



PUBLISHED BY:
**The
Ozboy File**

THE TRUTH ABOUT:

THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE

EXPOSING the
False Flag OP of fabrications and lies
used by the Tasmanian and Aust. Govt
against patsy and stooge Martin Bryant



*** THE MILITARY SKILLS OF A MENTAL RETARD ***
*** MARTIN BRYANT- AUSSIE GUN LAW PATSY ***
*** TASSIE POLICE FRAMEUP EXPOSED ***

The OzBoy File

The Truth About Port Arthur Massacre

Part 1



Written

By

Lloyd T Vance & Steve Johnson

The Truth About Port Arthur Massacre

Introduction

Australia has a deep, sinister, evil past that has to be told, one which was carried out by lose agents within Federal Government Depts 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 helped from the Tasmania State Government and employees within certain Depts 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 Government Depts, 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 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 that participated in this False Flag Terrorist Attack have all moved on to higher positions in life, while they destroyed Martin Bryant life and the lives of all those they killed in this attack and the families.

Its time to hold accountable all these people that took part in this False Flag Terrorist Attack, upon Australian citizens and Australian shores.

The issue is not that the Government passed Gun Law Control.

The issue is the Police, ASIO, Federal Attorney General Office with the blessing of Government and then cover up by Government carried out a Terrorist Attack against their own people, if you don't find that immoral, illegal, unjust and absolutely criminal I would get your head checked over

How dare these people arrange a Terrorist Attack to be carried out against their own people murdering them in cold blood.



When a Government carries out Terrorism against their own people, then that Government has become corrupt and no longer serves the Australian people, they serve themselves pushing their own agendas

But Australian politics has been like this for a number of years instead of the Liberal, Greens, National, and Labour Parties serving the people of Australia they serve their own interest and corporate Australia.



The Truth About Port Arthur Massacre

Part 1

As you read to this presentation remember!

The Truth never lies, if the Official Story released by the Government is true!!!

Then it should be able to stand up to scrutiny, investigation and examination, but if the Official Story released and told by the Government and Media are lies, then the whole story will collapse in a heap.

28th April 1996 A False Flag Terrorist Attack was carried out by Federal Police, ASIO, Tasmania Police and then covered up by the same politicians pushing for gun laws.

This False Flag Terrorist Attack was carried out against innocent Australians, they were mowed down– slain in cold blood, as they went about their business sight seeing Port Arthur historical site.

So What Happen this day?

Two Mid-east types befriended Martin Bryant in the month before.

That day they took two cars to Port Arthur.

One drives Bryant's Volvo to the cafe and slaughters the 35 moving his way back to the cottage.

There they killed the elderly couple and give Bryant a drug mixture (psychotropic drug cocktails) containing amphetamines and benzodiazepine (Used by Mossad on Arab suicide bombers.)





Bryant was told to 'Stay and protect' and they left.

A pair was seen escaping over drawbridge and there is video footage showing them with their escape

The Tasmania Police supplied a former SOG as Controller referred to by Martin Bryant in his conversations with the Police negotiator as "Rick" (actually Mick). Sgt Michael Dyson left the SOG unit in 1995 - before the Port Arthur terrorist attack

Sergeant Michael Dyson, the former SOG Assault Team Leader, the only SOG member with any siege experience, was not available to assist the SOG's 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 SOG'

The Tasmania Police also supplied the "torch" that was secreted about Seascope before the gunman returned with the BMW.

He torched the BMW and the Cottage.

Our ASIO intelligence Org was heavily involved – 2 of their agents died in the Broad Arrow Café.

The shooter is an Australian – now deceased

Our military air-wing was involved.

Covert sections as well as what used to be called "Special Branch" of State Police and the Federal Police were involved.

State and Federal Police SOG's were involved

And two agents of ASIO were openly involved in Tasmania as assistant to the Premier and media liaison with the Tasmania State Police.

To many clues left behind 2 ASIO Agents Killed in the Café` by the real gunman, so hence why the officials ordered the demolition of the Café` so no evidence would be left behind

Anthony Nightingale a loans officer with the Commonwealth Bank at Noble Park, who jumped up when the gunman started shooting and yelled out, "No, no, not here!"

The information I have received is that he was ASIO.

Andrew Bruce Mills a homosexual, and another reputed member of ASIO.

He was accompanied by Tony and Sarah Kistan of Sydney.

Tony Kistan a high ranking South African political activist of the ANC, Nelson Mandela's Communist Party.

Dennis Olson, Olson was quoted in an article printed in the American newspaper, 'The Nando times' on the 30th April 96 that, "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."

Any relation to Roland Browne?

Now consider this article from the Hobart mercury, and study closely just what it tells you.

A nurse, her name suppressed, has just received a six figure settlement from her employers, the Commonwealth Bank and Audiometrics of 814 Glenferrie Road Hawthorn.



SEARCH FOR TRUTH

The only Commonwealth Bank employee that was killed at Port Arthur was Anthony Nightingale, and since the Commonwealth Bank do not pay their employees or are responsible for their employees outside of working hours, or whilst taking 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 as to 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 Lyn Beavis, who according to her statement was on a 10 day holiday with her sister.

Again, why would the Commonwealth Bank pay for injuries to their staff that occurred whilst they were on holidays?

What were three ASIO personnel, a communist activist and an American Anti-gunner all doing at Port Arthur on this particular day???

Whoever was on the trigger that fateful day demonstrated professional skills equal to some of the best Special Forces shooters in the world.

His critical error lay in killing too many people too quickly while injuring far too few, thereby exposing himself for what he was, a highly trained combat shooter probably ranked among the top twenty such specialists in the western world.

Hard scientific facts were deliberately excluded by the frenzied media pack and not one attempt was made to establish the real identity of the shooter.

American video evidence submitted to the Supreme Court has already been scientifically proven a forgery, who ordered this fake video to be used?

There were no eyewitnesses who could positively identify Martin Bryant at Port Arthur, lets repeat that again there were NO, that means NO eyewitnesses who could identify Martin Bryant as the shooter.

Martin Bryant, an intellectually impaired registered invalid with no training in the use of high powered assault weapons, could not under any circumstances have achieved or maintained the incredibly high and consistent killed-to-injured ratio and kill-rate which were bench marks of the Port Arthur massacre

Without a single shred of credible evidence, someone somewhere decided that gun dealer Terry Hill would be the "fall guy" who provided "murderer" Martin Bryant with the weapons he allegedly used at Port Arthur.

The Tasmanian Government and Police Service went to great lengths to "fit up" gun dealer Terry Hill as the man who provided Martin Bryant with the weapons alleged to have been used in the massacre.

This draconian activity culminated in a civil court case against Hill, seemingly launched by survivor Quin for damages and breach of statutory duty.

Active in the case was Roland Brown, solicitor for the Legal Aid Commission and Chairman of the Coalition for Gun Control.

On 5th March 1998 the case against Terry Hill was suddenly discontinued.

Despite the fact that he has never been charged with any offence relating to Port Arthur, the police refuse to restore his gun dealer licence on the grounds that he, and his wife Dorothy, are not suitable people to handle firearms.



This is rubbish, easily proved by the fact that shortly after the gun dealer licences were revoked, the Tasmanian police renewed both of their personal firearms licences without question.

In the aftermath of the Port Arthur massacre, government went to great lengths to ignore or suppress all evidence including recently passing legislation banning any investigation of Port Arthur Massacre for the next 30 years.

If there is nothing to hide why the 30 year ban?

This alone tells us Port Arthur was An Inside Job carried out by Police Services, Military and ASIO and now covered up by corrupt politicians from all sides Liberal, Labour, Greens, and Democrat.

All of the hard evidence at Port Arthur bears the distinctive trademark of a planned "psyop", meaning an operation designed to psychologically manipulate the belief mechanisms of a group of people or a nation for geopolitical or military reasons.

In the immediate aftermath of the Port Arthur massacre, politicians developed collective verbal diarrhoea in the House of Representatives as they joined the feeding frenzy designed to undermine Australian national security by removing defensive weapons from the hands of the public.

There is now also convincing hard evidence that the gun control proposals accepted by Police Ministers in May 1996 were prepared before the massacre, by an ideological senior bureaucrat with United Nations connections.

<http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/ungun.htm>

Since the psyop at Port Arthur more than 400,000 reserve firearms have been pulped instead of stored by the Federal Government, leaving our nation and people terribly exposed to just about anyone interested in taking over the natural resources jewel in the southern hemisphere crown.

The only visible cause and effect that can be laid at the door of the Port Arthur massacre is that the effect of the obscene action caused public hatred to be directed against Australian sporting shooters, who were innocent of any crime at all.

Directly linked to this was a massive funded campaign to disarm the Australian people in spite of significant external threats to our national security.

Alleged Port Arthur gunman Martin Bryant.

Photo on the below was used by the media to convince you of Martin Bryant's "guilt".



Photo below taken from a different angle, shows identical three men on balcony of the Broad Arrow Cafe, and the man alleged to be Martin Bryant running down towards the bus park at Port Arthur in the presence of a police helicopter.



This frame was shot at 2.45 p.m., one hour and fifteen minutes after the mass murder was over!

This damning photographic evidence by itself proves Martin Bryant was deliberately set-up, wrongly accused and wrongly convicted.

Remember, a camera cannot lie.

Twenty Head-Shots !

In the cafe the gunman killed 20 & wounded another 12 with a total of 29 rounds. The magazine held 30 rounds, so by changing magazines after firing 29 shots he still had a round in the breech enabling him to kill if caught unawares.

????????????????
? WHY IS THERE ?
? A 30 YEAR ?
? EMBARGO ON ?
? THE EVIDENCE ?
????????????????

Bryant did not wear earmuffs.
His ears were not damaged, so
we know he was not the gunman
in the brick building.
The killer would have known to
wear earmuffs under the wig.

He was a cool,
calculating
professional.

Quote

Brigadier Serong DSO OBE
"There was an almost satanic
accuracy to that shooting
performance."

RIGHT- HANDED

He shot accurately from
the hip although the gun
was recoiling upwards.

THE PORT ARTHUR
KILLER

wig
earmuffs

Bryant admits he was
not a good shot and he
never practiced shoot-
ing from the hip.

Spot
the
differences

Very poor
skills

intellectually
impaired

LEFT- HANDED

MARTIN
BRYANT

MARTIN BRYANT - GENIUS / Or PERFECT PATSY

If one accepts the official Tasmanian 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.

Martin Bryant had such intelligence information and timed things so well as to wait until a whole series of things were in place just before, on, or slightly after the 28th April.

23 Coincidences Which the Media and Officials Cant Explain

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 Hobart 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 at the exact moment the shooting began.
8. He managed to fool staff at the Historic Site into believing he arrived at 1.15pm when in fact he was there at 12.45pm.
9. He managed not to look like himself - as if wearing a woman's wig - when being filmed in the car park by tourists.
10. He wore a face mask making his face look pockmarked when shooting in the cafe.
11. He arranged for a suspect black van to appear outside the Broad Arrow Cafe afterwards so people wouldn't think it was him who did it.

12. He managed to get Sally Martin to run around Seascapc naked that afternoon and make it appear she had been killed that morning.

13. He managed to shoot a rifle from upstairs at Seascapc when he was downstairs talking to police on the phone.

14. He had infrared night vision eyes.

15. He managed to shoot from two Seascapc 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 lie to the Court 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 two shots at 6.30pm at Port Arthur while he was under siege by police at Seascapc.

23. If you believe the official version, his marksmanship was fantastic - twenty head shots, from the right hip, in 90 seconds!

There are only about 100 shooters that good (better than Olympians) in the world.

They are the SPOOKS who work for various governments.

THE CONFESSION

He managed to get himself convicted of murder and get life.

He confessed after being held in solitary confinement for at least ten times the maximum allowable as punishment in war under the Geneva Convention.

The deal was that he got a TV set in his room.

After that much solitary men go mad or confess to anything.

Bryant was mentally retarded.

WAS THERE A TRIAL?

There was no trial.

Just torture (28 days sensory deprivation which is illegal) and the confession.

There is enough material for investigators to believe he is innocent.

MARTY WAS THE DUMMY CHOSEN TO TAKE THE RAP

When you add up all these things and a lot more not listed above, it is impossible for a reasonable person to come to the conclusion Bryant was behind this incident - that it was him doing the shooting and that others weren't involved and that a setup and cover-up hasn't occurred.

Those who were prepared to leave him to burn to death in Seascope saw Martin Bryant as expendable.



WITNESSES SPEAK OUT

Wendy Scurr, the lady who called the police while under fire has toured Australia pleading for a trial for Bryant.

She held the phone out the window so the police could better hear the shot to be convinced that there was a massacre going on.

WITNESSES GAGGED

Scores of other witnesses can't understand why the media reports differ greatly from what they saw and heard.

The eye witnesses 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.

UNFIT TO EVEN PLEAD

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, a first trial with evidence presented to a jury.

CATCH 22 - SO NO APPEAL

Appeal is impossible now because even a QC can't get access to Bryant because the prison officers say he doesn't want visitors.

Even Bryant's mother can't get to see him.
We only have the prison officers' word that he doesn't want visitors.

From all other skullduggery - why should they be believed?

EVIDENCE DESTROYED

All evidence of the shooting was removed from the building to make it a sacred site.



This is a standard procedure when the government does a sting.



Remember Waco, Oklahoma, Twin Towers 9-11 etc.



The Evidence Points In One Direction

The evidence points in 1 direction, Martin Bryant was the patsy – stooge chosen to be set – up and railroaded for this crime.

All the paid talking heads on TV, Radio and in Newspapers can point the finger at Martin Bryant until brown cows come home.

Martin Bryant is innocent period of this crime and the real perpetrators of this crime should be tracked down, prosecuted for their treasonous, traitorous, cowardly acts they committed and if the evidence leads to Top Political Figure like ex- Prime Minister John Howard and others at State Government level so be it.

Other oddities of this case which the Media & Officials can't explain are as follows.

Two ASIO Agents

Who placed two ASIO agents 1 in Premier Ray Grooms Office as Media Liaison Officer, 1 in Tasmania Police Dept as Media Liaison Officer?

Ready for Total containment of the case, feeding the media the official story line script and fake – false evidence Martin Bryant lone gunman story.



PETER HAZELWOOD

If the Official story is true, Martin Bryant was a lone nut gunman, why place ASIO Officers GEOFF EASTON & PETER HAZELWOOD in these offices?

Peter Hazelwood was also reportedly the Media Liaison Officer at the Hilton Hotel Bombing back in 1978 which was later found by a Royal Commission to have been orchestrated by persons connected with ASIO.

Who Threatened Premier Ray Groom?



Who threaten Premier Ray Groom to resign or else he would find himself set up in some sex, drug offence, criminal scandal?

Or was the reason Premier Ray Groom suddenly resigned ahead of time, Is because of the fact the fraud at Port Arthur has now been exposed and he and his associates have been caught out?

Who Threaten Senator Woodley?

Following a letter by one of the victims of Port Arthur Democrat Senator John Woodley from Queensland has backed up a call and stated his support for an inquiry into Port Arthur.

This follows the matter being referred to him by Senator Meg Lees, Democrat Leader.



Shortly after Senator Woodley called for an inquiry into Port Arthur, the next day Senator Woodley announced his resignation from Parliament citing "health" reasons.

Since then the ex-Senator has publicly shown no sign of serious health problems.

The question must therefore be asked why did he resign?

And who told him to do so?

And was it because of his support for this inquiry?

Witness Says Gunman Not Martin Bryant

The late Jim Laycock was co-owner of the Port Arthur Motel situated near the entrance to the Port Arthur Historic Site in view of the Tollbooth and Service Station.

On the afternoon of the massacre he saw the gunman hijack the BMW at the tollbooth and the shooting and taking of a hostage at the service station.

Laycock had also been the former owner of the Broad Arrow Cafe and had known Martin Bryant.

Laycock told police in his statement he says he DID NOT RECOGNIZE THE GUNMAN AS MARTIN BRYANT



STATEMENT - Continued

Name of Witness	LAYCOCK	James Clement
	Surname (in capitals)	Christian Names

I was informed by one of the people who had hid in the bushes that the male had a BMW car so I went back to the shop and advised the police of the vehicle, and that it wasn't the yellow Volvo which was still at the toll gate.

Constable Chris ISLES arrived about 3 minutes after the last incident, he asked me to get in the car and we would follow this vehicle, but after he had seen the young deceased female he decided to leave me at the scene.

I have known Martin BRYANT from the age of 10 years until he was about 23 years old, I only knew him as one of the local kids. Whilst he was with the lady (Helen HARVEY) he would come in to the Broad Arrow and she would buy him a devonshire tea and spend a lot of money on possessions. Over a 5 year period they came into the Restaurant about 1 dozen times, always on a Sunday and always for afternoon tea. Martin did tell me he had been kicked out of the Broad Arrow Restaurant at some stage. Martin was terribly competitive on possession, he would go to my daughter in the craft shop and tell her things such as "I've got a new Walkman what have you got, Dads got a Volvo car what sort of car has your father got".

I'm under the impression that Martin's father lived with Martin and Mrs HARVEY at Copping and that the father was the benefactor of Miss HARVEY'S estate and that when the father died Martin inherited the estate.

On this Sunday the 28th April 1996, I did not recognise the male as Martin BRYANT. The person I saw shooting appeared to be in then low twenties, about 5'10" tall, it was impossible to determine his build, (the coat was shapeless). His hair stood out, it was blonde, I thought it was bleached blonde and possibly a female. His hair was shoulder length. His walking appeared to be mannish.

The youths in the red car returned from the bush and they left the scene.

The blonde headed person I saw at the toll gate is definitely the same blonde headed person I saw shoot the woman in the white car at the General Store.

[J C LAYCOCK]

[L F JONES]

Sergeant No 1307 12.15 pm 10/5/96

Witnesses Descriptions Do Not Fit Bryant

Numerous witnesses, those that took a careful look at the gunman doing the shooting at Port Arthur that day, described someone other than Martin Bryant.

When one examines the DPP's witness statements a picture emerges that brings out 2 particular discrepancies between the gunman and Martin Bryant.

The LENGTH of the blonde hair and his AGE.

A great number of the witnesses said the blonde hair extended below the shoulders as did a great number say the gunman was in the 18 to 23 age range.

To backup this point there are 2 witness statements which graphically demonstrate this.

A witness who saw the gunman at the tollbooth when he shot people in a BMW and who was watching in his car says the gunman's hair "flowed down onto his chest". Refer Buckley Statement - Last Paragraph.

This is reinforced by the frames from the tourist video showing the gunman at the water.



This witness is particularly important because he was in a relatively calm state and standing stationery at the time he was saw the gunman.

Another witness who saw the gunman shooting from the entrance of Seascape described him as "18-22 years old only a young lad".

She also noted the hair flowing in the breeze. Refer Maloney Statement

Witness terminology: curley hair like Bryant had doesn't "flow" but straight hair does.

What is also noted there by Maloney is this hair was "almost gold in colour".



As you can see Martin Bryant's hair colour is rather dull white - not the striking gold colour Maloney said the gunman shooting from Seascape had.

Regardless of this at least 2 witnesses stated the gunman was NOT Martin Bryant. He was not the man they saw in the media.



Why Martin Bryant Cannot Be The Cafe Gunman

Based on the witness statements available to the Tasmanian Police & DPP on when and where people saw Martin Bryant it is impossible for him to have been in the Port Arthur Historic Site (PAHS) when the gunman was witnessed doing a host of things because the timing rules it out.

This being the case several witness statements provide a complete ALIBI for Martin Bryant and these alone are sufficient to totally disassociate him as being the Cafe gunman, and the original charge at the time of his arrest that he killed the first victim Kate Scott is untenable.

This also raises into doubt the goings on later at Seascapes because it is quite clear someone was attempting to make it appear it was him at PAHS - ie frame Bryant.

Remember these are the DDP's own witnesses giving their accounts.

Witness Says Martin Bryant Not Gunman

Another witness to the events at the Broad Arrow Cafe stated the gunman was not Martin Bryant.

John Godfrey, an ex VietNam Veteran saw the gunman at the Volvo after he left the Cafe.

Later he was asked by police to ID him as Bryant and he refused saying in his opinion the man he saw was not the same man in the newspapers (2 days later).

See statement page 3 of 3 page statement - second last paragraph.

This statement coupled with Grahame Collyer's and Jim Laycock's is sufficient to question whether Martin Bryant was the gunman (irrespective of what other witnesses may have said).

It also backs up our photographic evidence proving the gunman was discernably different to Martin Bryant.

The problem the Tasmanian authorities have is the photo images from the video footage doesn't lie.

It should be stated Tasmanian DPP Damien Bugg didn't point out to the Court at Martin Bryant's sentencing these conflicting statements by Godfrey, Collyer and Laycock and several others.

Nor did Bryant's lawyer John Avery either.

This is deception by omission.

Again the question must be asked why wasn't this discrepancy followed up by police and the DPP?
Was it because they were told not to take any notice of evidence indicating it wasn't Martin Bryant?

The Black Van

Following the massacre shortly after 2.30pm when medivac helicopters were ferrying the wounded to Hobart Hospital

A SUSPICIOUS BLACK VAN appeared outside the Broad Arrow Cafe where the bulk of the shooting had occurred.



The entrance to the cafe is just to the upper left of the front of the van.

You can see also the windows are black because the white decking of the Cafe doesn't show through in these picture.

This vehicle was parked in a place where it shouldn't have been right outside the main crime scene blocking 3 cars as you can see.

Also right in between where wounded victims were taken to choppers.



It was there for a considerable period of time.

Its black windows preventing anyone seeing inside.

Given its positioning it cannot be an SES van associated with the medical staff.

And why would anyone want to park their van there anyway?

What was this suspicious vehicle doing there?

Was it the cleanup team checking the Cafe for incriminating evidence and planting false evidence?

It should be noted the Tasmanian Police didn't arrive until 7.00pm that night and the Cafe crime scene was not sealed off and anyone could walk into the Cafe with bodies everywhere without interference for most of that time.

Many visitors went in there to get food and drinks as well as to help the wounded and check for survivors.

DPP Tamper With & Withholds Evidence

At the sentencing hearing for Martin Bryant Tasmanian DPP Damien Bugg QC told the Court the following:- Refer Court Transcript at Page 62--63

"There were two interesting observations made late in the morning 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 gunshots 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 Bryant was in 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."

What is wrong with this is that the claim that shots were heard by Mr. McCutcheon about 12.00 to 12.30pm is a lie.

McCutcheon heard the shots between 10.00am and 11.00am. Refer McCutcheon Statement .

Question must be asked why did the DDP change this?

Was it to rule out any suggestion someone else killed the Martin's between 10am and 11am well before Martin Bryant arrived at Seascape?

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 Seascape".

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 Seascape", so at about 11.20 a.m. the Crown case is that Mr. & Mrs. Martin were at the premises on their own. "

These 2 witnesses claim everything was fine at Seascape until around 11.15am when they left.

But what needs explaining is the fact that the Gunn's do not mention the gunshots that the other 2 witnesses said occurred before 11.00am emanating from Seascape when they would have been there.

This raises a question mark regards their presence at Seascape (timing of their departure).

The key point is NOBODY heard shots at Seascape between 11.45am and 12.40pm 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 10am and 11am.

It is unlikely McCutcheon could be 2 hours out in his timing. And witness Mr. A Simmons, who lived opposite Seascape and was watching the clock because he was waiting for a ride, also heard shots between 10.45am and 11.00am WELL BEFORE BRYANT ARRIVED.

Refer Simmons Statement.

(The DDP alleged he arrived after 11.20am, yet other evidence indicates Bryant never got there until 12.20pm).

If the only shots* fired that morning were just before 11.00am then it is a substantial alibi for Martin Bryant in respect of the allegation he killed the Martins of Seascape.

These 2 witnesses statements are reinforced by the fact Martin Bryant was witnessed being up to 58 kilometres to the north of Seascape when the shots were heard.

This is because Bryant was witnessed at the Midway Point Newsagency between 10.30am and 11.00am.

Refer Kessarios Statement .

Another witness saw him around the same time frame (11am) at the Shell Service Station at Forcett where Bryant spent 8 to 10 minutes having a cup of coffee.

Refer King Statement.

That would put Bryant leaving Forcett at 11.08am at the earliest.

Shots had been heard at Seascape, 58km away, some 20 to 30 minutes earlier.

Martin Bryant cannot be at 2 places at one time.

NONE OF THIS WAS DISCLOSED TO THE COURT BY THE DPP.

It is further necessary to state it believed it is in fact more likely the timing by the Gunn's is incorrect.

If they in fact left earlier than they said - at 10.15am to 10.20am - it would fit.

There is however another question mark in relation to the Gunn's - namely that 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 Seascapes heard shots between 11.45am and 12.40pm.

It is also important to note while DDP Bugg told this whopper to the Court Martin Bryant's second 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' 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.

Here we have not one but two pieces of critical evidence that gives Martin Bryant an alibi - one the timing of shots being heard much earlier and the other a failure to disclose Bryant whereabouts at that time - not being put to the Court.

WHY?

This calls on the Tasmanian DDP's Office and Bugg to explain why Mr McCutcheon's evidence was altered before the Court in such a manner as to remove any notion Martin Bryant was in fact elsewhere at the time events were occurring at Seascapes.



This is a clear case of not only **TAMPERING WITH EVIDENCE** but also **WITHHOLDING EVIDENCE** that was 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.

The Pre-Trial Media Control Strategy

Putting aside the fact there was never a proper trial for Martin Bryant - once his hearing date was set the Port Arthur Historic Site Management Authority put out the following MEDIA STRATEGY to its staff handle the media queries.

The Pre Trial Media Control Strategy

As you can see this Strategy was aimed at making sure there were no inconsistencies in media releases etc..

And the media was monitored and all of this was fed into the entire Tasmanian Govt. bureaucracy up to and including the Premier Ray Groom's Office (where SAC-PAV operatives Peter Hazelwood and Geoff Easton were running the show).

The question must be asked if Martin Bryant acted alone and did the massacre (and accordingly all the evidence was conclusive there would naturally be no inconsistencies in information - be they evidence or stories of witnesses etc.) why would you need to have a media strategy to handle inconsistencies and monitor the media for them?

The answer is quite simple - because Bryant was not the gunman and he was being set-up there were so many holes and inconsistencies in information and stories about the incident floating around they needed to be plugged and covered up and this strategy was aimed at ensuring people kept to the official fraudulent story and knew what others in the system had said to the media.

This partly occurred because there is evidence things didn't go according to their original plan on the day of the massacre - for the perpetrators of the massacre - particularly as to the timing of events.

This was a major cause of the inconsistencies, which they knew they had to try to counteract afterwards.

There would have been no need for such a media strategy if Martin Bryant hadn't been set-up.

If there had not been this strategy the holes in the case against Bryant may have been followed up and the fraud could have been at risk of being exposed.

This media strategy by PAHSMA assisted the perpetrators of the massacre to achieve its massive deception and railroad Martin Bryant.

It enabled media coverage to be controlled by controlling what was released.

It is an absolute disgrace to think a criminal conspiracy of this magnitude could occur in a country like Australia in the latter part of the 20th Century - whose effect was not only to perpetrate a fraud on firearms owners and deceive the public but would result in a helpless mentally handicapped young man in prison.

For something he did not do - by shooting up as many innocent people as possible, some of whom were foreign nationals.

All of this justifies the total removal of all police and governmental powers effecting the citizen's rights and liberties.

It is an example of why government as an institution cannot be trusted.

If the Official Story is true – Why did A Current Affair Lie about the Tape they showed on TV and who added the gun shots to the tape video?

A Current Affair?

Tasmania Police?

Tasmania DPP?

The Doctored Video On Channel 9

After the trial of Martin Bryant RAY MARTIN compare on the Channel 9 TV Network in his "A Current Affair" program screened nationally a video clip allegedly taken by a witness at Port Arthur that day.



The tape reportedly came from the Tasmanian DPP and had been presented to the Court at the trial.

The video showed a man running from the Broad Arrow Cafe carrying something. The video was shot from a fair distance away (hundred or more metres) so the resolution was low.



Gunshots were on the taped sound track.

It was purported by the program this was Martin Bryant - the gunman at Port Arthur - running from the Cafe to his car shooting (immediately after the massacre in the Cafe).

This has been proven to be FALSE.

Apart from the fact the man's clothes do not match Bryant's on the day and people are standing in the cafe doorway area watching, staff witnesses who were at the site that day know this man to be another staff member carrying blankets to the coach where wounded people lay.

Also as the shots are heard seagulls nearby are sitting there unaffected by the noise of an alleged high-powered rifle.

THE MOST SERIOUS THING ABOUT THIS TAPE IS THAT SOMEONE HAS ADDED THE GUNSHOT SOUNDTRACK TAKEN FROM ANOTHER VIDEO THAT WAS FILMED ON THE DAY.

Such an addition makes this a fabrication of evidence.

Who fabricated this videotape adding the gunshot soundtrack?

Was it someone at Channel 9 under Ray Martin's direction or was it the Tasmanian DPP or the Tasmanian Police?

If so why would they want or need to do so if Martin Bryant really did the shootings?

Why the gross deception?

Was it to try and reinforce to the Australian public on this high rating national TV program that the official line that Bryant was the gunman?

(The fact Ray Martin had persistently ran an anti-gun line on his program for years prior to this time raises the question of the extent of his involvement in this and other videos played on his program relating to this incident).

Is this piece of evidence in a series of things designed to frame Martin Bryant for the Port Arthur incident?

The evidence seems to indicate such.
Videos do not alter themselves.

The Real Picture the Video Was Taken From



Notice the time stamp of the real picture & video 2.45: 29 pm some 1 and half-hours after the Police and DPP say the shooting occurred So in other words Channel 9 "A Current Affairs" Show either doctored the video and pictures themselves or the Tasmania Police and DPP doctored the picture shown on A Current Affair

Remember a camera doesn't lie only reporters, host of Current Affairs Shows, Police and DPP lie, the camera tells the truth here is the picture again

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 help 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

Also other TV Current Affairs Programs, News Services, Newspapers and Radio Stations keep turning a blind eye

Here are two videos to watch, they blow the Official story out the door, on the second tape you can hear gun shots coming from the house.

Martin Bryant is talking on the phone to the police negotiator He cant be doing two things at once, talking to the police and firing a gun in another part of the house at the same time.

Nowhere while he was talking to police did he excuse himself?

You can heard him talking to police at the same time the gun shots are being fired in another part of the house.

So busted is the theory Martin Bryant was a lone gunman, who is that other person / persons firing that gun inside the house?



A Picnic at Port Arthur - The Port Arthur Massacre Part 1

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rB6HXcr8ffU>

A Picnic at Port Arthur - The Port Arthur Massacre Part 2

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JVZhvyubmp0>

Fake Tasmania Police Statement

Officer
making Fake Statement
Sgt Mick Dyson

If the Official story is true, like Tasmania Police, DPP, Tasmania Government and the corrupt incompetent media says it is.

Why the need for Sgt Dyson Fake – False Statement?

THE PORT ARTHUR MASSACRE - 28 April 1996

A dissemination of Sergeant Dyson's statement

Sergeant 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 of the 12th September 1996, 4 ½ months after the event.

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 Sergeant 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, the 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 QC.

In a memo put out by Superintendent Jack Johnston on the 14th August 1996, Johnston 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.

In other words, Sergeant 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 Sergeant 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."

Now for those who did not know, Sergeant 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 Sergeant 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 pm.

For Dyson to claim that he wasn't recalled to duty until 4 ½ 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 does not enter the fray.

Sergeant 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 Carlene 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."

As I have already stated, 'Liaison Officers do not enter the fray, they liaise and thus we must wonder as to why Sergeant Dyson would accompany the two detectives to Mrs Bryant's home.

However, let's look at the corroborative evidence as per Mrs Carleen Bryant as per Joe Vialls

"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 states emphatically that she was visited by detectives at 8 pm, three hours before Sergeant Dyson states he visited Carlene Bryant's home.

Now to detour slightly.

You may wonder as to how the Tasmania Police came to be aware of Mrs Carleen Bryant, when her son Martin had no police record.

The answer is that Detective Peter Hesman who was dropped off at the Port Arthur Historic Site found Martin Bryant's passport in the glovebox of the Volvo sedan.

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.

Now the next piece of 'corroborative evidence comes from a police statement for Petra Willmott, which was taken by Detective Constable Fiona Russell at Police Headquarters at 11.45pm on the 28th April, 1996 and finished on the 29th Aril 1996:

"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 Berridale.

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 Mrs Carleen Bryant's first name occurs in both the statement prepared by Det/Const Russell and the statement of Sergeant Dyson.

Again it is the police protocols that tell us what would have happened, and Mrs 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 found by Detective Peter Hesman in Bryant's Volvo at the tollbooth, the information would have been passed to Police Headquarters in Hobart.

Two detectives would then have been despatched to Mrs 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, which is why Mrs Carleen Bryant mentions the questions asked were mainly about the Clare Street residence and Martin Bryant's overseas trips 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 11.45pm, even though she had been in police custody since about 8.00 pm.

Now another thing that the Tasmania Police would not want would be that Mrs 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 Mrs 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 Sergeant Dyson's statement is not factual in regards to this point.

We are also aware that Petra Willmott was still at Police headquarters and that her interview didn't start until 11.45pm.

We must then also conclude that at this stage, Mrs Carleen Bryant is also still at Police Headquarters, and thus is not at her home as stated by Sergeant Dyson.

In regards to this point, Sergeant Dyson's statement is not factual.

Sergeant Dyson then states: "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 Sergeant Dyson could not have taken place as Mrs Bryant is at Police Headquarters.

Sergeant 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.

Sergeant 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 Mrs 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 Sergeant 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?

Sergeant 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 Sergeant Dyson tells us that he has both Mrs Carleen Bryant and Petra Willmott with him at 30 Clare Street Newtown at the very time that Detective Constable Fiona M. Russell has begun to take a statement from Petra Willmott at Police Headquarters.

This statement is not factual.

Sergeant 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 Sergeant 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:

"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 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.

So what Geoff Easton was telling the EMA (Emergency Management Australia) 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 Sgt Dyson, which he claimed to have taken possession of, the same photograph that later appeared on the front page of the Hobart Mercury newspaper, and a majority of Rupert Murdock owned newspapers throughout Australia?"

Sergeant Dyson's next statement 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 Claremont 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 (Major Incident Room).

As I stated 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 Sergeant Dyson is working from a copy of Petra Willmott's statement taken by Det/Const Russell No. 1902, with that statement being initiated at 11.45pm.

However, there is no mention of the detectives involved with Mrs Bryant, due to one very simple fact; Mrs Carleen Bryant refused to make a police statement on the night in question.

Now had this been a 'police matter' then Sergeant Dyson would have had access to all police activities on that night, but he hasn't, he is only using documents forwarded to the DPP's Office, and that means that Dyson has produced this statement at the request of the DPP, Mr Damian Bugg QC.

Which shows the DPP duplicity in fabricating evidence to help make their case.

Sergeant 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.

Sergeant 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."

This sentence simply describes the procedures that police are required to go through when they receive a warrant.

However, look at the time.

Sergeant Dyson's statement in regard to this episode starts at 11.00 pm 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?

Dr Ian 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.

Dr Ian 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?

Dr Ian Sale: There were wrappers to firearms and ammunition found in a sort of scullery room.

Now the police search that Dr Ian Sale took part in was led by Inspector Ross Paine, and again was at the time when both Mrs 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 Sergeant Dyson's statement been correct, then Dyson would have entered the Clare Street residence whilst Inspector 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.

Sergeant 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 Inspector 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.

We now know that the source of the photograph of Martin Bryant that appeared in the Hobart Mercury newspaper and other Murdock 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 newspaper journalists, then the photograph would definitely be missing.

For sloppy liars, Sergeant Dyson is in good company.
Sergeant Dyson's 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.

What is the problem with this statement is that the locksmith from Jacksons Locksmiths totally repudiates any suggestion that his company was involved in a search of the Clare Street premises on the 29th April 1996.

Sergeant 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”

This is extremely sloppy policework.

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 Sgt Dyson.

Sergeant Dyson’s 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 states in his police statement:

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.")

(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.

Sergeant 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 Sgt Dutton that involved ammunition in a plastic bag.

The several hundred is now 41 rounds and the .308 is now .223 ammunition.

Sergeant 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 hand cuff 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 hand cuff packets is missing.

The brand name is normally emblazoned on the packet, and as the DPP's assistant, Mr Nick Perks tells us that the hand cuffs were Smith & Wesson, and 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 hand cuff brand was not stated.

Now although the wrapper is corroborated by Dr Ian Sales 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, let alone a Smith & Wesson handgun.

The only logical conclusion that can be drawn here is that this evidence had to have been planted.

Sergeant 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 of Judge then has the final say on their legality.

What Sergeant 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.

Sergeant 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 Constable Harthill did arrive at Martin Bryant's residence at 30 Clare Street Newtown to provide security for those premises.

However Sgt Dyson cannot shirk his responsibilities in relation to his search warrant by simply passing those responsibilities onto somebody un-named within the Search Warrant.

But even if that was the case than Const. 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 Newtown on the 3rd May 1996.

It appears that Sgt Dyson is suggesting that Const. 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 Dr Ian Sale, we are made aware of the first Police Search of Bryant's Clare Street property led by Inspector Ross Paine at about 10.00pm on the 28th April 1996.

We are also aware that there was no evidence found of firearms or ammunition.

Sergeant Michael Charles Dyson then makes his statement that he searched the premises at 12.30am 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 Clare Street had to have been planted there by police, and we have Sgt 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 Sergeant Gerard Dutton.

The anomalies will astound you.

Appendix -Michael Charles DYSON

My full name is Michael Charles Dyson.

I am a Sergeant in the Tasmania Police attached to the Protective Security Section at Hobart.

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.

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 Carlene 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.

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

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 notice 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

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

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

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.

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.
M C DYSON Acting Inspector 12/9/96

Objective Conclusions About Port Arthur

So what does all this material mean?

Simply the claim 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 on the enormous number of facts that point to persons at high and middle levels in the Tasmanian Govt and Police Service and persons in Canberra being behind it.

The fact there is clear evidence of tampering with evidence to frame Bryant afterwards clearly indicates this.

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 Seascope.

(2) Senior Tasmanian Police deliberately did not attempt to collect evidence and in fact allowed evidence to be destroyed or tampered with.

(3) The Tasmanian DPP Damien Bugg lied to, misled and withheld evidence from the Court about the incident that would give Martin Bryant an alibi.

(4) The failure to hold a full Coroners Inquest afterwards and legislative changes in 1995 just before by Premier Ray Groom to prevent such an inquest indicate premeditation.

(5) That 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 fraudulently blamed on a private citizen - aimed solely at justifying a gun control agenda in particular the banning of semi-automatic firearms

(7) That federal ALP appointed bureaucrats in the Justice Dept. had been pushing the same gun control agenda for years 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 adopted after PA), 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 PA happened they isolated PM 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 politicians in Australia today are too afraid to face and why they run for cover whenever Port Arthur is mentioned.

That the Federal ALP Keating Govt. who had been pushing an anti-firearm agenda since getting elected in 1983 and more particularly since 1988 somehow coerced the Tasmanian State Govt. to having a gun massacre to occur after the 1996 federal election, 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 backlash at State level (who at the time in 1996 were controlled by the Coalition in all States but NSW)
All which would benefit only one party - the ALP.

Put another way - an Australian Federal Govt. entered into an covert arrangement with a State Govt. to engage in genocide for the sole purpose of defrauding persons in other States and Territories their property (and creating political mischief as a result)

.

If that is the case it would constitute a unlawful criminal conspiracy (homicide and fraud).

An Act of Public Sector Terrorism.

Also if this stemmed from Federal -State financial arrangements it constitutes an unlawful and most serious abuse of the Commonwealth Constitution Act 1901.

The only other alternative to this conclusion is persons within the Federal and Tasmanian public service (Justice Dept, ASIO, Tasmanian Police etc...) were running the same agenda on their own - a group of them - and compromised persons in the Tasmanian Govt. into cooperating with them - however it would have been unlikely it could have occurred without the knowledge and sanction of Federal politicians.

Was this a case of the federal bureaucrats telling Tasmania "you will do this - do as you are told" claiming they were acting under some authority granted them?

If this is the case then it explains why our politicians are so shy do not want to admit the civil service is out of control.

There are no other credible conclusions to these.

There is also a question whether persons overseas running the same agenda were also involved - in particular those in the Clinton Administration, the UN and those supporting them and their agenda of evil.

I hope you have enjoyed reading **The OzBoy Files – Truth About Port Arthur Part 1**, look out for **Part 2 & 3** where we totally destroy the DPP, Government and Media's case against Martin Bryant, thanks for reading.





We are asking people if they can donate something to keep Freedom Collective alive and producing more

Great Books

Videos

Web Sites

Stories & Articles

Here is our Banking details.

Bank Account Details

Name On Account: **Freedom Collective**

BSB: **013516**

Account No: **479225403**

Bank Swift Code: **ANZBAU3M**

Bank: **ANZ Banking Corporation**

927 Sturt Street

Ballarat Victoria 3350 Australia

Please just give the above details to your Bank Teller It cost \$25.00 to transfer – wire / deposit money straight into our account from overseas.

And **“0”** Amount to Transfer / Pay Anybody from your Bank Account in Australia & to deposit money into our Account at any ANZ Bank.

And thank you to everybody who donates!



Some Great Web Sites To Visit and Read

<http://southeastasianews.org>

<http://how911wasdone.com>

<http://binladden.blogspot.com/>

<http://itwasntmuslims.blogspot.com/>

<http://ozradiationnews.blogspot.com>

<http://www.alqaedadoesntexist.com/>

Support The OzBoy Files
Buy a T-shirt, Cap, Jacket, Camera today

<http://www.cafepress.com.au/OzboyFiles>



<http://www.cafepress.com.au/OzboyFiles>





<http://www.cafepress.com.au/OzboyFiles>



SEARCH FOR TRUTH

whatREALLYhappened.com



SEARCH FOR TRUTH