

Show 218 – Fear



Fear ...

... is a feeling induced by perceived danger or [threat](#) that occurs in certain types of [organisms](#), which causes a change in metabolic and organ functions and ultimately a change in behavior, such as fleeing, hiding or freezing from perceived traumatic events.

Fear in human beings may occur in response to a specific [stimulus](#) occurring in the present, or in anticipation or expectation of a future threat perceived as a [risk](#) to body or life.

The fear response arises from the [perception](#) of [danger](#) leading to confrontation with or escape from/avoiding the threat (also known as the [fight-or-flight response](#)), which in extreme cases of fear ([horror and terror](#)) can be a freeze response or [paralysis](#).

In humans and animals, fear is modulated by the process of [cognition](#) and learning. Thus fear is judged as [rational](#) or appropriate and [irrational](#) or inappropriate. An irrational fear is called a [phobia](#).

[Psychologists](#) such as [John B. Watson](#), [Robert Plutchik](#), and [Paul Ekman](#) have suggested that there is only a small set of basic or [innate](#) emotions and that fear is one of them.

This hypothesized set includes such emotions as [acute stress reaction](#), [anger](#), [angst](#), [anxiety](#), fright, [horror](#), [joy](#), [panic](#) and [sadness](#). Fear is closely related to, but should be distinguished from, the emotion [anxiety](#), which occurs as the result of threats that are perceived to be uncontrollable or unavoidable.

The fear response serves survival by generating appropriate behavioral responses, so it has been preserved throughout [evolution](#).¹

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fear>

Culture of fear

Culture of fear (or **climate of fear**) is the concept that people may incite [fear](#) in the general public to achieve political goals.

It is also a term applied to the workplace.

In the workplace

Ashforth discussed potentially destructive sides of [leadership](#) and identified what he referred to as [petty tyrants](#), i.e., leaders who exercise a tyrannical style of management, resulting in a climate of fear in the workplace.

Partial or intermittent negative [reinforcement](#) can create an effective climate of fear and [doubt](#). When employees get the sense that bullies “get away with it”, a climate of fear may be the result.

Several studies have confirmed a relationship between bullying, on the one hand, and an autocratic leadership and an authoritarian way of settling [conflicts](#) or dealing with disagreements, on the other.

An authoritarian style of leadership may create a climate of fear, where there is little or no room for dialogue and where complaining may be considered futile.

In a study of public-sector union members, approximately one in five workers reported having considered [leaving](#) the workplace as a result of witnessing bullying taking place.

Rayner explained these figures by pointing to the presence of a climate of fear in which employees considered reporting to be unsafe, where bullies had “got away with it” previously despite management knowing of the presence of bullying.

Individual differences in sensitivity to reward, punishment, and motivation have been studied under the premises of [reinforcement sensitivity theory](#) and have also been [applied to workplace performance](#).

In politics

Nazi leader [Hermann Göring](#) explains how people can be made fearful and to support a war they otherwise would oppose:

The people don't want war, but they can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. This is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and for exposing the country to danger. It works the same in every country.

The three psychological components of the culture of fear included silence through censorship, sense of isolation, and a "generalized belief that all channels of opposition were closed." A "feeling of complete hopelessness," prevailed, in addition to "withdrawal from opposition activity."

Former US National Security Advisor [Zbigniew Brzezinski](#) argues that the use of the term [War on Terror](#) was intended to generate a culture of fear deliberately because it **"obscures reason, intensifies emotions and makes it easier for demagogic politicians to mobilize the public on behalf of the policies they want to pursue"**.

[Frank Furedi](#), a former professor of Sociology and writer for [Spiked](#) magazine, says that today's culture of fear did not begin with the collapse of the [World Trade Center](#). Long before September 11, he argues, public panics were widespread – on everything from [GM crops](#) to mobile phones, from global warming to [foot-and-mouth disease](#).

British academics Gabe Mythen and Sandra Walklate argue that following terrorist attacks in New York, the Pentagon, Madrid, and London, **government agencies developed a discourse of "new terrorism" in a cultural climate of fear and uncertainty. UK researchers argued that this processes reduced notion of public safety and created the simplistic image of a non-white "terroristic other" that has negative consequences for ethnic minority groups in the UK.**

In his 2004 BBC documentary film series, *The Power of Nightmares*, subtitled *The Rise of the Politics of Fear*, the journalist [Adam Curtis](#) argues that politicians have used our fears to increase their power and control over society. Though he does not use the term "culture of fear", what Curtis describes in his film is a reflection of this concept. He looks at the American [neo-conservative](#) movement and its depiction of the [threat](#) first from the [Soviet Union](#) and then from radical [Islamists](#).

Curtis insists there has been a largely illusory fear of terrorism in the west since the [September 11 attacks](#) and that politicians such as [George W Bush](#) and [Tony Blair](#) had stumbled on a new force to restore their power and authority; using the fear of an organised "web of evil" from which they could protect their people.'

[Curtis's film castigated the media, security forces and the Bush administration for expanding their power in this way.](#)

The film features [Bill Durodié](#), then Director of the International Centre for Security Analysis, and Senior [Research Fellow](#) in the International Policy Institute, [King's College London](#), saying that to call this network an "invention" would be too strong a term, but he asserts that it probably does not exist and is largely a "(projection) of our own worst fears, and that what we see is a fantasy that's been created."

In a recent book, [Maximiliano E Korstanje](#) dangled the possibility the war on terror opens the doors for the upsurge of an old culture of fear, which though dormant in American life, results from the Puritan cosmology.

Far from being an external threat, Korstanje adds, terrorism represents a social phenomenon enrooted in the capacity of extortion and speculation, which nothing have to do with religion. This suggests that the main cultural values that determined terrorism are being created and disseminated through West.

[In this vein, Geoffrey Skoll argues that fear is used by elite in order to maintain its legitimacy over workforce, though it varied from time to time into different shapes.](#)

The meaning of fear not only is changing the tenets of democracy that characterized the life in America, as well as law-making, but also the ways judges understand the rights of workers.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Culture_of_fear

1984

The war is not meant to be won, it is meant to be continuous. Hierarchical society is only possible on the basis of poverty and ignorance. This new version is the past and no different past can ever have existed. In principle the war effort is always planned to keep society on the brink of starvation. The war is waged by the ruling group against its own subjects and its object is not the victory over either Eurasia or East Asia, but to keep the very structure of society intact.

[George Orwell](#) (mecci - Actually quoted from the movie 1984 - the actual quote from the book by Orwell is a lot longer.

English essayist, novelist, & satirist (1903 - 1950)

Tactics in the Media “If it bleeds, it leads”

The tactics used to communicate a message using fear-mongering range in different media. The news is an example where they aren't trying to inform the country of stories happening at the moment but rather scaring people about bombs and terrorist attacks.

It's the way its portrayed rather than straight forward truth there are headlines reading “TERRORIST ATTACK BOMBS” in bright red and bloody writing. Psychologically this will inform the viewer what it is however adding the sense of fear and therefore intriguing them to watch.

These types of stories prey on anxieties and hold the viewer hostage in their own home forced to watch what's happening in their beloved country.

Previously reporting the news used to be honest, truthful and fair, it's not about who gets the story first anymore but rather about who gets the best ratings due to the amount of horror stories taking first place.

(mecci - To Make matters worse most media is now owned by 6 large corporations – which clearly would never use that kind of power for their own gain or benefit)

Aside:

*Concentration of media ownership (also known as **media consolidation** or **media convergence**) is a process whereby progressively fewer individuals or organizations control increasing shares of the [mass media](#). Contemporary research demonstrates increasing levels of consolidation, with many media industries already [highly concentrated](#) and [dominated by a very small number of firms](#).*

Globally, large media conglomerates include [Viacom](#), [CBS Corporation](#), [Time Warner](#), [21st Century Fox](#) and [News Corp](#) (the former [News Corporation](#), split in 2013), [Bertelsmann AG](#), [Sony](#), [Comcast](#), [Vivendi](#), [Televisa](#), [The Walt Disney Company](#), [Hearst Corporation](#), [Organizações Globo](#) and [Lagardère Group](#).

As of 2015, [Comcast Corporation](#) is the largest [media conglomerate](#) in the US, with [The Walt Disney Company](#), [Twenty-First Century Fox](#) and [Time Warner](#) ranking second, third and fourth respectively.

Over time the amount of media merging has increased and the amount of [media outlets](#) have increased. That translates to fewer companies owning more media outlets, increasing the concentration of ownership. In 1983, 90% of US media was controlled by fifty companies; today, 90% is controlled by just six companies.]

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Concentration_of_media_ownership

Bloody shootings or murders take first story on the news these days but the story is never deep enough, the story stays at a surface level to emphasise the fear rather than explain the story. (Psy.D., 2011)

Another tactic used is called a “Crawl”. Viewers see this "crawl" scroll across the bottom on the screen which is related to “breaking news”, which will generally consist of something rather horrific which draws the viewers attention away from what's actually being talked about and instead to what's happening on the bottom of the screen.

The use of crawls is becoming a more common occurrence with some shows having 2-4 crawls per show and its not just on news-based programmes that it's happening. Adults and children are getting

used to having information shoved down their throats as it's available to pop up or read at any time. (Psy.D., 2011)

Using these fear based tactics have made people think that living in certain places is too dangerous or that crime rates have risen considerably and tainting their thoughts with these fearful stories and images is making the viewers think the world is an unsafe place when in reality these stories are coming from a small portion of the world and what's really going on that's important of the world to know is running as a mediocre story.

The generations growing up with this as news is going to think this is how it's always been, a biased truth.(Psy.D., 2011)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fear_mongering

A scholar's point of view

Our society, in many respects, is built on fear. News reports seem to be constantly announcing a crime alert, terror watch or consumer warning, and a new danger – such as West Nile virus, a really bad flu season or a shark attack – is right around the corner.

Meanwhile, the federal government is continually waging war, be it on crime, drugs – or, most recently, terror.

While reasonable concern is healthy, ASU Regents Professor David Altheide says much of the fear around us is unwarranted. It boils down to overuse of the language of fear, and an overeager media and entertainment industry attempting to strike an emotional chord.

“There’s now a discourse of fear that pervades society,” says the ASU School of Justice and Social Inquiry professor. “The discourse relates to the sense that danger, dread and fear are pervasive and just around the corner.”

Last fall, Altheide, earned the Charles Horton Cooley Book Award from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction for his book, "Creating Fear, News and the Construction of a Crisis." He is the first person to ever win that prestigious national honor twice, with the first coming in 1986 for his book “Media Power.”

His newest book, *Terrorism and the Politics of Fear*, due out this fall, looks at the use of fear in politics and its relation to the war on terror. The work documents how decision makers promote and use fear to push their own political agendas – and exact more social control over citizens.

Altheide, an expert in the use of content analysis of the media, says the language of fear has slowly built up in everyday use for a more than a decade. He says the use of language began to change with the government’s “war on crime,” as military terminology was integrated into common use. Eventually, he says, fear became built into every news story.

Entertainment has also taken on a decidedly more fearful tone, with storylines playing off of society’s fear.

"The metaphors from the arena of war slip into other areas of life," he says. "The fear became cumulative. One fear builds on another. This created a mood, an almost default assumption you weren't going to make it home at night."

In many ways, Altheide says former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was correct when he uttered the famous line, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." If society becomes based on fear, the professor says, the biggest consequence is that people will change their lives to deal with it.

"Social life starts to change because of it, and we start altering our lives," he says. "We don't go out as much. Architecturally, we protect ourselves with gated communities, high walls and no windows. Public space begins to decline."

Altheide says the answer is to take a realistic look at life and the risks around us. While there is such a fear of crime, rates are going down. In 2001, the national news media was bombarding people with frightening images of shark attacks along the nation's coast, building almost to the point of hysteria. In reality, while some of the attacks were sensational in nature, the overall number had dropped.

He maintains hope that the news media – which he says bears a great responsibility in all of this – will start to reverse the trend.

"Journalists can't keep touting fear," he says. "I think we have to find ways to talk about issues and make it interesting without scaring people. We need to find ways to say it without fear."

Altheide says he will do his part and continue to get the word out about the use of fear in media. In the fall, he will apply some of these ideas in a special course on terrorism.

<http://www.asu.edu/feature/includes/spring05/readmore/altheide.html>

[Fear and the race for control](#)

The statistics

Mass shootings: There were 372 mass shootings in the US in 2015, killing 475 people and wounding 1,870, according to the Mass Shooting Tracker, which catalogues such incidents. A mass shooting is defined as a single shooting incident which kills or injures four or more people, including the assailant.

Source: [Mass Shooting Tracker](#)

School shootings: There were 64 school shootings in 2015, according to a dedicated campaign group set up in the wake of the Sandy Hook elementary school massacre in Connecticut in 2012. Those figures include occasions when a gun was fired but no-one was hurt.

Source: [Everytown for Gun Safety Research](#)

All shootings: Some 13,286 people were killed in the US by firearms in 2015, according to the Gun Violence Archive, and 26,819 people were injured [those figures exclude suicide]. Those figures are likely to rise by several hundred, once incidents in the final week of the year are counted.

Source: [Gun Violence Archive](#)

How the US compares: The number of gun murders per capita in the US in 2012 - the most recent year for comparable statistics - was nearly 30 times that in the UK, at 2.9 per 100,000 compared with just 0.1.

Of all the murders in the US in 2012, 60% were by firearm compared with 31% in Canada, 18.2% in Australia, and just 10% in the UK.

Source: [UNODC](#).

The home front: So many people die annually from gunfire in the US that the death toll between 1968 and 2011 eclipses all wars ever fought by the country. According to research by Politifact, there were about 1.4 million firearm deaths in that period, compared with 1.2 million US deaths in every conflict from the War of Independence to Iraq.

Source: [Politifact](#).

Total number of guns: No official figure exists but there are thought to be about 300 million in the US, held by about a third of the population. That is nearly enough guns for every man, woman and child in the country.

The NRA: The right to own guns is regarded by many as enshrined in the [Second Amendment to the US Constitution](#), and fiercely defended by lobby groups such as the National Rifle Association, which [boasted](#) that its membership surged to around five million in the aftermath of the Sandy Hook school shooting.

Gun violence and terrorism: The US spends more than a trillion dollars per year defending itself against terrorism, which kills a tiny fraction of the number of people killed by ordinary gun crime.

According to figures from the [US Department of Justice](#) and the [Council on Foreign Affairs](#), 11,385 people died on average annually in firearm incidents in the US between 2001 and 2011.

In the same period, an average of 517 people were killed annually in terror-related incidents. Removing 2001, when 9/11 occurred, from the calculation produces an annual average of just 31.

<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-34996604>

OBAMA

“The one thing we do know is that we have a pattern now of mass shootings in this country that has no parallel anywhere else in the world, and there’s some steps we could take, not to eliminate every one of these mass shootings, but to improve the odds that they don’t happen as frequently.”

— **President Obama, interview that aired on CBS Evening News, Dec. 2, 2015**

“With respect to Planned Parenthood, obviously, my heart goes out to the families of those impacted. ... I say this every time we’ve got one of these mass shootings: This just doesn’t happen in other countries.”

— **Obama, news conference at COP21 climate conference in Paris, Dec. 1, 2015**

“We are the only advanced country on Earth that sees these kinds of mass shootings every few months.”

— **Obama, [statement](#) on shootings at Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, Ore., Oct. 1, 2015**

“You don’t see murder on this kind of scale, with this kind of frequency, in any other advanced nation on Earth.”

— **Obama, [speech](#) at U.S. Conference of Mayors, June 19, 2015**

“At some point, we as a country will have to reckon with the fact that this type of mass violence does not happen in other advanced countries. It doesn’t happen in other places with this kind of frequency. And it is in our power to do something about it.”

— **Obama, [statement](#) on the shooting in Charleston, S.C., June 18, 2015**

State University of New York-Oswego public justice professor Jaclyn Schildkraut and Texas State University researcher H. Jaymi Elsass have been tracking mass shooting incidents in 14 countries from 2000 to 2014.

They compared the United States to 11 other countries (Canada, Finland, China, Britain, Australia, France, Germany, Mexico, Norway and Switzerland), and found the United States had a lower rate of mass shooting fatalities per 100,000 people than Norway, Finland and Switzerland.

Other than China, these countries were all member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the common measure for “advanced” countries. But the actual count of incidents showed the United States had 133 shootings during the period, compared to a maximum of six in each of the other countries.

In their comparison of the United States to 19 other, mostly non-OECD countries, Lebanon rated higher than the United States in mass shooting fatality rate. They excluded shootings related to gang violence or targeted militant or terrorist activity.

There are caveats to these data. The researchers also looked at mass shootings that resulted in multiple injuries, not just fatalities. This could have driven the number of shootings up, especially for the United States. For comparison, Mother Jones’s [mass shootings database](#) of four or more fatalities from 1982 to October 2015 lists 72 shootings.

Plus, the Schildkraut/Elsass list is not exhaustive; they are still compiling the list of shootings in other countries, and it does not include all of the shootings that may fit their definition.

It’s also important to note that Norway, Finland and Switzerland all had one or two incidents each that left multiple dead or injured. The United States, in contrast, had 133 shootings that killed or injured multiple victims, according to their research.

For example, a single 2011 attack in Norway, a country of about 5 million people, killed at least 67 people. On a per capita basis, that equates to about 5,000 victims in the United States. In contrast, there were at least four mass shootings that killed four or more victims in the United States in 2011, but it did not add up to the number of people who died in Norway, Schildkraut said.

Schildkraut said it’s “absolutely not fair” to count the sheer number of incidents of shootings, which shows the United States ranks far higher than any other country. Plus, comparing shootings across countries is an apples-to-oranges comparison, because gun policies, politics and attitudes are unique to each country, she said.

John R. Lott Jr., a gun rights analyst who [has tracked](#) mass shooting rates in the United States and European countries, said Obama’s references to “frequency” are problematic and inaccurate: “If you are going to compare the U.S. to someplace else, if you are going to compare it to small countries, you have to adjust for population.

Alternatively, compare the U.S. to Europe as a whole.” Comparing to the U.S. to Europe (including OECD and non-OECD countries) from 2009 to 2015 shows the rate of mass shootings in the United States and Europe are about the same, Lott said. (Lott uses the FBI definition of four or more killings in a public space, excludes gang or crime-related activity, and includes acts identified as terrorism.)

Astute readers might notice how Lankford and Lott both compared the United States to grouped European countries, but their conclusions are vastly different. Lott says the rate is about the

same, while Lankford says the rate is five times higher in the United States. How is this possible? The researchers are looking at different sets of years and different sets of countries. (Lott looked at Europe as a whole; Lankford at the European Union.) Lott uses a broader measure of mass shootings than Lankford does. Lankford looks at the number of shooters; Lott uses fatalities and shooting incidents. This is an example of how the data and definition can be adjusted to show different findings about mass shootings, even using a per capita rate.

(mecci – **There are Lies, Damned Lies and Statistics**)

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2015/12/03/obamas-inconsistent-claim-on-the-frequency-of-mass-shootings-in-the-u-s-compared-to-other-countries/>

More Statistics:

	Rampage Shooting Fatalities (2009-2013) Per 1,000,000	Total Rampage Shooting Fatalities (2009-2013)*	Fatal Rampage Shooting Incidents (2009-2013) Per 1,000,000	Total Fatal Rampage Shooting Incidents (2009-2013)*	Population**	Level of Firearm Regulation***	GNI Per US\$** (r \$36,914)
Norway	15.3	77	0.19	1	5033675	Restrictive	88890
Finland	1.85	8	0.37	2	5421827	Restrictive	48420
Slovakia	1.47	8	0.19	1	5445324	Restrictive	16070
Israel	1.38	11	0.25	2	7941900	Restrictive	28930
Switzerland	0.75	6	0.25	2	8000000	Restrictive	76380
United States	0.72	227	0.12	38	314941000	Permissive	48450
Belgium	0.63	7	0.09	1	11041266	Permissive	46160
Netherlands	0.42	7	0.06	1	16751323	Restrictive	49730
Germany	0.31	25	0.04	3	81799600	Restrictive	43980
United Kingdom	0.19	13	0.02	1	62262000	Restrictive	37780
Canada	0.17	6	0.06	2	35010000	Restrictive	45560
France	0.06	4	0.02	1	65350000	Restrictive	42420

The U.S.' index of 0.12 per 5,000,000 places it behind Norway, Finland, Slovakia, Israel, and Switzerland – at half the ratio.

The top 5 countries for mass shootings per capita all have “restrictive” gun policies.

<http://conservativepost.com/this-chart-about-mass-shooting-in-the-world-completely-devastate-obamas-speech/>

Interlude

So, the statistics show a number of competing view points. As I said , there are lies, damned lies and statistics.

More interestingly, looking at Sandy Hook, one cannot help but question the veracity of the story.

Could it really have been a hoax? Seems incredible, but if it was it shows a number of things.

First, though, there are three possible scenarios:

1. Sandy Hook was truly a tragic event perpetrated by an insane gunman – Case closed and we should all hand our guns in
2. The Sandy Hook shooting was real but was perpetrated with government (elite) consent or even on their orders.

3. Sand Hook was a Hoax

If it was a hoax, then, as we said, it shows a number of things.

1. The elite is not ready to go to that level of evil – and make no mistake there is no coming back from that. Once a heinous act like that is committed it will stain your soul forever. And no, I am not being religious here. We know certain things are wrong, deep down, we know. That deep down I like to call our essence, soul, call it what you will. Killing the innocent, doing violence to them in any form is abhorred by every culture, every creed. So, faking it is a good sign.
2. It also means they are getting desperate and maybe plans are not progressing as they had hoped. If a Sandy Hook event cannot spark strong anti gun and strong pro gun control sentiments in the population, nothing can. We are in with a chance yet.
3. If the truth were to be known, faking a mass child shooting is a lot more forgivable than actually shooting children. So, the elite may fear some retribution at some point.

This shows some restraint. Restraint that was not shown in Australia.

WARNING

We will discuss Port Arthur only briefly and raise only the most disturbing details. We must warn our listenership that some of the accounts that we are going to share are graphic and may be distressing.

Please tune out now if you think this may be too much for you to handle.

Port Arthur

Australia

After the [Port Arthur massacre](#) in [Australia](#), the government changed [gun laws in Australia](#). Since the new gun laws were introduced in 1996 Australia has only had one mass shooting, which was in 2014 when a farmer shot dead 4 family members then latter killing himself.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass_shooting

(mecci – Interesting and wrong, also how many shootings did Australia have prior to that?)

Starting in 1971 (before that almost all mass killings were perpetrated against aborigines), there were 15 mass shootings, including 6 family murders and a number of criminal and bikie related shootings, totaling 95 fatalities in 25 years.

Then Port Arthur happened – 35 fatalities – 24 wounded

After Port Arthur another 5 mass shootings are recorded, toatalling 25 deaths up to 2015.

Apart from the massacres on the aborigines the Port Arthur incident stands out like a beacon at midnight on a moonless night.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_massacres_in_Australia

Another view on what transpired

Australia's Port Arthur Massacre

On Sunday April 28th, 1996, at the tourist site of Port Arthur in Tasmania, 35 people were killed and more wounded by a rampaging gunman, in what has become known as the Port Arthur massacre.

Joe Vials, the author of this report, is an independent investigator with thirty years direct experience of international military and oilfield operations.

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.

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.

This is the sequence of events that day:

The gunman rose from his chair at one of the tables in the Broad Arrow Cafe, removed the AR15 and spare magazine from a sports bag, immediately killing Mr Yee Ng with a shot to the upper neck, and Miss Chung with a shot to the head. Swivelling on the spot and firing from the right hip, the gunman fired at Mr Sargent who was wounded in the head, then killed Miss Scott with a shot to the head.

The gunman continued through the Broad Arrow, next killing Mr Nightingale with a shot to the upper neck and Mr Bennet with a shot to the upper neck, with the latter bullet passing straight through and hitting Mr Ray Sharpe in the head with fatal results. Next Mr Kevin Sharpe was killed by a shot to the head and was also hit in the arm, with shrapnel and bone fragments from the second intermediate strike on Mr Kevin Sharpe then apparently wounding Mr Broome, and possibly Mr and Mrs Fidler.

Still firing from the hip the gunman swivelled and killed Mr Mills and Mr Kistan with single shots to the head, with shrapnel and skull fragments from those shots apparently wounding Mrs Walker, Mrs Law, and Mrs Barker. Again the gunman turned, shooting and wounding Mr Colyer in the neck, before swivelling and killing Mr Howard with a shot to the head. Next he shot Mrs Howard in the neck and head with fatal effect. The gunman turned back, killing Miss Loughton with a shot to the head, and wounding Mrs Loughton in the back. Moving towards the rear of the building the gunman shot Mr Elliot in the head, causing serious injuries.

ELAPSED TIME 15 SECONDS...

The above sequence is the best the forensic scientists could deduce from the crime scene and there may be small variations, but in the final analysis they matter little.

What does matter is that at this precise juncture the gunman had killed twelve victims and wounded a further ten in 15 seconds flat, using only 17 rounds fired from the right hip. Such a staggering performance is on a par with the best combat shooters in the world, and two retired counter-terrorist marksmen ruefully admitted they would be hard pressed to equal such awesome speed and accuracy.

Both agreed that attributing such a performance to an intellectually-impaired invalid with an IQ of 66 and severely limited cognitive functions, amounts to nothing less than certifiable insanity on the part of Bryant's accusers. In military terms a fatal shot to the upper neck counts as a head shot, so for all practical purposes those who died during the first 15

seconds were killed by head shots fired with lethal accuracy from the gunman's hip.

Next the very professional gunman moved towards the area of the souvenir shop and killed Nicole Burgess with a shot to the head, then shot Mrs Elizabeth Howard through the chest and arm with fatal consequences. Swivelling around, the gunman killed Mr Lever with a shot to the head, and killed Mrs Neander with another shot to the head.

Temporarily distracted, he fired back into the cafe area and wounded Mr Crosswell. Turning again he shot Mr Winter twice, killing him with a shot to the head. On his way back to the souvenir area the gunman wounded Mr Olson, then proceeded to the kill-zone near the locked door where he killed Mr Jary, Pauline Masters, and Mr Nash, all of them with single shots to the head.

At this stage the gunman had killed twenty and wounded another twelve with a total of 29 rounds.

He then stopped firing and changed magazines in a most professional way. The magazine fitted to the AR15 held 30 rounds total, so by changing magazines after firing only 29 shots the gunman ensured that he still had a live round in the breech in case anyone moved, enabling him to kill that person instantly if caught unawares. Such professionalism is well known to counter-terrorist personnel.

Critically, the gunman then waited motionless in the Broad Arrow Cafe with a fully loaded magazine, which brings us back to the differential between the verified time estimate of four to five minutes, and the inaccurate official claim of 90 seconds.

The siege at Seascap

Bryant was firmly in place and Seascap was swiftly surrounded by armed police from Tasmania and Victoria, most of whom must have been very puzzled as the siege continued through the night. If we are to believe media reports **Martin Bryant fired 250 rounds during the siege period but hit nothing at all**, which is exactly what one would expect of someone whose prior experience was limited to a Webley Osprey air rifle.

If the professional shooter had fired 250 rounds from Seascap Cottage during the siege, his awesome killed-to-wounded ratio would have resulted in a police funeral cortege stretching from the Tasman Peninsula to Hobart.

It is beyond doubt that many of the armed police noticed Bryant's wild undisciplined performance at Seascap bore absolutely no resemblance at all to that of the deadly shooter at port Arthur and some must have told their senior officers about it, though it seems they were ignored or simply told to shut up. The media had its man, the feeding frenzy was in full swing and the police were not going to be allowed to spoil a lucrative politically-correct story by telling the truth.

(mecci – you make up your own mind about this...)

<http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/palies1.htm>