

National Human Rights Consultation Submission

AGWW-7T293B

Name: James SINNAMON

Submission Text:

This submission disputes the entire justification for the draconian anti-terrorist laws that have taken away from ordinary citizens, basic human rights and civil liberties that were once taken for granted in Australia.

As few cannot be unaware the justification for these draconian laws and the associated imposts upon our daily lives such as airport security checks and the banning of the ownership of megaphones, deemed by former Prime minister John Howard to be a terrorist weapon was the spectacular and deadly terrorist attack of 11 September 2001, the anthrax scare that shortly ensued and a number of other deadly terrorist attacks that have occurred since then - Bali, the Madrid bombing and the London Tube bombing.

Much of Australian public opinion had come to accept that the curtailments of our rights are a price well worth paying in order to prevent similar tragedies from ever occurring on our own shores.

OFFICIAL ACCOUNT OF 9/11, THE BASIS FOR ANTI-TERRORIST LEGISLATION, DISPUTED BY MANY CREDIBLE AUTHORITATIVE PUBLIC FIGURES

However, a large number of credible, authoritative and well known figures as well as a substantial sections of public opinion in the United States, and even more so, outside the United States question the official explanations of these attacks. They argue that the evidence that the attacks were perpetrated by a ubiquitous world wide terrorist network known as 'al Qaeda' has never been produced. They also argue that the investigations by the 9/11 Commission and the US National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) failed to ask many critical questions and ignored a great deal of evidence submitted to them.

The supposed evidence of Al Qaeda's guilt that was given to NATO by Colin Powell in order to win NATO's participation in the so-called 'war on terror' has never been made public and the evidence promised by Colin Powell to the United Nations, that would have legally made the United Nations a participant in the 'war on terror', was never produced.

Many have therefore called for the holding of a new and thorough investigation that would properly examine all the physical evidence, take account of all witnesses' statements and have the power to subpoena key players in the events of 9/11 including former President George W Bush, former Vice President Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice.

Indeed, it seems as if the City of New York may very well soon be conducting its own investigation into 9/11 as the group New York City Coalition for Accountability Now (NYCCAN - <http://nyccan.com>) has succeeded in collecting, as of 14 June 2009, 47,767 signatures of residents of New York City which asks that New York City hold a ballot within 3 months to decide whether or not an investigation into 9/11 be set up by New York City. This number exceeds the number of 45,000 that would make the holding of the ballot mandatory.

Many who question the official version of 9/11 go as far as to argue that, because of mountains of physical evidence which contradicts the official story and the fact that senior members of the Bush administration have been caught out lying and contradicting themselves, there is a prima facie case that members of the Bush administration themselves were complicit in the September 11 attacks.

People who are calling for a new investigation include:

* Lt. Col. Robert Bowman, PhD, U.S. Air Force (ret). Colonel Bowman was a fighter pilot who flew 100 missions in the Vietnam war. He served on President Ronald Reagan's Star Wars program.

* General Wesley Clark, U.S. Army (ret) former head of NATO.

* Col. George Nelson, MBA, U.S. Air Force (ret) Colonel Nelson is an experienced air crash investigator who states that the physical evidence at the crash sites of United Airways Flight 95 flatly contradicts the official account. (see <http://www.physics911.net/georgenelson>).

* Lt. Col. Guy S. Razer, MS Aeronautical Science, U.S. Air Force (ret)

* Raymond L. McGovern – Former Chairman, National Intelligence Estimates. Responsible for preparing the President's Daily Brief (PDB) for Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. 27-year CIA veteran. Former U.S. Army Intelligence Officer.

* William Christison – Former Director of the CIA's Office of Regional and Political Analysis, a 250-person unit responsible for political analysis of every country and region in the world. 29-year CIA veteran.

* US Senator Max Cleland – Former member of the 9/11 Commission.

* Morgan Reynolds – Chief Economist, U.S. Department of Labor under George W. Bush 2001 - 2002.

* Paul Craig Roberts – Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Treasury under Ronald Reagan.

* Daniel Ellsberg - Author of "The Pentagon Papers" which told the world the truth about the Vietnam War.

* Paul Hellyer – Former Minister of National Defense of Canada.

* Michael Meacher – Former Under Secretary for Industry, Under Secretary for Health and Social Security, Minister for the Environment, and Member of the House of Commons (UK).

* Tony Benn – Former Member of British Parliament 1942 - 2001.

* Andreas von Buelow, PhD – Former State Secretary of the Federal Ministry of Defense of West Germany.

* Horst Ehmke, PhD – Former Minister of Justice (West Germany). Former Minister for Research and Technology.

* Francesco Cossiga – President of Italy (1985 - 1992) and Former Prime Minister.

* Yukihisa Fujita – Member, House of Councillors (the upper house), National Diet of Japan.

* Jeanette Fitzsimons – Greens Member of Parliament, New Zealand, 1996 - present.

* General Leonid Ivashov – Former Chief of Staff of the Russian armed forces.

Many more who are calling for a new investigation are listed on the web site <http://patriotsquestion911.com/>

Abundant solid evidence in contradiction with the official account of the 9/11 attacks can be found on many sites including <http://ae911truth.org> (Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth) and <http://911truth.org>

If these people are right -- and I believe they are -- then Australia's efforts to combat terrorism are not directed towards where the real terrorist threat lies.

BALI BOMBING

In regard to the terrorist threat much closer to home, on 12 October 2004 former president, Abdurrahman Wahid said in an interview with SBS that he believed that either the Indonesian military or the Indonesian police planted the second larger bomb which destroyed the Sari Club. This allegation has never been properly investigated.

Before discussing the appropriateness or otherwise of the measures now in place to combat terrorism, the Human Rights consultation needs to evaluate firstly how real is that threat and secondly from what quarters the terrorist threat, if it exists, is likely to come from.

The Human Rights Consultation should therefore at least seriously look at the abundant evidence which stands in contradiction to the official accounts of terrorists atrocities in recent years and try to bring about renewed and proper investigations. Furthermore, it should give its full support to those people overseas who are seeking to bring about proper investigations into 9/11, the London Tube Bombings, the Madrid Train bombings, the Bali bombings etc.

%0A