, 311, 405, 494
Copping, M. 215, 231, 406, 446, 448, 469, 494
Cordwell, M. 407-409, 494
Costa, A. 122
Coulthart, R. *xii*, 42, 48, 63
Cox, A. 76
Cox, W. *passim*
Craig, M. 154, 172, 173, 239, 364, 385, 409, 410, 432, 494, 637
Cranwell, W. 410, 494
Craven, T. 509, 518, 633
Creamer, M. 146
Croger/Kroger, R. 163
Cromer, D. 411, 494
Cross, R. 68
Crosswell, P. 328, 411, 494
Crowley, G. 604, 631
Cunningham-Dax, E. 509, 517, 538, 633
Curti, R. 121, 122, 129, 501

D Darby, A. 606
Dasey, D. 616
Davies, B. 207
Davies, J-A. 205, 216, 233
Daviess, BG. 411, 413, 494
Daviess, BJ. 412, 413, 445, 494
Dawtreay, Z. *lxiv*, 591-593, 595-598
Day, B. 317, 585, 604
De Menezes, C. 122
Dermody, K. 142
Dershowitz, A. 616
Diamantis, S. 350, 433, 434, 494
Dickinson, J. 328
Dillingham, C. 98

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Dillon, C. 110, 111
Di Monde, R. 91, 92
Dixon, P. 8, 288
Doomadgee, C. (see Mulrunji)
Dotcom, Kim. 136
Douglas, A. 637
Dowling, J. 342
Dowling, S. 617
Doyle, M. 570, 572, 574, 575, 578
Drysdale, B. 14, 30
Dunn, R. 86
Dutton, G. *passim*
Dutton, JD. 345, 346, 347, 356, 414, 469, 494
Dutton, JH. 346, 347, 414, 494
Dylan, B. 219
Dyson, M. *passim*

E Easton, G. 135, 268, 269, 272, 273, 279, 282, 306, 418-420
Eastwood, G. 422
Edward, J. 392, 424, 495
Edward, K. 386, 392
Edwards, B. *lxiii*
Edwards, C. 207, 425, 495
Edwards, R. 425, 495
Eisen, J. 43, 480, 606
Eldridge, B. 88, 90
Eliot, G. 3
Ellen, W. 175, 189, 534
Elliott, R. 161, 318
Ellis, T. *b*, 505
Emery, F. 227, 633
Enever, P. 261
Evans, T. 225

F Fackler, M. 297
Farquharson, J. 312
Favell, W. 83, 85
Featherston, J. 428
Featherstone, G. 29, 33, 34
Fenton, WL. 54, 59
Fielding, B. 97, 191, 192, 228, 263, 267, 270, 277-279, 282, 479, 506, 507,
Finnigan, E. 10, 593 532
Fischer, T. 17
Fisher, BAJ. 45, 342
Fitzgerald, T. 110, 111, 585
Fleming, J. 268, 277, 279
Fletcher, Y. 630
Floyd, C. 64
Fogarty, A. 97, 154, 228, 259, 366, 426, 432, 456, 495
Fogarty, M. 87, 98, 150, 259, 282
Fox, K. 357
Francis, G. 426, 495
Francis, J. 427, 495
Francis, Pope. *ix*
Franklin, B. *xxi*, 9
Frankum, W. 339, 536, 615
Fraser, M. 83, 85
Freeman, J. 289, 481
Frow, J. 225

G Gabbedy, D. 161
Galeano, A/T. 115
Gallant, P. 43, 480, 606
Garth, R. 174
Gaylard, E. 638

Geberth, WJ. 45, 379, 383
Georgatos, G. *xii*, *xxv*, 103, 127, 129
Ghedini, M. 411
Gibbon, R. 51
Gibson, S. 427, 495
Giffard, J. 174, 175
Gilewicz, J. 87-92, 94-98, 100-102, 119, 150, 259, 282, 489, 591
Gillard, J. 142
Gilovich, T. 10, 309
Glatezer, S. 606
Glare, K. 120
Goble, Rev. 54
Godfrey, Dr. 54, 57
Godfrey, J. 209, 280, 347, 427, 474, 495
Goethe. 101, 132, 545
Gollan, E. 96
Goninon, S. 228, 428, 434, 495
Goodluck, B. 570
Goodman-Delahunty, J. 151
Goodwin, L.-A. 428, 495
Goodwin, V. *xxxii*
Grabowsky, PN. 68, 73
Grant, S. *xxxix*
Gray, D. 536
Gray, R. 615
Greeley. *xi*, *xliv*
Green, A. 501
Green, M. 621
Grenfell, Pau. 345
Grenfell, Pet. 345
Griffiths, T. 86
Griffits, P. 518
Groom, R. 8, 155, 246, 279, 315, 489, 564, 566, 569, 570, 621
Gross, H. 379
Gunn, D, *xxxiii*, 269, 334, 335, 367, 429, 495, 621
Gunn, S. 334, 335
Gunson, D. 21, 146, 212, 237, 262, 287, 300, 351, 352, 480, 511, 609,
Gyselman, R. 92, 94 612

H Hall, H. 505
Hall, Z. *xxxviii*, 149, 260, 261, 443, 511, 624, 638
Hallinan, J. 96
Hamann, R. 80
Hammond, C. 429, 495
Harwood, C. 429, 495
Hamilton, J. 193
Hamilton, T. 536
Hamish. 122
Hammond, C. 220, 435
Hanusz(c)ewicz, S. 50, 87, 89, 92, 94, 95
Harthill, ?. 423
Harwood, C. 429, 430, 433
Harvey, H. 311, 407, 513, 519, 527
Harwood, C. 96, 278, 283, 366, 389, 430, 434
Hateley, G. 117, 118
Hawke, E. 607
Hawkins, P. 386, 470
Hayes, L. 269
Hayes, M. 366
Hazelwood, P. 272
Head, M. 85
Hedges, C. 43
Hesman, P. 331, 416, 417, 430, 436, 481, 495, 604
Hewart, G. *xvi*, *xlili*, 203
Hewson, J. 142
Hewson, L. 151

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Hickey, T.J. 105, 106, 129
Hicks, N. 141
Hill, P.J. 661
Hill, T. *xxxvii*, *lxvi*, 31, 32, 34, 204, 217, 237, 254, 312, 319, 338, 379, 523
Hills, B. 531
Hillman, A. 144
Hinch, D. *xxxix*
Hine, B. 112
Hine, D. *b*, *c*, *d*, *v*
Hitler, A. 587
Hoani, Ms. 530
Hodge, B. 58
Holden, B. 307
Holland, L. 604, 631
Hoon, G. 70
Hope, A. *xii*, 103, 113
Horn, A. 125
Horne, D. 386, 430, 495
Horrocks, L. 394, 431, 495
Horsborough, S. 446
Howard, E. 160, 162, 638
Howard, F. 426
Howard, J. *passim*
Howard, Mar. 638
Howard, Mer. 638
Howard, S. *xxxi*, *xxxviii*, 160, 215, 251, 252, 266, 431, 440, 476, 495
Hull, K. 141
Hurley, C. *xxx*, 107-112
Huxley, A. 383
Hyland, P. *passim*

I Iles, C. *xxxviii*, 136, 185, 245, 363, 439-441, 635, 636
Ingram, P. 225

J Jackson, J. 51
James, T. 96, 278, 430, 432, 495
James, W. 3, 9
Jamie(s). *passim*
Jarvis, R. 93, 95, 441
Jarvis, T. 280, 467
Jary, R. 638
Joan of Arc. 3
Joblin, I. *xxviii*, 354, 509, 516, 517, 522, 531, 625, 633
Johnson, B. 3
Johnson, L. *xiv*
Johnson, R. 127
Johnson, S. 23, 202, 221, 380, 423, 502, 597
Johnson, T. 52
Johnston, J. 32, 270, 415, 450, 637
Johnstone, ? 96
Johnstone, B. 111
Jones, Char. 567
Jones, Chris. 647
Jones, I. 227, 633
Jones, L. 338, 484
Jones, R. 125
Jones, W. 32
Jones, ?. 445
Joyce, B. 145
Julius Caesar. 3
Juvenal. 3

K Kaminski, J. 585
Karam, J. 604
Kateros, Y. 207, 209, 386, 432, 485, 495

Keane, J. *xii*, 42, 65, 67
Keating, P. 23, 147
Keenan, M. *lxiii*
Kelly, D. 47, 70
Kelly, N. 267, 278
Kelsall, G. 301
Kennan, J. 615
Kennedy, H. 268
Kennedy, JF. 7, 371, 539
Kent, W. 58
Kerr, D. 620
Kessarios, A. 220, 433, 434, 495
Keygan, ?. 33, 323, 324, 361
Kierath, AJ. *xliv*
King, GJ. 20, 150, 220, 264, 434, 495
King, ML. *xix*, 204, 284, 644
Kingston, A. 245, 386, 390, 403, 404, 435, 437, 440, 459, 495, 604
Kingston, I. 20, 159, 314, 350, 401, 403, 404, 438, 443, 458, 469, 495, 542
Kissinger, H (war criminal). 614
Kistan, T. 247, 277, 638
Klugman, C. *a*
Knight, J. 150, 536, 537, 615
Koch, T. 112
Kollerstrom, N. 26
Kroger/Croger, R. 163
Kruger, D. 502
Kuipers (family). 526
Kurland, M. 380
Kyle, C. 26

L Lagrange, L. 113
Lambie, Jacqui. *xxiii*, *xlv*
Lão-Tzu. 4
Larner, R. 219, 264, 314, 347, 431, 438, 488, 495, 514
Latham, J. 145
Laudisio, J. 121
Laughton, C. 161
Laughton, S. 161, 638
Law, A. 321, 414, 440, 446, 468, 474, 495
Law, P. 325, 328, 411
Laxton, H. 242, 297, 311
Laycock, J. *xi*, *xliv*, 149, 207, 209, 227, 236, 246, 290, 298, 300, 375, 386,
Lazarowitz, S. 43 427, 441, 443, 472, 485, 495, 511
Lean, S. *xix*, 604, 616
Lee, J. 58
Lee, HC. 45
Le Grand, C. 351
Lennox, G. 344
Lever, C. 443, 495
Lever, D. 638
Levy, J. 219
Lewandowsky, S. 492
Lieberman, S. 182, 270, 274
Linnell, G. 517, 520
Linnell, S. 14
Livesey, M. 227
Loftus, E. 224, 380
Lopes, W. 509, 512, 515-517, 633
Loughton, C. 443, 495
Love, B. 520
Lucas, B. 509, 516
Ludeke, M. 285
Lynd, G. 157, 248, 276, 300, 443, 445-445, 495, 525
Lyons, P. 314
Lyons, T. 301

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

- M** MacColl, E. *xi*
MacDougall, W. 76
MacFarlane, B. 11
MacGregor, AS. *passim*
MacLeod, I. 315
Maguire, D. 263
Maguire, P. 32
Mahoney, D. 101, 103
Major, J. 76, 445
Maloney, J. 207, 495
Mann, F. 62
Manning, B. *xix*, 136
Manning, C. *xix*
Manning, K. 77
Manning, W. 597
Marie Madeleine de la Fayette. 4
Mark, R. 85
Marrett, D. *xii*, 103, 120
Marsden, J. 114
Marshall, E. 445, 496
Marshall, R. 620
Martin, D. *passim*
Martin, G. 336
Martin, R. 355, 513
Martin, S. *passim*
Mason, J. 446, 496, 621
Masters, P. 638
Mather, B. 517, 518, 538, 633
Matterson, I. *passim*
Matthews, R. 615
Maxwell, J. 443
Maxwell, M. *xliv*, 661
May, R. 7
Mazengarb, M. 570
McAlpine, P. 569
McCall, M. 88, 90, 91, 100
McCarthy, T. *passim*
McCartney, P. 517, 538
McCreadie, R. *xv*, *passim*
McClelland, J. 72
McCulloch, J. 104, 119
McCutcheon, D. 150, 334, 335, 448, 453, 496
McDonald, N. *iv-vi*, 37, 216, 217, 218, 237, 239
McDonnell, B. 124
McElwee, I. 382, 448, 496, 542
McFarlane, Kyla. *xlvi*
McGregor, D. 37
McGuire, A. 111
McGuran, P. 74
McKenna, M. *xii*, 103, 118
McKenna, R. 19, 21, 153, 206, 209, 245, 248, 350, 352, 382, 449, 452,
McKenzie, A. 419 469, 483, 485, 496
McLachlan, D. *xliv*, 661
McLaren, C. *b*
McLoughlin, V. 165
McNamara, J. 93
McNamara, R. 63
McNiven, I. 17, 216, 241, 250, 353
Mele, N. 301
Melton, M. 43
Menaull, S (*Paddy*). 75
Mencken, HL. 44, 45
Menzies, R. 48, 64, 66, 68, 72
Mikac, A. 165, 356, 357, 391, 403, 436, 498, 541, 546, 638
Mikac, M. 165, 356, 357, 391, 403, 436, 498, 546, 638

Mikac, N. 159, 165, 356, 357, 391, 403, 436, 498, 546, 638
Mikac, W. 37, 38, 165, 404, 541
Miller, MT. 45
Mills, A. 247, 277, 622, 639
Milne, B. 380, 586
Moles, R. xxxvii, xlv, 342, 604, 616
Molomby, T. 85
Montgomery, B. 180, 469, 624
Mooney, L. 70
Moore, M. 28, 242, 615
Moors, J. 452, 496, 641
Morgan, K. xii, 42, 51, 53, 61
Morgan, P. 344, 357
Morgan, R. 55
Moroney, K. 141, 261, 352
Morri, M. xii, 103, 122
Morrison, J. 366
Morton-Thomas, P. xii, 103, 123, 126
Mott, L. 7
Moylan, K. b
Moynihan, M. 110, 112
Mullen, P. 37, 286, 508-510, 515-531, 535-538, 627, 633
Mulrunji. xxx, 107-112, 127, 129
Mundine, A. 128
Mundine, M. 129
Munro, I. 357
Murdoch, B. 99, 309
Murdoch, J. 60
Murdoch, R. 589
Murray, E. 103
Myers, G. 409
Myles, C. 117

- N** Nash, C. 563
Nash, P. 563, 639
Naylor, LA. 11, 604, 617
Neander, G. 639
Neander, R. 452, 496
Neil, M. 316
Neill-Fraser, S. a, b, 505
Newburn, T. 45, 380
Newitt, K. 496
Ng, W. 5, 352, 504, 510, 639
Nichols, J. 347, 453, 496
Nietzsche. 35, 587
Nightingale, A. 18, 43, 247, 250, 277, 312, 405, 411, 561, 622, 639
Nixon, MR. xxxviii, 159, 222, 260, 364, 382, 386, 391, 396, 453-456, 461, 534, 551, 552-554, 556(?), 559, 639, 642
Nixon, R. 454
Nixon, S. 222, 453-457, 459, 496, 534, 551, 552, 557, 559, 562
Noble, J. 136, 207, 247, 316, 405, 457, 458, 475, 496, 641
Noble, KA. *passim*
- O** O'Brien, A. 344
O'Brien, Dr. 52
O'Brien, G. 289
O'Brien, K. 251, 255, 266, 637, 640
O'Brien, M. 604
O'Brien, P. 317
O'Connell, J. 381
O'Farrell, M. 603
Ofshe, R. 225
Ogle, R. 343
O'Gorman, T. 117
O'Hara, C. 343
Olsen, D. 160, 277, 325, 328, 341, 344, 345, 489

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Olsen, M. 458, 496
Opas, P. 58
O’Gorman, T. 117
Osborn, M. 169
Osterburg, J. 298
Oswald, LH. 372
Ottavi, Nicki. *a*, xviii
Overbeeke, B. *passim*
Overbeeke, H. 135, 247, 285, 452, 458, 476, 496, 641
Overbeeke, W. 135, 234, 452, 458, 462, 467, 489, 562, 640

- P** Paine/Payne, R. 31, 32, 193, 216-218, 254, 310, 312, 333, 336, 338, 352,
Palmbach, T. 45 420, 506
Palmer, J. 256, 257
Parker, C. 318, 382, 459, 475, 496, 510
Parker, G. 633
Parker, P. 569
Parkinson, A. 74
Parry, S. *a*, xiv, xxvii, xxxiv, xxxvi, xlii, 303, 567
Patterson, B. 96
Paul, J. 276
Paul, N. 96
Pearce, C. 206
Pearce, K. 459, 496
Pears, G. *passim*
Pender, J. *xlv*
Penn, W. 4
Penney, W. 75
Penno, C. 30
Perera, J. 79
Perks, N. 24, 154, 169, 170, 172, 179, 305, 322, 329, 339, 422
Peters, R. 618, 620
Petrov, S. 502
Pike, D. xxix, 275
Pitt, T. xii, xxxviii, 2, 19, 21, 27
Pollard, RJ/J. xxxviii, 159, 260, 261, 639, 641
Polya, G. 44
Popa, M. 456, 459, 496
Porter, C. *v*, xxiii, xlii
Potter, S. 307
Pratt, K. 118
Price, B. 118
Priest, T. 88
Prins, L. 97, 144, 150, 175, 179, 248, 276, 348, 357
Pritchard, R. 459, 496
Prout, C. 159, 391, 404, 459, 460, 485, 496
Prudentius. 4
- Q** Quin, J. 639
Quin, N. 34, 314, 460, 496
Quinn, M. 94, 426
- R** Rabe, D. xxxviii, 159, 391, 397, 443, 456, 459, 461, 462, 472, 473, 476,
Rae, M. 608 485, 496, 555, 560, 562
Raeburn, N. 620
Raedler, J. 274
Ramage, G. xxx, li
Ranger, C. 412
Ransley, J. 617
Raz, J. 111, 644
Redmond, M. 317
Renée de France. 4
Rich, A. 5
Richards, F. 463, 496
Richards, L. 464, 496

Rigby, D. xxxiii, 146, 288, 605
Riviere, J. 318, 464, 496
Roach, S. 328
Roberts, P. 465, 496
Roberts, R. 465, 496
Robertson, G. 617
Robinson, J. 359
Robson, F. 312
Roganovic, D. 466, 496
Roganovic, M. 466, 496
Rooke, J. xxxvii, 149, 466, 467, 496
Roosvelt, F. 298
Ross, CC. 51-62
Rubuntja/Russell, K. 115
Ruddock, P. 146
Rummel, RJ. 44, 698
Rundle, T. 155, 216, 570
Rushton, Dr. 538, 633
Russell, F. 416, 417, 419
Ryan, Mat. 53
Ryan, Mic (AU). 505
Ryan, Mic (UK). 536
Ryan, RJ. 58

S Sale, I. 8, 180, 189, 305, 322, 333, 372, 420, 505-514, 538, 569, 633
Salzmann, H. *passim*
Salzmann, R. *passim*
Sarat, A. 44
Sargent, M. 317, 352, 353, 467, 496
Sarre, R. xxxiii
Savage, S. 380, 586
Saville, B. 508-510, 512, 529
Schadendorff, M. 318
Schulze, T. xii, 140, 153, 371, 504, 539, 608
Schumacher, B. 621
Schweitzer, A. 4
Scott, KE. 217, 236, 288, 289, 481, 510, 604, 605, 639
Scott, Mal. 279, 365, 386, 470
Scott, Mar. 37
Scott, W. 29
Scully, O. 25, 152, 267
Scurr, G. 165, 578, 599
Scurr, W. *i (IN MEMORIAM), xi (speaking), passim*
Sekar, S. 617
Selsor, M. 586
Semmens, A. 100
Serong, T. a, xxxvi, lxvi, 290, 312, 313
Sharp, K. 471, 639
Sharp, Mar. 471, 497
Sharp, Mic. 637
Sharp, R. 471, 639, 642
Shelly, P. 58
Sherrer, H. 586
Shilkin, H. 471, 497
Shilkin, N. 472, 497
Simmons, A. 150, 334, 335, 453, 472, 497
Simmons, L. 150
Simpson, L. 37
Sinclair, GI. 30, 32, 34
Sinnamon, J. xxxiv, 9, 298, 490
Sloan, T. 351, 425, 472, 497
Smallwood, G. 109
Smith, All. 173, 235, 637
Smith, Ann. xlvi
Smith, B. 502, 503
Smith, C. 246, 586

OFFICIAL TERROR
in Tasmania, Australia

Snowden, E. *xix*, 136
Söderman, H. 381
Solomon, S. 394
Soros, G. 614, 620, 637
Speed, T. 58
Spinney, L. 224
Spruce, K. 149, 424, 461, 462, 472, 473, 497
Stafford, G. 604, 631
Stainthorpe, P. 163, 473, 497
Stana, R. 93
Standen, D. 321, 361, 367
Standish, F. 267
Stanfield, L. 81
Stanton, EC. 4
Staples, J. 96
Steele, C. 82
Steele, T. 118
Stevenson, C. 11
Stevenson, R. 486
Stone, I. 352
Stride, P. 154
Stubbins, D. 501
Stubbins, N. 501
Stump, G. 570
Sullivan, C. 394, 474, 497
Sutherlands (?). 409

T Tacitus. 24
Tapp, P. 42, 50, 87, 89, 91, 150, 282
Tarpley, WG. 250, 461
Tattersalls. 6
Taylor, JF. 190, 332
Taylor, JP. 62
Tedder, A. 48
Tennent, S. *xxix*, *xxxiii*, 275
Terence. 330, 588
Tertullian. 4, 137
Thompson, R. 163, 639
Tippet, G. 357
Tierney, J. 189, 305, 420, 506, 507, 513, 516
Tilyard, C. 289
Tirtschke, A. 60, 61
Titterman, M. 432
Tonna, CE. 4
Toohey, P. *xii*, 103, 122
Totaro, P. *xxxix*, 36, 39, 233
Trestrail, J. 343
Triffett, C. 474, 497
Turner, ? video. 315, 348
Turse, N. 48
Turvey, B. 297, 342

U Unsworth, B. 17, 19, 567, 613
Urban, AL. 697
Uttley, S. 577

V Vallance, P. 475, 497
Vance, LT. 23, 202, 221, 380, 423, 502, 597
Vandepeer. 314, 475, 497
Vials, J. 36, 38, 102, 135, 141, 258, 316, 330, 458, 476, 497, 630,
641 (see Ben-Menashe, A.)
Villiers, C. 476, 497
Vitkovic, F. 150, 536, 537, 615
Voltaire. 4

- W** Wagner, WR. 487
Wainwright, R. xxxix, 36, 39, 233
Walker, J. 147
Walker, P. 58
Walker, S. xxxix, 47, 249, 608, 615
Walker, The. 325, 328
Walker, Tho. 411
Wallace, W. 298
Walpole, B. 622
Wanders, M. 209, 476, 482, 497
Ward, I. 113
Ward, R. 298
Wardle, A. 477, 497
Warren, J. 193, 216-218, 220, 229-231, 310, 312, 338, 471, 477, 497, 565
Weathered, L. 697
Webber, F. 11
Weber, S. 501
Weisbrot, D. xvii, xxxiii, xlv
Wernerhoff, C. xii, 46, 205, 303, 354, 643
Wevers, L. xlv
White, Je. ix, xvii, xxxiii, 697
White, Jo. 89
White, L. 149, 169, 209, 313, 380, 482, 497
Whitlam, G. 279, 615, 621
Whittle, G. 135, 136, 151, 169, 170, 173, 178, 245, 375, 409, 431, 482, 497
Whitton, E. 60, 217, 594, 604, 617, 697
Wilkinson, ? (Scottsdale TAS). 94
Wilkinson, K. (Port Arthur TAS). 315, 425, 618
Wilkinson, S. xxxviii, 159, 328
Will, G. 18
Willesee, M. xxxix
Williams, Car. 149
Williams, Col. 443, 476, 483, 484, 485, 497
Williams, D. 142, 146
Williams, H. 274
Williams, I. 443, 444, 476, 484, 485, 497
Williams, J. 77
Williams, She. 485, 497, 621
Williams, Sim. 170, 486, 497
Williams, Sus. 621
Williamson, T. 45, 380
Willmott, P. *passim*
Wilson, J. 410
Wilson, P. 604, 631
Wilson, V. 136
Winder, C. 63
Winter, J. 639
Windsor, H. 26
Winnett, E. 353
Withnall, C. 98
Woffinden, B. 225
Wollaston, J. xii, 311
Wood, N. xxxix, xlv, 202, 284, 590, 608
Woodlands, D. 569
Woolley, C. 136
Woolley, G. 407
Wright, A. 45, 380
Wright, C. lvi, 15, 302
Wright, L. 225
York, C. 352
Zahorcak, C. 385, 442, 466, 497, 618 ■

INCOMPLETE NAME/NO NAME/PSEUDONYM/ETC.

Benny of Brisbane. *xxiii*, 7, 590
Cadstar, The. 585
ex-Police Officer. 99
eyewitness. 379, 484
Farmgirl of South Burnett. 201
flathead. 606
Freeman Opinion. 585
FreeMartinBryant. 201
GoCo77. 607
Jasher Team, The. *xii*, 97, 301
Julie. 429
Kathy of Victoria. 203, 586
Kita. 201
Mick of Perth. 201
Mick/Rick. passim
MM. *b*
ms of oz. 202
narcosynthesis. 607
Tiger. 239, 285, 308, 315, 372, 486, 489, 497, 627, 643
2010 Unlimited. 44
v of b. 202
VICTIM (unidentified). 643
Virginia. 429 ■

SUBJECT INDEX

- A** Abu Ghraib IRAQ. 644
accent, Australian. 443, 484
Accident Investigation Squad (AIS). 189
Adelaide Institute. 297
Administrative Appeals Tribunal. *a*, *xiv*
Advance Australia Fair. *xxiii*, 648
Advance Obituary. vi, viii, xvii, xxiii, xxiv-xliv
agent orange. 48, 77-82
A Gunsmith's Notebook on Port Arthur. passim
alcohol. 524
alibi. 20, 150, 218, 335
Alice Springs NT. 124
ambulance/Ambulance, St. John. 16, 157, 164, 325, 344, 470, 478, 566,
Americans, war monger. 26, 48, 49, 63, 64, 643 634
American tourists, North. 18, 144, 276, 624
ammunition/ammo. 194, 202, 259, 269, 305, 306, 324, 329-341, 344,
345, 358, 360, 366, 369, 421-423, 429, 487, 540 (see hot-round[s])
Ananda Marga. 49, 83, 86
animals, Martin Bryant's concern for. 20, 488
Apocalypse Now. 487
Aramoana incident/massacre NZ. 37, 282, 536, 633 (see Christchurch NZ)
arson, official. 96, 192, 228, 274, 278, 280, 389, 470, 539, 543
Arthur Highway. 139, 172, 301, 341, 407, 425, 471, 472, 476, 482, 488,
ARTICLES & INSERTS. 669 545
Asian Human Rights Commission. 585
Asperger/Asperger's syndrome. 316, 509
assets plundered by State, Martin Bryant's. *xxii*, 284, 292, 605
Association, Fully Informed Jury (FIJA). 616
Association of Firearm and Toolmark Examiners. 353
audio tape, missing emergency phone. 632
Australian and New Zealand Forensic Science Society. 216, 353
Australian Automatic Arms (AAA). 305, 310, 333, 361, 422
Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). *passim* (see Four Corners)
Australian Bureau of Criminal Intelligence (ABCI). 637
Australian Council of Civil Liberties. 117
Australian Defence Force (ADF). *a*, *xliv*, 85
Australian Federal Police (AFP; Commonwealth Police until 1979). 83

Australian Firearms Buyback, The. 147
Australian Funeral Directors Association (AFDA). *lxv*, 303, 567
Australian Human Rights Commission, *xl*, *lvii*, *lviii*
Australian Journalists Association. *lxi*
Australian Labor Party. 89, 142, 147, 620
Australian Medical Association (AMA). *xli*, *lviii*, 505, 622
Australian Police Ministers Conference (APMC). 147
Australian Press Council. *xl*, *xli*, *xliv*, *xlvi*, *lix*, *lxi*, 202
Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency. 74
Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO). *passim*
Australian Security Intelligence Service (ASIS). 37, 311, 316
AUTHOR ARTICLES & INSERTS. 665
AUTHORS. *xvi*
Avis (see Commodore, red) 389, 392, 546-548, 562

B Bagram AFGHANISTAN. 644

Bali bombing. 26
Ballarat VIC. *iv*, 394, 399
barbecue, police. 16, 176, 413, 441, 450, 458
best of British justice, the deception. *xix*, 11, 604
beyond reasonable doubt. *xxiii*, *xxxvii*, *xlix*, 600
BIBLIOGRAPHY. 658
Bilambil Heights NSW. 453, 455, 552
black van. 20, 43, 221, 303, 348, 349, 405, 441, 632
blankets. 161, 164
blog/blogger. 28, 43, 251, 298, 600, 604, 607, 615, 664, 668
BMW (motor vehicle) sedan, gold-coloured. *passim*
books, port Arthur incident. 35-39
boots, Blundstone-type. 90, 388, 462
boots, lace. 388, 433
boycott. 44, 649
Brandon QLD. 115
British Criminal Case Review Commission. 11
Broad Arrow Café. *passim*
Brook Islands QLD. 78
Brunswick Heads NSW. 391, 552, 560, 641
Bundeena, M.V. 144, 157, 248, 276, 427, 547, 622 (see Marana)
Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI), NSW. 135
burns/burnt, Martin Bryant. *passim*

C Cable Network News (CNN). 274, 620, 622

cairnsnews.org. *xxxix*, *xliv*
cannabis/marijuana, 153, 300, 433, 444, 447, 488, 525
Central Intelligence Agency US (CIA). *xvii*, *xxxvi*, 618, 620, 621, 630
Centre for Journalism Ethics. 1
chain of custody/evidence/possession. 297, 300, 321, 342
Channel 7. *xxxix*, *xliv*, 117
Channel 9. 25, 82, 96, 136, 143, 145, 183, 221, 241, 268, 269, 313, 337, 353, 356, 502, 614
Chemical Industries Kwinana. 82
Children Overboard Affair. 145, 352
Christchurch NZ. *iv*, *vi*, 37 (see RATA Counselling Christchurch NZ)
Christchurch incident/massacre NZ. *iv*, *vi* (see Aramoana.... NZ)
cigarette lighter. 433, 434, 444, 488
Citizens Commission on Human Rights International. 525, 526
Civil Liberties Australia. *a*
Clare Street, Hobart TAS, 30. 202, 269, 290, 292, 305, 310, 322, 333, 370, 409, 416-423, 488, 489, 506, 510, 511 (see assets plundered by State, Martin Bryant's)
Clougha building. 165, 168, 177, 428, 429, 451
Coalition for Gun Control. see National Coalition for Gun Control
Code Brown, hospital emergency plan. 19, 276, 566
Code of Silence. 94, 98 (see lie/lying, police)
Commissioner of Police (TAS). *passim* (see NAME INDEX; Hine, D)
comments/posts about Martin Bryant. *lii-lvi*
Commissioner of Police (VIC). 14, 30, 32, 34, 119, 120, 267

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Commodore, red. 389, 391-393, 404, 424, 437, 485, 489, 546-555, 558-562, 632 (see Avis)
Commonwealth Bank. 148, 247, 277, 387
Commonwealth Constitution Act 1901. 23
Commonwealth Heads of Government Regional Meeting. 83-86
Commonwealth Police. 85 (see AFP)
Commonwealth Serum Laboratories. 79
Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. 68
Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty Organization. 68
confabulate/confabulation. 227, 228
conspiracy theorist/theory. 10, 27, 46, 136, 258, 287, 290, 357, 591, 593,
Constitution, The. 142, 144, 480 620
Convention Against Torture & Other Cruel, Inhuman or.... xli, lxi
coronial inquest/inquiry, no. ix, 18, 21, 23, 28, 47, 49, 85, 97, 137, 156,
167, 201, 265, 572, 576, 578, 620
coronial post mortem. 103, 108
corrupt/corruption. *passim*
corruption, chain of. 6
CORRUPT TO THE CORE. 114, 118, 662
court, kangaroo. lxxv, lxxvi, 4, 21, 40, 58, 294, 343, 376, 586, 617, 654, 696
Court, Supreme of Tasmania. xxix, xxxi-xxxiii, xlii, 24, 166, 186, 200,
203, 217, 19, 236, 238, 241, 252, 262, 275, 281, 287, 314, 316,
336, 498, 518, 536, 538, 564, 566, 569, 578, 580
cover-up(s). 19, 155, 167, 216, 303, 352, 476, 532-534
Crabtree TAS. 551, 552
Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC). 110-112, 117
crime scenes. 137, 639, 448, 639, 647
Criminal Investigation Branch (CIB). 33, 323, 423
Cui bono. 27, 140, 651
Current Affair. 252, 268, 307, 348, 355, 372, 502, 513 (see Channel 9)

- D** Davies Brothers Limited. lxii, 647
Darra QLD. 78
Deadly Deception at Port Arthur. 476
deaths in custody (State killing). 107-113, 123-126
DECEIT AND TERRORISM - Port Arthur. *passim*
DEDICATION (Wendy Esme Scurr). i
DEFINITIONS. 650
demolition round(s). see hot-round(s)
demonize/vilify Martin Bryant. 202, 203, 206, 214, 231, 242, 256, 257,
271, 281, 307, 311, 447, 464, 481, 610, 695 (see image(s) of Martin
Bryant, manipulated eyes)
Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade (AUS). 594
Department of Justice (*sic*) TAS. lxiii
Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP). 153, 334, 335, 345, 356, 410,
415, 422, 431, 666, 667, 669, 670
DNA evidence, no. ix, 17, 25, 151, 152, 196, 211, 214, 215, 233, 290,
313, 316, 353, 355, 384, 543
D Notice. 142, 316 (see *OFFICIAL COVER-UP*)
Douglas LPT. 505
Dow Chemicals. 80
DRAWING BY MARTIN BRYANT. 696
drug(s). 136, 153, 169, 410, 444, 478, 488, 525
DU (depleted uranium). 81
Dunblane incident/massacre UK. 19, 47, 504, 536, 537, 577, 661
- E** embalming / embalming machine box. xxi, 303, 304, 356, 467, 489,
530, 567, 587, 623, 648
Emergency Management Australia (EMA). 170, 172, 178-181, 270, 276,
304, 341, 348, 418, 419, 567 (see Seminar Papers, Port Arthur)
Emu Field SA. 68, 73
ends & means. 6, 79, 85, 132
EPILOGUE. 647
EUREKA STOCKADE. ii, 587
evidence, ignored. *passim*

evidence missing. *ix*, 631-637, 640-643
evidence, police manipulate. 98, 479
exit door, emergency. 156, 162, 194, 243, 262, 371, 402, 563-565,
Expendable Project. 501 568-576, 578-581
explosions, three. 389, 429
explosives, alleged. 629, 630

F F88 rifle. *xlv*
fairdinkumradio.com. *xliv*
Fairfax Media. *xxxix*
FAKE TASMANIA POLICE STATEMENT. 415, 592, 635
false-flag. 22, 49, 132, 502, 544
Family Law Pathways. *ix*
FIND! FALCONIO. 91, 299, 662
fingerprint evidence, no. *ix*, 17, 20, 25, 152, 211, 215, 233, 281, 290,
297, 300, 313, 315, 316, 317-328, 355, 449, 469, 542, 543, 582
fire(s). *vi*, 8, 192, 426, 456, 457, 533
firearm ownership, no. *ix*, 5, 197, 254, 255, 310, 523
firearm(s). *passim* (see handgun)
firearm legislation. 22, 23
firearm licence. 254, 312, 523, 524
fire brigade/fighters. 391, 392, 532
Fitzgerald Inquiry. 107
footwear. 388 (see boots, Blundstone-type; boots, lace)
Forcett TAS. 20
forensic evidence, no. *ix*, 480
Fort Bragg FL. 627
Fortescue Bay TAS. 204, 222, 224, 227, 236, 489, 512, 542, 628, 634
Four Corners. 637, 640
Fox & Hounds Hotel/Inn TAS. 139, 169, 170, 172, 174, 192, 268, 406,
Frankfurt FRG. 627 407, 430, 471, 532
freestatevoice.com.au. *xii*, 2, 13
Freudian slip. 477
fuel (fire accelerant). 226, 228, 263, 354, 429, 434, 435, 488, 532, 622

G G8 Summit. 26
Gemini, green. 404
Genocide. 44
gentleman, Asian. 643
gentleman, elderly. 391, 437
gentleman, Taiwanese. 643
Glock (pistol). 595 (see handgun)
Goods & Services Tax (GST). 143, 146
Gorrill Team. 78
Granite Arms. 29, 30, 32, 33, 34
grave deceptions. *b*, *vi*
Greek extraction. 390, 391, 393, 494, 548-550
Greenpeace. 80
Griffiths and Jackson. 287, 518
Guantánamo Bay CUBA. 644
guardianship order. 146, 217, 287
gunman. *passim*
gunshot residue (GSR). 58
Gutteridge Haskins and Davey. 74

H *habeas corpus*. 11, 145
Hades/hell. 7
hair, long blond(e). *passim*
handcuffs. 90, 322, 338, 339, 340, 364, 369, 422, 423, 470, 479, 481,
487, 501, 633
handedness, shooting. 20, 149, 312, 318, 356, 470, 474, 482, 540
handgun. 192, 315, 389, 422, 423, 428, 432, 453, 633
Hawaiian holiday. 629, 630
helicopter(s). 19, 163, 175, 178, 182, 187, 221, 348, 429, 487, 599, 630
Helidon QLD. 78

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

Herald Sun. 446, 463, 518, 614
Hilton Hotel bombing, Sydney. 46, 49, 83-86
Hobart Community Legal Centre. 603
Hoddle Street, Melbourne VIC. 19, 150, 613, 615
homicide statistics. 633
hostage(s). 137, 172, 187, 188, 223, 222, 225, 243, 246, 260, 267, 281,
338, 339, 479, 501, 511, 533, 624
hot-round(s). 193, 197, 297, 375, 389, 540
HUMAN RIGHTS. 697
Hungerford UK. 536
Hurricane (song). 219

- I** image(s) of Martin Bryant, manipulated eyes. *vi, xxii, xlvi, 39, 202, 256,*
IMAGES & MAPS. 672 271, 307, 309, 590
identification, no. *ix, 209-210, 640, 641*
incident, Port Arthur. *passim*
Independent Media Council. *xl, lviii*
Information and Research Service (IRS). 618, 621
injustice. *passim*
Innisfail QLD. 77-80
innocence/innocent. *passim*
Innocence Project. 384, 628
inside job. 84, 151
intimidation, police. 31, 239, 312, 379
IQ of Martin Bryant, low. *passim*
Isle of the Dead TAS. 18, 144, 157, 248, 276
Ivy Tanks SA. 103
- J** Jacksons Locksmiths. 421
Japan. 628
Jetty Road. 356, 386, 389, 390, 391, 404, 489, 545, 555
Johns-Hopkins School/University. 620
jury, no. *ix, 62, 171, 498, 535, 545, 593, 640*
Justice/justice. *passim*
Justitia. xvii, 9, 198
- K** Kissinger-Rockefeller Consortium. 620
knife. 196, 197, 211, 214, 339
Korea, American-led war in. 79
- L** Lauderdale FL & TAS. 223, 224, 236
Law Society of Tasmania. *ix, 610, 611*
lawyer(s), failings of. *passim*
Lawyers Weekly. 607
Liberal Party. *xiv, 143, 147*
Libraries Tasmania. *xviii*
Lithgow NSW. 78
lone gunman/nut. iv, xlv
Lopes Centre, Wilfred. *xxx*
- M** Macquarie Island TAS. 622
Magna Carta. 4, 11, 602
"main man". 176, 186, 489, 629, 635
Major/Murder Incident Room (MIR). 416, 417, 419, 421, 423
Malayan/Malaysia/Malaysian. 510, 614
mannequin(s). 274, 642
Maralinga SA. 48, 65-76
Marana, M.V. 157 (see Bundeena)
Mason Cove TAS. 545
massacres in Australia. 130, 131
Mau Mau KENYA. 614
media, complicit mainstream. *passim*
media conference, mainstream Hobart. 17, 19
Media, Entertainment, and Arts Alliance. *lxi*
Media Watch. 254, 307, 309

- Melbourne VIC. *xvi*, 79, 503, 535-537, 627
Member of the Order of Australia (AM). *xlvi*, 581
memorial garden brochure. 460
memory manipulation. 224, 225, 227, 511, 512
Miles QLD. 78
miscarriage of justice. *passim*
mongrel, meaning of. *xxvii*
Monte Bello Islands WA. 48, 68, 72, 73
mortuary truck, 22-body refrigerated. *xxi*, *lxvi*, 14, 15, 16, 19, 247, 301-304, 311, 315, 356, 467, 487, 489, 540, 558, 567, 582, 587, 648
MORE MONGRELS. *xvii*
Moslem(s). *vi*, 26, 313, 619
MOSSAD/Mossad. *xxxvi*, 135, 248, 539
motive, no. *ix*, 259, 260, 526, 527
motto. *xxx*, *xl*, 7, 104, 112, 116, 405
MSM (mainstream media). *passim*
Murdoch Media. *xxxix*
must happen, this. 97, 609, 636
- N** naked woman with black hair. *xxi*, 17, 20, 315, 364, 382, 426, 431, 448, 455, 489, 624, 636
National Anti-Terrorist Plan (NATP). 279
National Coalition for Gun Control (NCGC). 145, 355, 356, 541, 566, 618
National Crisis Centre. 155
National Party. 141, 147
Nelson Brothers Funeral Services (VIC). *xiv*, *xxi*, *xxxvi*, *lxv*, 303, 315, 356, news.com.au. *xlvii* 567, 648
News Corporation Australia. *passim*
News Limited. *lxii*
newspaper, The Advertiser. *xlvii*, 202
newspaper, The Age. 202, 309, 614
newspaper, The Australian. *xxxix*, *xl*, *xlvi*, *xlvii*
newspaper, The Courier-Mail. *xlvii*, 202, 474
newspaper, The Daily Telegraph. *xlvii*, 202
newspaper, The Examiner. 354
newspaper, Herald Sun. *xlvii*, 202, 309
newspaper, The Mercury. *passim*
newspaper, New Zealand Herald. 317
newspaper, NT News (facebook). *xlvii*
newspaper, Sunday Tasmanian. *xlvii*
newspaper, Sunday Times. *xlvii*
newspaper, Sunshine Coast Daily. *xlvi*, 202
newspaper, The Sydney Morning Herald. 202, 312
newspaper, The West Australian. 202, 354
New World Order (NWO). 624
New Zealand/er(s). *iv*, *vi*, *xvii*, 11, 98, 159, 216, 282, 353, 389, 393, 424, 505, 547, 562, 614, 633, 697
night-vision device/scope. 21, 186, 221, 283, 429, 430, 483, 543, 633
Nike runner. 388, 433, 448, 462
Nine/9 Network. 25, 82, 96, 143, 145, 221, 241, 269, 313, 353, 356, 502
nine/eleven (9/11) incident. 313
nonfeasance. 376
No, no, not here! 18
not guilty. *xlx*, 212, 237, 252, 516, 528, 530, 609
- O** Ocean Shores NSW. 391, 552, 553, 560
OFFICIAL APPROVAL. *a*, *i*, *xiv*
OFFICIAL COVER-UP. *xviii* (see D Notice)
OFFICIAL KILLERS. *xvi*
OFFICIAL MONGRELS. *xvii*
OFFICIAL NARRATIVE. *xv*, *passim*
ONE FLEW OVER THE KOOKABURRA'S NEST, *b*
- P** Palm Island QLD. 107, 110
Parsonage building. 20
passport(s). 313, 372, 393, 416, 436, 481, 604, 619, 698

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- PATSY/patsy. *ix, xxii, 5, 22, 182, 199-294, 297, 300, 326, 372, 425, 428, 461, 511, 655, 695, 698*
- pellets, gunshot. see shotgun(s) / shotgun pellets
- Pelverata TAS. *87, 92, 96, 104, 150, 282*
- penis. *18, 51, 279, 532*
- Penong SA. *103*
- People for Coronial Inquiry Into Port Arthur Massacre. *13*
- perjury. *190, 320*
- Perpetual Trustees TAS. *518, 605*
- perthnow.com.au. *xlvii*
- pervert the course of justice. *passim*
- photoboard(s)/folder(s). *380, 398, 401, 411, 430, 438, 442, 443, 462-465,*
Pitjantjatjara people. *73 470, 475, 477, 484, 491*
- PLEASE NOTE. *xiii, xiv, 696*
- police acronym. *326*
- police corruption. *passim*
- Police Forward Commander (PFC). *181*
- Police Forward Command Post (PFCP). *175, 179, 181, 188, 272*
- police killing/violence. *passim*
- police lie/lying. *passim*
- Police Operations Centre (POC). *180*
- police records sealed 75 years. *a, b, c, d, xviii, 698*
- Police, News South Wales. *85, 128-129, 261-263, 352, 451, 458, 475, 501,*
Police, Northern Territory. *124 568*
- Police, Queensland. *xxx, 107-112, 115, 431*
- Police, South Australia. *412*
- Police, Tasmania. *passim*
- Police, Victoria. *14, 29-34, 119, 120, 150, 155, 179, 394, 431, 599*
- Police, Western Australia. *113, 127, 128*
- Port Arthur & Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS). *passim*
- Port Arthur Motor Inn TAS. *165, 168, 177, 391*
- Port Arthur Shooter, bearded. *467*
- Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). *146, 164, 168, 177, 405, 427,*
pray/PRAYER (Carleen Bryant). *vi, xliii 429, 566*
- PROLOGUE. *xix-xxii*
- Protective Security Co-ordination Centre (PSCC). *155, 180, 195, 279, 614*
- PROZAC. *339*
- psychiatric/psychiatrist(s)/psychiatry. *480, 505, 525, 614, 633*
- Psychiatry and Industry of Death Museum. *526*
- psycho-political event/exercise/massacre/terror. *c, 7, 9, 22, 28, 147,*
322, 329, 406, 471, 541, 567
- public inquiry, no. *ix*
- Q** Queen Street, Melbourne VIC. *19, 150, 613, 615*
question (noun & verb). *passim*
- R** radio device/transmission. *135, 183, 187, 278, 405, 461, 464, 475, 624*
rape. *xvii, 11, 33, 224*
RATA Counselling Christchurch NZ. *37* (see Aramoana.... NZ)
Reality Check News. *298*
re-enactments, no. *ix, 237, 411, 456, 605*
registration plate(s), Volvo ID. *313, 321, 340, 452, 484, 485, 488*
RendezView (Daily Telegraph). *xlvii, lxiv*
REQUEST DENIED. *b*
RESOURCES. *xliv*
Returned Services League (RSL). *80, 201*
Richie Allen Show. *xliv*
Richmond TAS. *455*
Ride of the Valkyries. 487
Risdon Prison TAS. *passim*
Roaring Beach TAS. *xxiii, 219, 245, 264, 299, 365, 389, 413, 425, 432,*
435, 439, 488
Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists. *505*
Royal Australian College of Surgeons. *17, 311*
Royal Australian Institute of Architects. *311*

Royal Commission. *b, iv, v, ix, xviii, xxvii, xxxv, xlii, 37, 91*
Royal Commission on Intelligence and Security (RCIS). *86*
Royal Hobart Hospital. *passim* (see mannequin[s])


- S** Standing Advisory Com for C'wealth-State Cooperation for the Protection Against Violence (SAC-PAV). *154, 155, 182, 272, 279, 567, 625*
Saltwater River TAS. *15, 151, 169, 363, 410, 478, 479*
Salvation Army. *569*
sarin gas. *48, 63, 64*
schizophrenia/schizophrenic. *517, 518, 538, 614*
scope/sight, infrared/laser/telescopic. *21, 186, 187, 283, 320, 321, 332, 359, 361, 367, 368, 429, 483, 629, 633*
Scottsdale TAS. *94, 98, 101*
Seascape cottage. *passim*
secrecy, official/State. *passim*
Security Amendment (Terrorism) Bill 2002. 142
seminar/Seminar. *17, 18, 19, 221, 274, 276, 297, 311, 353, 487, 540, 566, 582*
Seminar Papers, Port Arthur. *xiv, xv, xlii, lxv, 135, 139, 150, 170, 175, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 191, 267, 268, 270, 272, 273, 276, 289, 301, 303, 306, 337, 341, 344, 345, 347, 358, 525, 527, 565, 567, 589, 632* (see Emergency Management Australia EMA)
Senate of Australia. *a, i, iii, xiv, xxxiv, xlii, 142, 143, 145, 309*
senator. *xiv, xxiii, xxvii, xlii, xlv, 64, 107, 145*
set up, Martin Bryant. *passim*
Seven Thirty (7.30), ABC. *255, 266, 637*
Shell Store Forcett TAS. *434*
"shitloads of ammo". *242, 268, 269, 577* (see ammunition/ammo)
shop/store, Port Arthur. *170, 222, 260, 347, 363, 465, 473, 474, 511, 550*
shotgun(s) / shotgun pellets. *160, 263, 277, 315, 318, 321, 327, 328, 333, 340-345, 361, 362, 365-367, 372, 422, 458, 459, 472, 522-524, 528, 542, 634, 655*
show trial(s). *99*
Sims Metal Furnace. *627*
skynews.com.au. *xlvi*
Slater & Gordon. *148*
Smith & Wesson. *422, 423, 633*
Social Democracy Now. *202, 298*
Society of Evidence Based Policing (SEBP), Australia & New Zealand. *b*
soap powder (includes Rinso). *15, 136, 151, 169, 363, 431*
Special Air Service (SAS; military murderers). *83, 627*
Special Operations Group (SOG; *Sons of God*). *passim*
spook(s). *8, 247, 250, 276, 277, 387, 405, 461, 668*
sportsbag, second. *passim*
STANDARD GUIDELINES FOR CORRECTIONS IN AUSTRALIA. *xli, lxiii*
Stare Kiejkuty POLAND. *644*
State buggery. *581*
State Emergency Service (SES). *177, 180*
STATE INCITEMENT TO KILL. a, xxiii
State killing/terror. *25, 26, 43, 64, 112, 116, 193, 619, 623, 643, 648*
(see Abu Ghraib; Bagram; Guantánamo; Stare Kiejkuty)
Stateline, ABC. *506*
State Protection Group (SPG), NSW. *96*
STATUTORY DECLARATION EXTRACTS. 317-325, 327, 328
Strathfield Plaza. *339, 536*
sub judice. 306, 376, 414
Suddenly One Sunday. *514*
suicide. *91, 95, 120, 253, 257, 264, 311, 316, 526, 527, 530, 531, 533, 536, 537, 567, 582, 592, 615, 649*
Sunrise A.V. Productions. *502*
surfboard(s), no/yes. *346, 350, 364, 398-400, 402, 406, 410-412, 414, 425, 427, 431, 434, 438, 445, 448, 469, 542*
surgeon(s). *17, 18, 159, 277, 327, 328, 458, 634*
Swansea TAS. *15, 18, 19, 158, 164, 176, 405* (see seminar/Seminar)
swing bridge, Dunalley TAS. *15, 20, 136, 313, 478*
Switzerland. *391, 642*

OFFICIAL TERROR in Tasmania, Australia

- T** taser. 115-118, 121-122, 128
TASMANIAN DEVILS. *b*
Tasman Peninsula. 7, 8, 150, 151, 157, 169, 174, 176, 215, 219, 285, 375, 478, 510, 567
Tasmanian Bar. ix, 603, 610, 611
Tattersalls. 6, 292, 311, 518, 519
Tavistock Institute, UK. 227, 640
Terra Australis. 130, 644
terror/terrorism/terrorist. *passim*
THANK YOU. *xi*
THAT WOMAN: Lies, Damned Lies & Clintonisms. 18
three shots at Clougha. 16
TIME Australia. 401
timeline credible, no. ix
Tjarutja people. 65-67, 74, 75
Today. 269, 281
tollbooth/gate, PAHS. *passim*
tomato sauce. 300, 350, 413, 433, 434, 444, 474, 488, 489, 494
torture. ix, xvi, xl, xli, xlii, lvii, lviii, lxi, lxxv, 11, 25, 43, 62, 74, 100, 116, 127, 140, 227, 286, 292, 299, 316, 431, 582, 588, 592, 597, 614, 619, 623, 644
training video, Tasmania Police. *passim*
transcript(s). 21, 24, 216, 218, 223, 232, 238, 240, 255, 269, 282, 372, 373, 408, 625
Trans Otway. 412
trauma, induced. *passim* (see PTSD)
tray at café, gunman's. 17, 19, 24, 152, 262, 634
trial, no. *passim*
Truth/truth. *passim*
Tube bombing, London. 26, 47, 122
- U** ultimate-research-assistant.com. xii, 42, 83
UNETHICAL LAWYERS. 697
Union Carbide. 80, 81
Union Jack. 48, 66
United Nations. 614
Unites States: *passim*
University, Griffiths. 353
- V** Van Dieman. 144, 276
victim/killing, 36th (Martin Bryant). a, 243, 498, 592, 697, 698
Vietnam, American-led war in. lxvi, 48, 49, 77, 79-81, 158
video, corrupt Balasko. 240, 241, 244, 299, 425, 494, 618
video camera, gunman's missing. 17, 19, 194, 228, 232, 350, 352, 353, 354, 355, 464, 488, 582, 635
Vigilant. 144, 276
violent incident management plan (VIMP). 96
Volkswagen, gunman in a. 206, 378, 446, 469
Volvo(s), yellow. *passim*
- W** WASP(s). 18, 24, 157, 248, 276, 425, 488, 618
WEBSITES. 664
Wee Waa NSW. 103
WHAT YOU CAN DO. 649
wikileaks. xix
wikipedia. xii, 14, 48, 64, 70, 76, 81, 86, 103, 107, 112, 113, 130
wikispooks. 8
witness recollections/statements, contamination of. *passim*
witness statements. 379-498
- Y** Yankunytjatjara people. 73
yellow safety-vests. 649
YOUTH I YINDI. 696
youtube.com. v, xviii, 100, 201, 253, 281, 502, 585, 664 ■

DRAWING BY MARTIN BRYANT

BELOW is a reduced copy of a drawing (original size not known) believed to be by Martin Bryant.



Facts prove that Martin Bryant was the case **patsy** and that the shooting at and near Port Arthur, Tasmania, was falsely attributed to him. (see *SUBJECT INDEX*, "must happen, this") It is inconceivable he was not going to be charged and convicted. So when Avery says he gave Martin Bryant art supplies to try and get him to reveal through some drawings how he (allegedly) shot people, Avery reveals his own deviousness. Avery displayed and confirmed a total lack of interest in defending his client, who Avery publicly called a "monster." This Avery was one of three *killers* (Avery, Bugg, Cox) who ensured innocent Martin had **NO trial**, who ensured he was wrongly convicted, and who ensured he would die slowly in prison.

Most people do not know Avery thought he was an art connoisseur. That Avery had any interest in trying to determine what Martin did and did not do by guessing the meanings of Martin's drawings is doubted. Avery it seems wanted those drawings as he thought he could profit from them. We do not need any artist or crayon expert to tell us the drawing above is childish. Martin was/is a *boy-man*. In 1996, he drew things as best he could perhaps trying to relieve the anguish and pain he must have felt locked in an isolation wing of Risdon Prison. We have no certain understanding of what this crude drawing means, if anything. That Avery might think he knows means nothing. His words are those of a criminal ex-lawyer.

Martin's drawing confirms to us that he is as he has been described – a mentally-handicapped person who had an IQ of 66, who received a disability pension, and who at times would forget what he was doing. **His artwork, drawn at the age of 29, confirms he is a patsy. ■**

HUMAN RIGHTS

HUMAN RIGHTS are being trampled worldwide. States suppress and kill people using police powers, kangaroo courts, controlling laws, and military murder. Everywhere, complicit judges, police thugs, death squads, and torturers are in action. So while you still can, question those who think they have authority over you. In every democracy, it is *We the People* who are supreme – not overweening officials. As the Australian group YOUTH I YINDI tells us in their inspirational song *Tribal Voice*: **GET UP! STAND UP!** for Truth and Justice – they are your irrevocable human rights.

Recall the barrister Jennifer White. She claims to be a member of *Australian Lawyers for Human Rights*. Her membership seems so ethical, so righteous. But White and her legal colleagues have done nothing to aid an innocent *boy-man* now in his third decade of wrongful incarceration. In relation to this horrendous injustice, not one lawyer in Australia has displayed integrity by crying out to the nation – **NO! NO! NO!** The denial of a trial for Martin Bryant is an eternal indictment against this so-called profession. When INNOCENT Martin is officially killed in Tasmania, becoming the 36th death of Port Arthur, it will be because lawyers in Australia, not just Tasmania, failed to fulfill their professional responsibilities. **Lawyers denied Martin Bryant his legal rights, then they killed him under the guise of justice. ■**

UNETHICAL LAWYERS


HERE, the word lawyer includes prosecutors as well as judges, not one of whom should ever be addressed as *Justice* given the existence of so many tragic cases of false conviction and/or wrongful imprisonment which arise from adversarial legal system courts. In Australia, an extremely cruel reality of truth being restricted even denied by lawyers and of justice subsequently not being served seems pervasive. (see Lynne Weathered. Does Australia Need a Specific Institution to Correct Wrongful Convictions? *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*; 2007: pp.179-198) Conviction-focused courts of adversarial legal systems do not seek truth and justice. Such courts rob people – men, women, children – of their assets, their rights, their freedoms, and/or their lives. Victims of such courts are left cynical, gutted, and some to die slowly. **Australia does not have systems of justice.** It has legal systems created by lawyers for the benefit of lawyers. The *best of British justice* is NOT the description of a golden colonial inheritance. It is bullshit and deception, confirmed in the wrecked lives of so many Australians. For Tasmania, see Andrew L. Urban. *Tasmania Justice System Self-Harmed*; wrongfulconvictionsreport.org; 10 March 2019. For Australia, see Evan Whitton. *OUR CORRUPT LEGAL SYSTEM: Why Everyone is a Victim (Except Rich Criminals)*; Book Pal; 2010. ■

RESISTING CHANGE

NO MATTER what the strength of a new or even an old opinion might be, or how well expounded, existing beliefs are often deeply entrenched and strongly defended. Intellectually this is how humans function. Replacing well-learned facts (even if false), changing emotional commitments, altering habitual thinking, and causing data and/or beliefs to be reordered are not things human minds handle rapidly and smoothly.... When it comes to mental changes, people are stubborn. They oppose all beliefs, facts, opinions, scenarios, *etc.* considered contrary to what they already hold in their minds. Internally, an individual says this to her/himself: *what I know is correct, what I am now being told is incorrect....* As an international introduction to the topic of human killing, I urge you to read the book **DEATH BY GOVERNMENT** (2008). The following appears on the paperback cover:



"R.J. Rummel's fourth book in a series devoted to genocide and **government mass murder**, or what he calls democide." Governments have been killing human beings big time for a long time. It's going on right now around the world.... That an official says something does not make it credible. Officials lie for the State – their overseer.... Australian readers might recall the



State lie they have been told about a passport **allegedly** found at the Port Arthur massacre site, and that officials **allege** it identified the lone gunman – innocent Martin Bryant; a patsy whose IQ was 66 (retarded), who was denied ethical legal assistance, who has been denied justice since 1996 when **he was wrongly imprisoned**. [now being killed slowly in Risdon Prison] Read this revealing article by [the Canadian] professor Michel Chossudovsky – *Manchester, Berlin, Paris, Nice, London, New York: Passports and IDs Mysteriously Discovered in the Wake of Terror Attacks*; off-guardian.org; 25JUN2017. (original italics, added emphasis)

Keith Allan Noble
OMEGA – Human Killing
2018: pp.35,37,55

*People who resist change are unable to accept the massacre in Tasmania was **an official psycho-political terror incident**. They cling to the belief that one very low-IQ person planned and perpetrated everything at seven crime scenes, even though hard evidence proves this false. That police records are sealed for 75 years confirms the State's involvement in the incident at and near Port Arthur. Resisting change aids the State cover up its role in the killing (35) and wounding (23) there – **Martin Bryant will be the 36th victim killed by the State.** ■*