

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

**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.**

(continued on p. 19)

---

Dr. Keith Allan Noble; Unit 72 B, Am Heumarkt 7, 1030 Vienna, Austria; t. 43-1-9712401  
author: MASS MURDER: Official Killing in Tasmania, Australia (2014, 2nd edition)  
paperback copies: bookfinder.com; free pdfs: BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net

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

## 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 a Gary Ramage. 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 made 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 is 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. (more below)
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 the 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 and squarely at the subject. And the possibility the images were manipulated electronically also exists – as this has not been negated in any of the articles. Could these images be replicated, exactly as presented by News Corp Australia, with the same type of equipment as was used by Ramage(?) on Thursday 10 SEP 2015?

## **SPECIFIC INTERNET POSTS**

The following posts appear on the website [dailytelegraph.com.au](http://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 Seascope were the weapons used at PA. Shots reported as late as 6pm at PA. Shots heard at Seascope 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 Seascapes 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 nonsense 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. 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. (extract downloaded 25 SEP 2015)

[www.independentmediacouncil.com.au/code-of-conduct.html](http://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 the people of Australia 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://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, 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/](http://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](mailto:BIGWORMBOOKS@gmx.net) or [MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com](mailto:MARTINBRYANTISINNOCENT@gmail.com). But you probably won't, so an Insert from THE WORST OF BRITISH JUSTICE accompanies this submission (pp.20, 21). 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)

## 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 all of this?) **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. Fifty-seven phone calls took place – the police negotiator said it sounded like a prepared script, snacks were made inside Seascapes 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 Special Operations Group 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.**

1/2

**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.**

2/2