

Subject: Submission to Committee
Date: Wednesday, 21 March 2012 6:15:12 PM

To: The Committee Secretary
House of Representatives Standing Committee on Infrastructure and Communications
P.O Box 6021
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

Dear Sir/Madam

I feel compelled to write to the Committee in light of the submission made by Mr Peter Robertson on 19 March 2012 (which presents as a supplementary document to the submission made by the Department of Infrastructure & Transport).

In addition to the arguments I have already presented I would like to add the following comments:-

1. At slide 3 of the PowerPoint presentation from Mr Robertson it states Mr Abdulmutallab, the underwear bomb was "Not detected during security screening processes (including a frisk search)". It seems this statement has been made in a supplementary submission in light of the overwhelming public position that an "opt out" provision should be provided for in the proposed legislation. In response to this statement by Mr Robertson I point out the following:-

a. Mr Kurt Haskell (a witness to the attempted "underwear" bombing) made the following sworn statement to the Michigan state court:-

*"I witnessed Umar
dressed in jeans and
a white t-shirt,
being escorted around
security by a man in
a tan suit who spoke
perfect American
English and who aided
Umar in boarding
without a
passport.....
The Dutch police,
meanwhile, in this
article (show
article), also
confirmed that Umar
did not show his
passport in Amsterdam
which also meant that
he didn't go through
security as both are
in the same line in
Amsterdam*

." For the full article please see:- <http://www.infowars.com/breaking-kurt-haskell-exposes-government-false-flag-operation-during-underwear-bomber-sentencing/>

b. Following the underwear bomber incident, the manufacturer admitted that the scanners would be unlikely to have detected the bomb even if they had been used http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/8439285.stm

c. As per slide 8 under title "Technical" it appears the intent of the scanners is to identify areas on the body that have anomalies – following such anomalies a security agent will pat that person down in the relevant area. How then can Mr Robertson state that a "pat down" would be ineffectual in this regard yet allege that a scan followed by a pat down will be effective? This seems to be a contradictory statement.

In summary, I believe this statement by Mr Robertson is inaccurate (given there is no evidence to support said statement) and for the reasons stated above I believe the committee should disregard it entirely.

2. At slide 6 Mr Robertson has provided that "Any alternative would be less effective and more intrusive". For the reasons stated above, I do not agree that a "pat down" would be "less effective". In fact there is evidence that the scanners can be "fooled" please see <http://www.opposingviews.com/i/technology/gadgets/video-engineer-jonathan-corbett-shows-how-beat-tsa-body-scanners>. As to the statement that a pat down is "more intrusive" again I disagree with this. Although Mr Robertson has not explained what the basis of this statement is, one would presume with appropriate training, airport security would be able to "pat down" passengers in an appropriate manner. Presently, selected passengers receive a pat down and as far as I am aware, there have been no substantial complaints in this regard.

3. At slide 8 it is stated under title "Privacy" that the scanners "uses a generic human drawing". From my review of the L-3 Communications website and supporting commentary, this is not strictly true. The detailed image of the naked human body is created by the scanning machine and stored on the memory bank – a secondary piece of software then converts that image to a generic human drawing. Therefore, the machine uses what is termed as "facade software", meaning the detailed image is still produced and stored. I do note however, that allegedly this image is then deleted from the memory bank.

4. At slide 8 under title "Health and Safety" it states that "there is no evidence to suggest that millimetre-wave body scanners are a health risk for the travelling public or operators". This statement is also inaccurate - there is evidence that it's possible for the terahertz radiation emanating from these scanners to damage human DNA (see the study performed by Boian S. Alexandrov (and colleagues) at the Centre for Nonlinear Studies at the Los Alamos National Laboratory). The aforementioned study showed terahertz waves could "...unzip double-stranded DNA, creating bubbles in the double strand that could significantly interfere with processes such as gene expression and DNA replication." In laymen's terms, it would be a catalyst for developing cancer. I find it disturbing that this submission failed to consider a study that is widely published and available through even the most simple of "google" searches. It seems to me there is evidence to suggest that these machines could be harmful. Despite these reports, there are repeated assurances from the government that they are "safe" – in short the long term effect of these machines is unknown and in dispute. In the absence of a strong, independent, peer reviewed study that concludes these scanners have no long terms effects whatsoever, how can a responsible government introduce these scanners simply because they are not "proven to be dangerous" – this seems remarkably irresponsible. Surely, they should only be introduced if they are proven to be safe?

5. At slide 8 under title "Exposure levels" it also states that the frequency used in the millimetre-wave body scanner means the penetration into the human body will be lower than from most other exposures encountered in daily life. It states that "these (scanner) levels are thousands of times lower than that of a single phone call" and also provides "people will be exposed to "exceptionally low levels of electromagnetic energy". The L-3 Provision uses a gigahertz rating in the "ultra high" frequency zone. There is no other example of this kind of exposure "encountered in daily life". Further, the majority of radio waves in a telecommunication device is directed away from the body – meaning the head usually receives scatted radio waves. The L-3 device is directed **at** the entirety of the human body. In any event mobile phones are regarded as potential carcinogens which begs the question, why the government is going to great lengths to make unsupported statements as to the safety of these devices.

In short, I have been monitoring Bills for the past few years as they progress through parliament. This is the first time I have felt that a truly pointless, dangerous and oppressing piece of drafting has been presented. I urge the committee (as I will the Senate enquiry) to recommend the Bill be struck down in its entirety. In the absence of this, at the very least, an "opt out" provision should be provided to citizens for a "pat down" as an alternative screening procedure.

Sincerely

Andrea Schafer