

NEW RCB EVIDENCE WHICH PROVES DEFENCE UNTRUTHS

Intro

These comments are linked to the information contained in a archived Defence File Ground defence – RAAF Butterworth Ground defence Plans Part 8 against the NOS Submissions Background Information Paper Nature of service Classification ADF Service at RAAF Butterworth dated 14 Oct 2011 and 2011 Nature of Service Branch Review ADF Service at RAAF Butterworth 1970-1989.

The first major question is how many times does Defence falsehoods have to be proven in their submissions before they loose all credibility?

Next I have critiqued both submissions under the following criteria:

1. Cat 1- Statement is technically incorrect.
2. Cat 2- Statement is not appropriate to actual responsibilities conducted.
3. Cat 3- Intentionally misleading.
4. Cat 4- Leaving relevant evidence out for discussion as it is in support of RCB claims.
5. Cat 5- Making statements with no evidence.

So the Background Information Paper Nature of Service Classification – ADF Service at RAAF Butterworth has the following inconsistencies:

1. Cat 1-6
2. Cat2-1
3. Cat3-3
4. Cat 4-3
5. Cat 5-4

The document 2011 Nature of Service Review ADF Service at RAAF Butterworth 1970-1989 has the following inconsistencies:

1. Cat 1-4
2. Cat2-4
3. Cat3-2
4. Cat4-6
5. Cat 5-2

Archive Documents

The following archive documents (170 pages) are to be viewed on the RAR SA website (www.rarasa.org.au) and the following comments are made:

1. Document 2 INTSUM threat to BAB remains unchanged. (Firstly this indicates there was threat even though it was low at that stage). Various other INTSUM's regarding CT actions in area but BAB threat remains unchanged.
2. Document 6-12 AJSP 1/1973 Plan Asbestos. Page 8 emphasises "protection of Australian assets, property and personnel at BAB' as key role. Page 11 Para 15 details the media deception plan.
3. Document 19 Para 3 CAS expressing concern about RCB moving away from BAB for training and highlighting the CNS comment that the Committee was losing sight of the primary task of RCB.

4. Document 65 Apr 1975 Minute from CAS to Minister expressing security concerns may last a month.
5. Document 71 Apr 75 Minute from CAS to Minister detailing increased security arrangements at BAB.
6. Document 80 MINDEF Malaysia concerned about rocket attacks on BAB.
7. Document 84 DAFI Minute regarding CT's possessing mortars adds to the threat against BAB.
8. Document 86-87 INTSUM DAFI 4 Aug 75 The threat to BAB must be considered to be slowly increasing.
9. Document 90-91 SITREP Security 2 Aug 75. Increased arrangements each night include 5 standing patrols, piquet on aircraft and QRF responsibilities. RCB responsibilities to last for a month.
10. Document 95-124 Draft JIO paper on CT threat to BAB (published later) page 118 and 119 Possible forms of attack by CTO a, b, c and d. Page 123 The Threat Assessment was:
 - a) Unlikely external overt attack on Malaysia.
 - b) Potential threat to BAB from CTO.
 - c) Not likely yet.
 - d) Possible attack to embroil Australia.
 - e) Danger to attack BAB by CTO to achieve psychological and propaganda victory.
 - f) Some CTO members may act independently.
11. Document 125 INTREP CTO Instruction to attack airbases.
12. Document 128-129 JIO INTSUM 23 Jul 1975 CTO acquired 2 mortars. This will impact on BAB Security.
13. Document 131-147 SECRET Brief for DCAS concerning Security of Butterworth. Page 133 Primary Threat to BAB para 7 a and b. Page 134 para 9 current assessment. Page 135 para 11, 12 and 13 the effects of an attack on BAB. Page 146 para 35 No off base activities.
14. Document 148-149 SECRET Minute to Minister 7 Oct 75 para 6 highlighted possibility of CTO attacks on RAAF Assets.
15. Document 153 Security Situation in Malaysia deteriorated in last six months.

These documents show that the decisions made by the DHAAT Inquiry into RCB to be a political farce and the two Defence NOS papers to be patently false reconstructed history at best.

LtCol M Dennis, MBE (Rtd)