

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: November 1, 2006 7:42:20 AM PST
To: mmacleod@scotlandonsunday.com
Subject: **The scientific 'alternative explanation' wiring/cargo door**

Dear Mr. MacLeod, Wednesday, November 1, 2006

Myth versus science. Conspiracy bombers versus professional accident investigators. Backroom plotter whisperers versus sudden loud sound on a cockpit voice recorder.

Which one is talked about, read about, considered, discussed?
Which one is more pleasing to the psyche? Which one is real?

Well, the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation offers professional Crown opinion about the probable cause of Pan Am Flight 103 while the myth has all the intrigue of a grade B movie plot.

Myth Rules! Gripping entertainment is more pleasing than unpleasant stale reality.

If you should perhaps be one of those inquiring investigative journalists who does not always believe what you read in the newspapers, check out <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com> and <http://www.nts.org>

If you believe in the literal interpretation of the Loch Ness monster, stick with pesky Palestinians or looney Libyans and check out The Da Vinci Code.

Should you wish to talk facts, data, and evidence I am available

via email or phone or course.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsbt.org>

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: November 15, 2006 7:38:03 AM PST
To: mmacleod@scotlandonsunday.com
Subject: The scientific 'alternative explanation' wiring/cargo door

Dear Mr. MacLeod, Wednesday, November 15, 2006

Conspiracy guys like the CIA can sure spin a tale to be believed by the ignorant, sort of like the Loch Ness thingie.

Do you know why airplanes crash? I do.

I know why Pan Am Flight 103 crashed too.

I don't know much about human nature and its willingness to believe pleasing falsehoods while rejecting unpleasant truths.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsbt.org>

Lockerbie trial was a CIA fix, US intelligence insider claims

By Liam McDougall, Home Affairs Editor

THE CIA manipulated the Lockerbie trial and lied about the strength of the prosecution case to get a result that was politically convenient for America, according to a former US State Department lawyer.

Michael Scharf, who was the counsel to the US counter-terrorism bureau when the two Libyans were indicted for the bombing, described the case as "so full of holes it was like Swiss cheese" and said it should never have gone to trial.

He claimed the CIA and FBI had assured State Department officials there was an "iron-clad" case against Abdelbaset al-Megrahi and al-Amin Khalifa Fimah, but that in reality the intelligence agencies had no confidence in their star witness and

knew well in advance of the trial that he was a liar.

Scharf branded the case a whitewash and added: "It was a trial where everybody agreed ahead of time that they were just going to focus on these two guys, and they were the fall guys."

The comments by Scharf are controversial, given his position in US intelligence during the Lockerbie investigation and trial. It also comes at a crucial time as the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission (SCCRC) is to report in the coming months on whether it believes there was a miscarriage of justice in the case.

In January 2001, following a trial at Camp Zeist in the Netherlands, Fimah was acquitted and al-Megrahi was sentenced to life in a Scottish jail for his part in the December 1988 bombing.

Scharf joined the State Department's Office of the Legal Adviser for Law Enforcement and Intelligence in April 1989, just four months after Pan Am Flight 103 was downed and at the height of the CIA's Lockerbie bombing investigation. He was also responsible for drawing up the UN Security Council resolutions that imposed sanctions on Libya in 1992 in order to force Tripoli to hand over al-Megrahi and Fimah for trial.

He added: "The CIA and the FBI kept the State Department in the dark. It worked for them for us to be fully committed to the theory that Libya was responsible. I helped the counter-terrorism bureau draft documents that described why we thought Libya was responsible, but these were not based on seeing a lot of evidence, but rather on representations from the CIA and FBI and the Department of Justice about what the case would prove and

did prove.

“It was largely based on this inside guy [Libyan defector Abdul Majid Giaka]. It wasn’t until the trial that I learned this guy was a nut-job and that the CIA had absolutely no confidence in him and that they knew he was a liar.

“It was a case that was so full of holes it was like Swiss cheese.
ä

Scharf, now an international law expert at Case Western Reserve University in Ohio, said he was convinced that Libya, Iran and the Palestinian terrorist group the PFLP-GC were involved in the bombing, which killed 270 people. But, he said, the case had a “diplomatic rather than a purely legal goal.”

“Now Libya has given up its weapons of mass destruction, it’s allowed inspectors in, the sanctions have been lifted, tourists from the US are flocking to see the Roman ruins outside of Tripoli and Gaddafi has become a leader in Africa rather than a pariah. And all of that is the result of this trial,” Scharf said.
“Diplomatically, it has been a huge success story. But legally, it just seemed like a whitewash to me.”

Robert Black, professor of Scots law at Edinburgh University and the principal architect of the Lockerbie trial at Camp Zeist, described the Lockerbie case as “a fraud.”

“That the trial at Camp Zeist resulted in a conviction is a disgrace for Scottish justice,” he said. “I think this [Scharf’s comments] indicates that a growing number of people on both sides of the Atlantic now believe they were used in this case.”

Dr Jim Swire, who lost his daughter Flora in the bombing, said:
"Myself and Michael Scharf are coming from exactly the same position. I went to the trial and became convinced after watching it unfold that the case was full of holes."

Tony Kelly, al-Megrahi's solicitor, said he would not comment while the SCCRC was still examining the case.

No-one at the CIA in Washington was available to comment.

12 November 2006

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: November 15, 2006 7:48:23 AM PST
To: news@theherald.co.uk
Subject: For Liam McDougall, Home Affairs Editor The Sunday Herald

Dear Mr. McDougall, Wednesday, November 15, 2006

Re: Pan Am Flight 103

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com> and <http://www.nts.org>

If one can forget the conspiracy nonsense, the political fix, the emotional grief and look at science for the explanation for an airplane crash, it is evident that the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is the clearest of all.

It's not too late for a down to earth explanation that can be corroborated by hard evidence.

Regards,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

1 831 659 3552

1 831 241 0631 Cell

barry@johnbarrysmith.com

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.nts.gov>

Commercial pilot, instrument rated, former FAA Part 135 certificate holder.

US Navy reconnaissance navigator, RA-5C 650 hours.

US Navy patrol crewman, P2V-5FS 2000 hours.

Air Intelligence Officer, US Navy

Retired US Army Major MSC

Owner Mooney M-20C, 1000 hours.

Survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet plane crash in RA-5C

Lockerbie trial was a CIA fix, US intelligence insider claims

By Liam McDougall, Home Affairs Editor

THE CIA manipulated the Lockerbie trial and lied about the strength of the prosecution case to get a result that was politically convenient for America, according to a former US State Department lawyer.

Michael Scharf, who was the counsel to the US counter-terrorism bureau when the two Libyans were indicted for the bombing,

described the case as "so full of holes it was like Swiss cheese" and said it should never have gone to trial.

He claimed the CIA and FBI had assured State Department officials there was an "iron-clad" case against Abdelbaset al-Megrahi and al-Amin Khalifa Fimah, but that in reality the intelligence agencies had no confidence in their star witness and knew well in advance of the trial that he was "a liar".

Scharf branded the case a "whitewash" and added: "It was a trial where everybody agreed ahead of time that they were just going to focus on these two guys, and they were the fall guys."

The comments by Scharf are controversial, given his position in US intelligence during the Lockerbie investigation and trial. It also comes at a crucial time as the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission (SCCRC) is to report in the coming months on whether it believes there was a miscarriage of justice in the case.

In January 2001, following a trial at Camp Zeist in the Netherlands, Fimah was acquitted and al-Megrahi was sentenced to life in a Scottish jail for his part in the December 1988 bombing.

Scharf joined the State Department's Office of the Legal Adviser for Law Enforcement and Intelligence in April 1989, just four months after Pan Am Flight 103 was downed and at the height of the CIA's Lockerbie bombing investigation. He was also responsible for drawing up the UN Security Council resolutions that imposed sanctions on Libya in 1992 in order to force Tripoli to hand over al-Megrahi and Fimah for trial.

He added: "The CIA and the FBI kept the State Department in the dark. It worked for them for us to be fully committed to the theory that Libya was responsible. I helped the counter- terrorism bureau draft documents that described why we thought Libya was responsible, but these were not based on seeing a lot of evidence, but rather on representations from the CIA and FBI and the Department of Justice about what the case would prove and did prove.

"It was largely based on this inside guy [Libyan defector Abdul Majid Giaka]. It wasn't until the trial that I learned this guy was a nut-job and that the CIA had absolutely no confidence in him and that they knew he was a liar.

"It was a case that was so full of holes it was like Swiss cheese.
"

Scharf, now an international law expert at Case Western Reserve University in Ohio, said he was convinced that Libya, Iran and the Palestinian terrorist group the PFLP-GC were involved in the bombing, which killed 270 people. But, he said, the case had a "diplomatic rather than a purely legal goal."

"Now Libya has given up its weapons of mass destruction, it's allowed inspectors in, the sanctions have been lifted, tourists from the US are flocking to see the Roman ruins outside of Tripoli and Gaddafi has become a leader in Africa rather than a pariah. And all of that is the result of this trial," Scharf said.
"Diplomatically, it has been a huge success story. But legally, it just seemed like a whitewash to me."

Robert Black, professor of Scots law at Edinburgh University and the principal architect of the Lockerbie trial at Camp Zeist,

described the Lockerbie case as "a fraud".

"That the trial at Camp Zeist resulted in a conviction is a disgrace for Scottish justice," he said. "I think this [Scharf's comments] indicates that a growing number of people on both sides of the Atlantic now believe they were used in this case."

Dr Jim Swire, who lost his daughter Flora in the bombing, said: "Myself and Michael Scharf are coming from exactly the same position. I went to the trial and became convinced after watching it unfold that the case was full of holes."

Tony Kelly, al-Megrahi's solicitor, said he would not comment while the SCCRC was still examining the case.

No-one at the CIA in Washington was available to comment.

12 November 2006

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>

Date: July 6, 2007 5:06:05 AM PDT

To: enquiries@aaib.gov.uk

Subject: Freedom Of Information Act 2000 for 1200 significant items of wreckage was compiled and included a brief description of each item and the location where it was found".

From:

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552

1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsب.org>

To: AAIB UK.

RE: <http://www.foi.gov.uk/yourRights/index.htm#how>

Dear Sirs, Friday, July 6, 2007

This information request, which is made under the Freedom Of Information Act 2000, refers to the Aircraft Accident Report No 2/90 (EW/C1094) which is your Branch's formal report on the accident to Boeing 747-121, N739PA at Lockerbie, Dumfriesshire, Scotland on 21 December 1988.

My request specifically refers to some information which is mentioned in Paragraph 1.12.1, in which the Report states: "A computer database of approximately 1200 significant items of wreckage was compiled and included a brief description of each item and the location where it was found".

I request a complete copy of the full data in that database.

Any moderny recognisable data format on any moderny readable medium would fulfill my request. I believe that your Branch currently uses Microsoft Windows format(s) for your office work, but if this requested database data is in an older format, such as dBaseIII, please transmit the data in full in its original format if it is not possible or practicably convenient for you to make the format conversion yourselves. In either case, please include details of the data format.

Please send the requested data, at your earliest convenience,
either by email to me at my email address.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsب.org>

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: August 11, 2007 5:20:36 PM PDT
Subject: Pan Am Flight 103 Freedom of Information

From: John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsب.org>

To: Karen Culverwell
Information Officer
KCulverwell@aaib.gov.uk
Air Accidents Investigation Branch
Farnborough House

Berkshire Copse Road
Aldershot
Hampshire
GU11 2HH
TEL: +44 (0)1252 510300
FAX: +44 (0)1252 376999
www.aaib.gov.uk

RE: <http://www.foi.gov.uk/yourRights/index.htm#how>

Dear Sirs,

This information request, which is made under the Freedom Of Information Act 2000, refers to the Aircraft Accident Report No 2/90 (EW/C1094) which is your Branch's formal report on the accident to Boeing 747-121, N739PA at Lockerbie, Dumfriesshire, Scotland on 21 December 1988.

Photos of starboard side fuselage, leading edge of right wing, maintenance records of cargo doors, engine breakdown reports, baggage manifests.

Please send the requested data, at your earliest convenience, either by email to me at my email address.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.nts.gov>

From: "Cousse, Richard" <RCousse@aaib.gov.uk>
Date: August 28, 2007 6:45:30 AM PDT
To: <barry@johnbarrismith.com>
Cc: "Culverwell, Karen" <KCulverwell@aaib.gov.uk>
Subject: **FOI request (Ref: F0003317) - update**

Dear Mr Smith,

Accident to Boeing 747-121A, N739PA on 21 December 1988

Ref: F0003317

I refer to your request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 for information contained in a database referred to in the AAIB formal report on the accident to Boeing 747-121A, N739PA on 21 December 1988.

I am writing to advise you that following a lengthy search of our paper and electronic records and conversations with present and retired staff, I have located a floppy disc that **MAY** contain the information you have requested.

You will appreciate that the database was very much a working tool and was saved on what appears to be a very early MAC floppy disc. It was also created well before an AAIB wide IT network was implemented.

I believe that I will be able to obtain a computer capable of reading the disc and hopefully read the information on it.

Assuming the disc contains the database and we are able to download the information I will then be in a position to decide whether we can legally release all or part of the information.

I must, however, stress again that that the disc we have located may not contain the information you require or may be totally unreadable.

Given these difficulties I am extending the deadline for a final reply for another twenty days until 27 September 2007.

I apologise for the delay.

Yours sincerely

Richard Couss✓

Richard Couss✓
Head of Administration
Air Accidents Investigation Branch
Farnborough House
Berkshire Copse Road
Aldershot
Hampshire
GU11 2HH

Tel: + 44 (0) 1252 510300
Fax: + 44 (0) 1252 376999

From: "webserver@gulfnews.com" <webserver@gulfnews.com>
Date: September 3, 2007 6:10:23 PM PDT
To: "barry@johnbarrysmith.com" <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Subject: Gulf News: Letter to the Editor (Auto Reply - Do not respond to this address)

Dear Reader,

Thank you for your letter/comment. It is very valuable to us. All mail is read, but we cannot respond to each query because of the volume of mail received. Your comments will be considered for publication.

For our records, we ask that your full name, address and daytime telephone number, along with mobile number, be included in your letter. If you request for your name and other details to be withheld from publication, it will be respected.

A full list of guidelines for sending a letter for publication can be found by visiting <http://archive.gulfnews.com/articles/06/11/29/10085979.html>

The Gulf News website also gives you a chance to comment on the burning issues of the day by logging onto <http://www.gulfnews.com/yoursay>

Thank you.

Anupa Kurian

Readers Editor

www.gulfnews.com

From: "Cousse, Richard" <RCousse@aaib.gov.uk>
Date: September 20, 2007 4:05:56 AM PDT
To: "John Barry Smith" <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Cc: "Culverwell, Karen" <KCulverwell@aaib.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: FOI request (Ref: F0003317) - letter attached

Dear Mr Smith,

Thank you for your email of 19 September 2007. I will endeavour to address your points in the order you have raised them.

Contents of the disc

I can only reiterate what I have said in my letter of the 14 September 2007

“despite our best efforts we have been unable to confirm that the floppy disc we located holds the database in question. It appears that over the passage of time the disc has corrupted and is only partially readable. We are, therefore, in a position where we can neither confirm nor deny that we hold the information.”

Further investigation of the disc and paper files

Again I reiterate what I have said in my letter of the 14th September 2007.

“Any additional technical work on the disc or further exhaustive search of paper files would incur substantial costs, in excess of the appropriate limit of £600. Section 12 (1) of the Act removes the obligation upon a public authority to do so where they estimate the costs would exceed the appropriate limit.”

Despatch of the corrupted disc to yourself

I refer you to our exchange of emails on the 28th August 2007 where this topic was raised and again I reiterate what I said then.

“You will appreciate that it would be unwise of me to send you the disc without knowing for sure what is on it.”

Hard copy

I referred to the possibility of a “hard copy” in my covering email, this was a reference to a hard copy of my emailed letter of the 14th September 2007.

Final comments

I was gratified to note your comments on our response to your request.

The AAIB is, as you will appreciate, an extremely busy unit and while we endeavour to assist researchers as much as we can, our resources are finite and current operational commitments have to take precedence.

Yours sincerely

Richard Couss✓

Richard Couss✓
Head of Administration
Air Accidents Investigation Branch
Farnborough House
Berkshire Copse Road
Aldershot
Hampshire

GU11 2HH

Tel:+ 44 (0) 1252 510300
Fax: + 44 (0) 1252 376999

From: John Barry Smith
[mailto:barry@johnbarrysmith.com]
Sent: 19 September 2007 16:48
To: Cousse, Richard
Cc: Culverwell, Karen
Subject: Re: FOI request (Ref: F0003317) - letter
attached

At 11:32 AM +0100 9/14/07, Cousse, Richard wrote:
Dear Mr Smith,

I attach our formal reply re your FOI request.

Richard Couss✓
Head of Administration
Air Accidents Investigation Branch
Farnborough House
Berkshire Copse Road
Aldershot
Hampshire
GU11 2HH

I am writing to advise you that despite our best efforts we

have been unable to confirm that the floppy disc we located holds the database in question.

JBS>You read the disk to know that it does not include the 1200 data points named in the AOR.

It appears that over the passage of time the disc has corrupted and is only partially readable.

You could not read the disk to know it does not include the 1200 data points named in the AOR.

We are, therefore, in a position where we can neither confirm nor deny that we hold the information.

You don't know if you know if the disk includes the 1200 data points named in the AOR.

After careful consideration, we judge that further interrogation of the disc would be unlikely to be more successful, also an examination of our paper files has failed to uncover a printed copy of the database.

You know, you don't know, and maybe you don't know if the disk includes the 1200 data points in the AOR. And no paper record of extremely important data that in 1989 was most certainly placed in hard copy in several folders for the various police agencies, accident boards, manufacturer representatives, and Crown attorneys?

You were able to find a Mac and a floppy disk drive to determine the disk was corrupted, which is a good start. Since you have the floppy drive and the Mac, just copy the corrupted file to Mac memory, put in another floppy and copy the corrupted data to the new floppy and send it to me.

Let me know if you need a hard copy and I will arrange for a copy to be posted to you

Well, Richard, let me have a go at it. There is data on the disk and I can probably retrieve it using DiskWarrior and other programs for retrieving data on corrupted floppy disks and hard drives. The copy disk should cost no more than a few pounds and take a minute or so to copy. You might put it on a CD if you wish.

If you are unhappy with the way the AAIB has handled your request

I am not unhappy and respect the hard work you have put into attempting to fulfill my request for that important data referenced in the AOR. I am not complaining, I am complimenting. Thank you again for the time and effort.

And not giving up. Let's both try to retrieve that data. When you send the corrupted floppy disk to that will suffice as fulfillment. If irrelevant data on it, then it will be trashed but it's worth a try, yes?

As researchers we like to keep on digging....

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsب.org>

regards

Richard

Richard Couss✓
Head of Administration
Air Accidents Investigation Branch
Farnborough House
Berkshire Copse Road
Aldershot
Hampshire
GU11 2HH

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley,
California 93924
USA

Dear Mr Smith,

Accident to Boeing 747-121A, N739PA on 21 December 1988 (Ref: F0003317)

I refer to your request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and our subsequent correspondence regarding information contained in a database referred to in the AAIB formal report on the accident to Boeing 747-121A, N739PA on 21 December 1988.

I am writing to advise you that despite our best efforts we have been unable to confirm that the floppy disc we located holds the database in question. It appears that over the passage of time the disc has corrupted and is only partially readable. We are, therefore, in a position where we can neither confirm nor deny that we hold the information.

After careful consideration, we judge that further interrogation of the disc would be unlikely to be more successful, also an examination of our paper files has failed to uncover a printed copy of the database. Any additional technical work on the disc or further exhaustive search of paper files would incur substantial costs, in excess of the appropriate limit of £600. Section 12(1) of the Act removes the obligation upon a public authority to do so where they estimate the costs would exceed the appropriate limit.

If you are unhappy with the way the AAIB has handled your request or with the decisions made in relation to your request you may complain within two calendar months of the date of this letter by writing to me at the above address. Please see attached details of DfT's complaints

procedure and your right to complain to the Information Commissioner.

If you have any queries about this letter, please contact me. Please remember to quote the reference number above in any future communications.

Yours sincerely

Richard Couss/
Head of Administration

Your right to complain to [DfT/AAIB] and the Information Commissioner

You have the right to complain within two calendar months of the date of this letter about the way in which your request for information was handled and/or about the decision not to disclose all or part of the information requested. In addition a complaint can be made that DfT has not complied with its FOI publication scheme.

Your complaint will be acknowledged and you will be advised of a target date by which to expect a response. Initially your complaint will be re-considered by the official who dealt with your request for information. If, after careful consideration, that official decides that his/her decision was correct, your complaint will automatically be referred to a senior independent official who will conduct a further review. You will be advised of the outcome of your complaint and if a decision is taken to disclose information originally withheld this will be done as soon as possible.

If you are not content with the outcome of the internal review, you have the right to apply directly to the Information Commissioner for a decision. The Information Commissioner can be contacted at:

Information Commissioner's Office
Wycliffe House
Water Lane
Wilmslow
Cheshire
SK9 5AF

From: MIKINVENT@aol.com
Date: November 30, 2008 5:07:12 PM PST
To: barry@johnbarrismith.com
Subject: 747s sudden airframe break-ups in flight

THE INSTITUTE OF INVENTORS
19-21-23 FOSSE WAY, EALING, LONDON W13 0BZ
Tel: 020 8998 3540, 020 8998 4372, 020 8998 6372 Fax: 020
8998 1275
e-mail mikinvent@aol.com Webs www.gigadron.com
www.instituteofinventors.com

Hi Barry,

**Re: AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800
sudden airframe break-ups in flight**

I am pleased to have found a website supporting the true causes of 747 sudden airframe break-ups in flight” fatal accidents.

My name is Michael V. Rodrigues; I am a professional aircraft design engineer inventor with a commendable track record see [Profile - Inventor Michael Rodrigues](#) www.gigadron.com and President [Institute of Inventors](#)

I have been on teams designing and on stress calculations of several aircraft – Most notably the Lynx – still the fastest helicopter in the world.

My common sense, wisdom and evaluation are that all the above “Sudden airframe break-ups in flight” fatal air accidents were not bombs and were due to :-

- a) “Out Opening Forward Cargo Door Failure “ caused by
- b) “Hazardous defective designed C Latches uncommanded opening” combined with
- c) Old Structural Fatigue Failure - excess of 10,000 pressurizing reversals.

Your web site supports my view but ***lacks a contact phone number.***

We need to talk and inform the families of victims, the courts and public.
All believe it was a bomb!

Please phone me any time on
[020 8998 3540](tel:02089983540), or [020 8998 6372](tel:02089986372) if phoning from the UK or
[00 44 208 998 3540](tel:00442089983540) or [00 44 208 998 6372](tel:00442089986372) if phoning from outside the UK.
– or email your phone numbers.

Best regards

Michael

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: info@libya-canada.org

Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab

Jamahiriya

The Embassy

81 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1000

Ottawa, Ontario

K1P 6K7

Tel.:(613) 230-0919

Fax: (613) 230-0683

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400

Ottawa, Ontario

K1P 5V5

Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. I am not associated with any government agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring. There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

United Airlines Flight 811

Pan Am Flight 103 forward cargo door in shattered condition.
The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.nts.gov> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@nts.gov

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: support@libya-canada.org
Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

**People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya**
The Embassy

81 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1000
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6K7
Tel.:(613) 230-0919
Fax: (613) 230-0683

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. I am not associated with any government agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring. There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since

with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

United Airlines Flight 811

Pan Am Flight 103 forward cargo door in shattered condition. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.nts.gov> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552

1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsb.org

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: consulate@libya-canada.org
Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab

The Embassy

81 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1000
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6K7
Tel.:(613) 230-0919
Fax: (613) 230-0683

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. I am not associated with any government agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring. There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

United Airlines Flight 811

Pan Am Flight 103 forward cargo door in shattered condition. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.nts.gov> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsb.org

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: consulate@libya-canada.org
Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya

The Embassy

81 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1000
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6K7
Tel.:(613) 230-0919
Fax: (613) 230-0683

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. I am not associated with any government agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring. There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.nts.gov> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsb.org

From: John Barry Smith <safety@ntsb.org>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: consulate@libya-canada.org
Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. I am not associated with any government agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring.

There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.ntsbt.org> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsbt.org

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: info@libya-canada.org

Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

Dear Support Person, Sunday, September 10, 2006

Please forward to Consulate, my email to them can't get through.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsb.org

Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:33 -0400
From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@ns1.vdilink.com>
To: <safety@ntsb.org>
Subject: Returned mail: see transcript for details
Auto-Submitted: auto-generated (failure)
X-Nospam: None

The original message was received at Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:26 -0400
from smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net [64.202.165.181]

----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----
<consulate@libya-canada.org>
(reason: can't create (user) output file)

----- Transcript of session follows -----

procmail: Quota exceeded while writing "/var/spool/mail/
consulate"

550 5.0.0 <consulate@libya-canada.org>... Can't create output

Reporting-MTA: dns; ns1.vdilink.com

Received-From-MTA: DNS;

smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net

Arrival-Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:26 -0400

Final-Recipient: RFC822; consulate@libya-canada.org

Action: failed

Status: 5.3.0

Diagnostic-Code: X-Unix; 73

Last-Attempt-Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:32 -0400

Return-Path: <safety@ntsb.org>

Received: from smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net

(smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net [64.202.165.181])

by almosabka.net (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id

k8AF7Ex06094

for <consulate@libya-canada.org>; Sun, 10 Sep 2006

11:07:26 -0400

Received: (qmail 10757 invoked from network); 10 Sep 2006

15:07:10 -0000

Received: from unknown (71.202.36.138)

by smtpauth01-04.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net

(64.202.165.181) with ESMTP; 10 Sep 2006 15:07:09 -0000

Mime-Version: 1.0

Message-Id: <p06230905c129da43c852@[192.168.0.100]>

Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 08:07:06 -0700

To: consulate@libya-canada.org

From: John Barry Smith <safety@ntsb.org>
Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.
Content-Type: multipart/alternative;
boundary="=====-1054221667==_ma=====
=="

People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya
The Embassy

81 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1000
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6K7
Tel.:(613) 230-0919
Fax: (613) 230-0683

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft
accident investigator. I am not associated with any government
agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103

was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring. There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

United Airlines Flight 811

Pan Am Flight 103 forward cargo door in shattered condition. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.nts.gov> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsb.org

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: support@libya-canada.org
Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

Dear Support Person, Sunday, September 10, 2006

Please forward to Consulate, my email to them can't get through.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
safety@ntsb.org

Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:33 -0400
From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <MAILER-DAEMON@ns1.vdilink.com>
To: <safety@ntsb.org>
Subject: Returned mail: see transcript for details
Auto-Submitted: auto-generated (failure)
X-Nospam: None

The original message was received at Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:26 -0400
from smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net [64.202.165.181]

----- The following addresses had permanent fatal errors -----
<consulate@libya-canada.org>
(reason: can't create (user) output file)

----- Transcript of session follows -----
procmail: Quota exceeded while writing "/var/spool/mail/consulate"
550 5.0.0 <consulate@libya-canada.org>... Can't create output

Reporting-MTA: dns; ns1.vdilink.com
Received-From-MTA: DNS;
smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net
Arrival-Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:26 -0400

Final-Recipient: RFC822; consulate@libya-canada.org
Action: failed
Status: 5.3.0

Diagnostic-Code: X-Unix; 73

Last-Attempt-Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 11:07:32 -0400

Return-Path: <safety@ntsb.org>

Received: from smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net
(smtpauth01.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net [64.202.165.181])

by almosabka.net (8.10.2/8.10.2) with SMTP id
k8AF7Ex06094

for <consulate@libya-canada.org>; Sun, 10 Sep 2006
11:07:26 -0400

Received: (qmail 10757 invoked from network); 10 Sep 2006
15:07:10 -0000

Received: from unknown (71.202.36.138)
by smtpauth01-04.prod.mesa1.secureserver.net
(64.202.165.181) with ESMTP; 10 Sep 2006 15:07:09 -0000

Mime-Version: 1.0

Message-Id: <p06230905c129da43c852@[192.168.0.100]>

Date: Sun, 10 Sep 2006 08:07:06 -0700

To: consulate@libya-canada.org

From: John Barry Smith <safety@ntsb.org>

Subject: Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

Content-Type: multipart/alternative;

boundary="=====-1054221667==_ma=====
=="

People's Bureau of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab
Jamahiriya

The Embassy

81 Metcalfe Street, Suite 1000
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 6K7
Tel.:(613) 230-0919
Fax: (613) 230-0683

Consular & Cultural Section

170 Laurier Avenue West, Suite 1400
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5V5
Consular Section Tel: (613) 216-0136

Dear Gentlemen of Libya, Sunday, September 10, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. I am not associated with any government agency or airline. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was not caused by a bomb but was caused by a common mechanical problem: Faulty wiring. There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracies, no crime, no criminals, just an aging aircraft that crashed when a small part failed. It's happened since with United Airlines Flight 811 in February 1989. The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

United Airlines Flight 811

Pan Am Flight 103 forward cargo door in shattered condition.

The nose came off Pan Am Flight 103 after the forward cargo door blew off.

The dangerous condition of faulty wiring causing forward cargo doors to open in flight on early model Boeing 747s remains to this day and I wish to correct the safety problems. The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan Am Flight 103 is the correct explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me for discussion? This is not a terrorist security issue, this is an unsafe aircraft issue and requires an aviation experienced official. Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash after all.

Further details at <http://www.nts.gov> and <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrismith.com
safety@nts.gov

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrismith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: bolthuis@arvayfinlay.com, tony@taylorkelly.co.uk,
Robert.Black@ed.ac.uk, jeffreycampbell@home.com,
rjohnston@sccrc.org.uk, mtansey@majorcomm.ca
Subject: The best defense is a strong offense. 1

Air India Flight 182 past and present attorneys
Messrs. Murray L. Smith and Brent B. Olthuis
Smith Barristers,
Suite 1300 -
355 Burrard Street,
Vancouver, BC, V6C 2G8
V6C 2G8
Tel: 604-689-4438
Fax: 604-689-4451
bolthuis@arvayfinlay.com

Ian Donaldson, QC
Vancouver County
Donaldson Jett/
490 - 1090 Homer Street
Vancouver, BC V6B 2W9
604 682 5232 phone
604 681 1331 fax
David Crossin

Pan Am Flight 103 past, present, and associated attorneys
Eddie MacKechnie
MacKechnie and Associates
27a Park Circus
Glasgow G3 6AP

Tony Kelly
Mssrs Taylor & Kelly,
3 Main Street, Coatbridge

ML5 3AJ
tony@taylorkelly.co.uk
01236 710999 phone
01236 429080 fax

Professor Robert Black QC FRSE FFCS
The Edinburgh Law School
+44 (0)131 650 2021
+44 (0)131 650 6317 (School fax)
+44 (0)871 247 2026 (Personal e-fax)
+44 (0)7740 541495 (Mobile)
Robert.Black@ed.ac.uk

Kamal Maghur,
Mr. Alistair Duff,
Mr. Stephen Mitchell,
Mr. Richard Keen,
Murdo Macleod,
McGrigor, Donald,
Alex Prentice,
William Taylor,
John Beckett
Jeffrey Campbell jeffreycampbell@home.com

Judicial official for Pan Am Flight 103
Robin Johnston
Solicitor
Senior Legal Officer
Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission
Glasgow
rjohnston@sccrc.org.uk

Judicial official for Air India Flight 182

Commission of Inquiry into the Bombing of Air India Flight 182
Commissioner John Major
P.O. Box 1298, Station B
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 5R3
Canada
Telephone:(613) 992-1834
Fax:(613) 995-3506
Spokesperson:
Michael Tansey
Telephone:
(613) 949-8477
(613) 851-4587 (cell)
Email:mtansey@majorcomm.ca, michael@tancom.ca

Air India Flight 182 accused
Inderjit Singh Reyat upcoming perjury trial, convicted, and plea
bargained, now in prison.
Ripudaman Singh Malik acquitted but trying to restore his
reputation.
Ajaib Singh Bagri acquitted,

Pan Am Flight 103 accused
Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi convicted, now in prison,
appealing
Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah, acquitted.

Dear Gentlemen Representatives of the Law, the Accused, the
Bewildered and the Downhearted, Tuesday, October 10, 2006

The legal controversies continue:

Air India Flight 182
Commission of Inquiry into the Bombing of Air India Flight 182

Started September 2006 through September 2007 Mr. Malik has intervenor status.

Reyat Perjury Trial May 2007

Reyat Parole Hearing Unknown date

Pan Am Flight 103

SCCRC appeal Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi Awaiting ruling.

Crown appeal for longer sentence for Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi. Status unknown

Discussion:

Early model Boeing 747s are machines. We say they die when they crash but they were never really alive, now were they? We anthropomorphize. Let me continue with the analogy.

Four early model Boeing 747s were assumed to have been murdered with the killers caught and tried. Some went free and some went to jail. I am here to say to you that there was no murder, no crime, no killers and innocent men are in prison for a crime that was nonexistent but that a machine failed because of a mechanical part, wiring. That safety hazard persists.

It's as if a person falls down dead. The police, the media, the man's family, the courts, the prosecution, and the defence all agree, yes, it was a shot to the head that killed him but we'll argue about who and where and when he was shot. Several men are arrested, and at the trial the defence states that yes, the victim was shot in the head but their clients did not do it. All the while some physicians who examined the dead person are saying, no, it was not a gunshot to the head but a heart attack, while other physicians say we don't know how he died but we may find out

later.

And then another man fall down dead at same spot and it's the brother of the previous dead man. Same thing happens, most non physicians say gunshot to head but the autopsy cause of death determined by government physicians claim natural causes. Several more men are accused and tried. The defence agreed with the prosecution as to cause of death as gunshot but their clients did not pull the trigger.

And then another brother falls down dead under similar circumstances...first guesses were gunshot to head but later proven wrong.

And then another brother falls down dead under similar circumstances...first guesses were gunshot to head but later proven wrong.

All four brothers share the same exact DNA and the evidence discovered at their deaths is generally the same. Two brothers are conclusively proven to have died of heart attacks and the deaths of the other two remain controversial.

And all the while, the people who know why people fall down dead are saying, not a gunshot to the head but heart attack, probably caused by poor diet.

Too bizarre an analogy? No. It's happening in your lives and has happened for years.

Gentlemen, do you have time to examine a reasonable alternative explanation for the aircraft crashes for which your clients are accused of being involved in? I would think your clients have

time as they have the rest of their lives to think about it, live with it, and integrate the accusations into their lives inside or outside of prison.

How does a four time serial killer called faulty wiring get away with it?

1. The deaths happen over a period of years, 1985 through 1996. Memories are short. Personnel change. Documents are thrown away, misplaced, or lost. Witnesses forget.

2. The deaths happen many thousands of miles apart from each other, such as Ireland, New York, Lockerbie, and Hawaii.

3. The deaths involve many agencies; RCMP, Scotland Yard, FBI, CIA, CSIS, TSB, NTSB, CASB, AAIB, Indian Civil Aviation Agency, and all the way to the top political leaders. The agencies do not cooperate or communicate fully, they defend their area of investigation, they are secretive, and they have many administrative senior officials directing them. Each agency looks closely at its lone tree/brother/aircraft in the forest/family of four while ignoring the other three.

4 The deaths involve objects that look different at first glance such as different colors in their livery, different names in their titles, and different nicknames.

5. The deaths involve victims who are not wealthy, important, connected to authority, or famous.

6. The deaths involve different complex legal jurisdictions in faraway places such as India, Canada, UK, and USA.

7. The deaths involve billions of dollars which means people get funny when they get around money.

A. The killer is well loved, well connected, wealthy, powerful, and not a suspect and anybody raising suspicion is scorned.

B. The killer has killed before but is still above suspicion having

said to have reformed.

C. The killer's freedom is necessary for the financial well being of thousands of workers.

1. The accused are relatively poor, different color skin and language than the accusers, and have in the past expressed violent thoughts.
2. The accused reinforce the prejudices of the accusers.
3. The accused get the suspicion off the real killer.

There are no conspiracies among the agencies, courts, media, or public to hide or protect the real killer or to convict the innocent. All involved really believe the real killer is not guilty and the accused are guilty based upon the public's own self interest. The well meaning accusers all believe in a vast international conspiracy by the accused to commit mass murder and like all zealots, refuse to consider down to earth explanations for such mass grief causing events. The hysteria feeds on itself with the stories gaining myth status with constant repeating, embellishment and modifications.

The real killer is faulty wiring, a small failure which brings down huge machines, early model Boeing 747s, by exploiting the design flaws of non plug cargo doors and no locking sectors on the midspan latches. The dead brothers/machines are Air India Flight 182, Pan Am Flight 103, United Airlines Flight 811, and TWA Flight 800.

Details:

The innocent accused are:

Air India Flight 182

Inderjit Singh Reyat now in prison.

Ripudaman Singh Malik acquitted but trying to clear his reputation.

Ajaib Singh Bagri acquitted,

Pan Am Flight 103 accused

Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi now in prison

Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah, acquitted.

United Airlines Flight 811

A ground crewman accused of killing nine passengers by negligence in improper latching of the forward cargo door before takeoff. He was proven innocent years later when the cargo door was found to be properly latched but the inadvertent opening was caused by an electrical problem in the wiring or switch.

TWA Flight 800

US Navy by firing a missile which blew up the aircraft.

Disproved by lack of evidence after two years.

Unknown terrorists who placed bomb in aircraft. Disproved after seventeen months of attempts to confirm by FBI.

The deaths are respectively 329, 270, 9, and 230 for a total of eight hundred thirty eight fatalities. That's a mass killing in four events over eleven years and thousands of miles apart involving the governments of four countries. (And it can happen again and it may have with China Airlines Flight 611 in 2003 but more evidence is needed to rule out or rule in so that early model Boeing 747 inflight breakup is not considered in this report.)

And the four victims are virtually identical. They are early model Boeing 747s. There are tens of thousand of airliners out there in hundreds of model and submodels but there are currently about

five hundred Boeing 747-100 and 747-200 aircraft still in service of which only four have the below similar evidence after inflight breakups.

The similarities in the circumstances and of the wreckage of those events are many: larger version at <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com/>

How can it be that the court systems of two countries had partial failure and partial success in determining who did what?

That's where you gentlemen come in. You are the defence. You are the professionals who represent the mature society's belief that it could make mistakes and therefore offers an opportunity to present alternative explanations and alternative culprits.

That opportunity has not been realized in the past. For the record: In the several trials in two countries against several men accused of being involved in the killing of 838 men women and children, the defence has never said, "It was not gunshots that killed the four brothers". The defence never claimed it was a heart attack, just that their clients never pulled the trigger of the guns.

Enough of the analogy already...

Defence Strategy:

The defence for Inderjit Singh Reyat, Ripudaman Singh Malik, Ajaib Singh Bagri, Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi, Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah, never once said that Air India Flight 182

or Pan Am Flight 103 was not brought down by bombs but by something else. The defence essentially stipulated to the cause of the crashes as bombs and quibbled over a few feet of where it was in the aircraft and challenged the Crown to prove who planted the bombs.

And the defence followed that strategy all the while knowing (assuming they did their homework) that the actual government experts in aviation crash investigations were saying they did not know the cause, or the cause was an explosive decompression and that one UK crash expert even refuted the bomb cause. The defence knew that similar type aircraft had similar type fatal accidents in 1989 and 1996 and the cause was electrical, not a bomb explosion. The defence uncritically believed the police story and that of the Crown prosecutors, the media, the public, and the anguished victim's families, while ignoring the one group who knew what they were talking about, the Canadian Aviation Safety Board investigators, the UK Air Accidents Investigation Board investigators, the National Transportation Safety Board investigators, and the Indian accident investigators.

The defence was caught up in the hateful revenge seeking hysteria of the moment which was kept hot by those that wanted to believe it for their own self interest motives. Everybody loves the bomb explanation except for a few and we know who they are, they are the clients you represent or have represented. The accused probably believe the crashes were caused by bomb explosion but they know and I know they had nothing to do with those tragic events.

For Air India Flight 182 the location of the explosion was in the forward cargo compartment for fifteen years. That conclusion is amply supported by hard wreckage evidence and yet on the day

of the trial the location switched to the aft bulk cargo compartment, a location conclusively ruled out by earlier investigators. The defence never disputed the move of the explosion from forward to aft compartments.

For Pan Am Flight 103 the AAIB investigator of the wreckage observed that the cause of the soot in the container alleged to have held a powerful, spherical and loud bomb was actually: "Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range." The defence never objected to the premise of a bomb explosion which was shown by evidence to be mild, directed, and silent, three physical impossibilities for a bomb but natural for a 'very large shotgun' in the luggage which was safe unless a huge explosive decompression were to occur nearby were a cargo door to rupture open in flight.

Emotion trumped science. Wishful thinking ruled the day. Pleasant explanations based on grief salving emotions were believed while unpleasant explanations supported by hard evidence that could be touched, seen, and listened to was rejected without consideration.

Esteemed attorneys, barristers, solicitors, members of the bar, I'm sure you have heard of the saying, "The best defense is a strong offense." Well, now is the time to go on the offense, become offensive, risk scorn, accept ridicule, take charge and present to the world at large and the courts in specific the reality scientific explanation for those airplane crashes to counter the conspiracy nonsense with its Mr. Xs and bombs flying around the world in multiple aircraft sometimes detonating and sometimes not.

I'm asking that you consider the hard evidence that supports the science explanation for the aircraft crashes your clients are accused of being involved in. They are innocent, they did not do it because nobody did it. It was a mechanical problem, a problem which still exists which involves my interest in aviation safety. I wish to have the hazards of faulty wiring and non plug cargo doors removed and repaired.

More Discussion and Quotes:

Speaking legally as an amateur, I understand there are several types of evidence possible; circumstantial, indirect, hearsay, and direct. All can be very persuasive. The best evidence is direct evidence. For Air India Flight 182, Pan Am Flight 103, United Airlines Flight 811, and TWA Flight 800 there is only once source of direct evidence and much of circumstantial such as altitude and time of day and indirect such as wreckage debris pattern and twisted metal. Hearsay is for the conspiracy guys.

The one source for the best evidence which is direct and irrefutable is the cockpit voice recorder and the flight data recorder. They were there. Those recorders were put there to do precisely what they did, record for later evaluation events which took place in the cockpit and in the aircraft at large. They tell us directly what went on in the final minutes.

And what does the best and indisputable direct evidence show as to what the cause of Air India Flight 182 and Pan Am Flight 103 and two others?

Chart 12 above from NTSB public docket for TWA Flight 800 showing the sudden loud sound from the CVRs in graphical format. Air India is Air India Flight 182, PanAm is Pan Am Flight 103, and United is United Airlines Flight 811. (Philippine Air was a Boeing 737 that had a fuel tank explode on the ground and not a Boeing 747 exploding in the air as the others.)

The graph shows a sudden loud sound followed by an abrupt power cut to the flight data recorders, a rare event separately, and extremely rare to have both together.

The sudden loud sound was analyzed very carefully by the government analysts for frequency, duration, limiting, and rise and fall time.

The conclusion reached by all the analysts in the UK, USA, Canada and India is that the sudden loud sound is not a bomb explosion sound, nor a missile exploding sound, but that of an explosive decompression sound. The bomb sound was ruled out because necessary low frequencies were not present and the rise time was too slow. There was no bomb sound in the cockpit at the initial event time for Air India Flight 182, Pan Am Flight 103, United Airlines Flight 811, and TWA Flight 800.

If not a bomb sound, then what was the cause of the sudden loud sound?

Air India Flight 182

"Mr. R.A. Davis, Head, Flight Recorder Section, Accidents Investigation Branch, Farnborough, U.K. 3.4.6.16 In conclusion, Mr. Davis reported as follows :- "It is considered that from the CVR and ATC recordings supplied for analysis, there is no evidence of a high explosive device having detonated on AI 182.

There is strong evidence to suggest that a sudden explosive decompression occurred but the cause has not been identified. It must be concluded that without positive evidence of an explosive device from either the wreckage or pathological examinations, some other cause has to be established for the accident".

2.10.2 Analysis by Accidents Investigation Branch (AIB), United Kingdom

The AIB analysis was restricted to the CVR and the Shannon ATC tape. An analysis of the CVR audio found no significant very low frequency content which would be expected from the sound created by the detonation of a high explosive device. A comparison with CVRs recording an explosive decompression* on a DC-10, a bomb in the cargo hold of a B737, and a gun shot on the flight deck of a B737 was made. Considering the different acoustic characteristics between a DC-10 and a B747, the AIB analysis indicates that there were distinct similarities between the sound of the explosive decompression on the DC-10 and the sound recorded on the AI 182 CVR. *Explosive decompression is an aviation term used to mean a sudden and rapid loss of cabin pressurization.

(Gentlemen, note the DC-10 explosive decompression above referenced in the Air India Flight 182 CVR analysis was probably the Turkish Airlines DC-10 fatal event when the aft cargo door blew open causing an explosive decompression which destroyed the flight controls leading to the crash.)

Pan Am Flight 103

"It is not clear if the sound at the end of the recording is the result of the explosion or is from the break-up of the aircraft structure. The short period between the beginning of the event and the loss of electrical power suggests that the latter is more

likely to be the case."

United Airlines Flight 811

"The Safety Board believes that the approximate 1.5 to 2.0 seconds between the first sound (a thump) and the second very loud noise recorded on the CVR at the time of the door separation was probably the time difference between the initial failure of the latches at the bottom of the door, and the subsequent separation of the door, explosive decompression, and destruction of the cabin floor and fuselage structure. The door did not fail and separate instantaneously; rather, it first opened at the bottom and then flew open violently. As the door separated, it tore away the hinge and surrounding structure as the pressure in the cabin forced the floor beams downward in the area of the door to equalize with the loss of pressure in the cargo compartment."

TWA Flight 800

"The TWA flight 800 CVR recorded noise characteristics that were most similar to those recorded by the CVRs on board the United flight 811 and Philippine Airlines airplanes."

Summary:

The Pan Am Flight 103 sudden loud sound is 'more likely' to be the case for the break-up of the aircraft structure, not a bomb sound.

The United Airlines Flight 811 sudden loud sound is indisputably and irrefutably the explosive decompression sound when the forward cargo door burst open because that aircraft barely landed at Honolulu.

The TWA Flight 800 sudden loud sound is most similar to United Airlines Flight 811 as that both were early model Boeing 747s.

United Airlines Flight 811 is the model that fits the other three, it is the victim of the killer wiring that was able to make it back to Honolulu to point to the culprit, the electrical system of wiring or a switch. Just as it was only after United Airlines Flight 811 that the cause of the sound on Air India Flight 182 was identified, it was only after TWA Flight 800 that the true extent of the pervasive and dangerous Poly X wiring in all early model Boeing 747s was made known. To put it another way: If United Airlines Flight 811 had been caused by a bomb explosion, all causes would be bombs, if United Airlines Flight 811 were a missile attack, all four events would be missile attacks, but the cause was electrical thus all were electrical.

(United Airlines Flight 811 is the case law analogy; it was a similar case that was tried and proven beyond doubt to be a certain cause and that cause may be applied to other similar cases.)

The best evidence for these similar events in similar aircraft is the direct evidence which is the cockpit voice recorder which recorded the sudden loud sound which when analyzed indicated an explosive decompression from a ruptured open forward cargo door and not a bomb explosion sound. That's science, that's real, that's confirmable, and it's corroborated by government sound analysts.

Human Nature Conjecture:

Why has the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Air India Flight 182, Pan Am Flight 103, and TWA Flight 800 not been advanced before in the public's mind?

I would hope I would not but I might very well have reacted as others have if my job, my reputation, my income, and my freedom depended upon the bomb explosion explanation being the accepted one and the wiring/cargo door explanation rejected. There is no conspiracy, just people acting in their own perceived best interests. What are they?

1. The manufacturer wants the blame for the loss of the aircraft and life to be placed upon factors out its control and not on its design errors of non plug cargo doors and absent locking sectors in the midspan latches. The manufacturer does not want to have to spend millions to correct the manufacturing faults in the wiring nor modify the cargo doors.
2. The airline wants the blame placed on others such as airport screening personnel and not on itself for not finding the frayed wires to the cargo door unlatch motor. The aircrews want to believe the event was a rare occurrence and do not want to believe that every minute they fly in early model Boeing 747s the aircraft can come apart in flight in seconds when the cargo door blows open as it did in United Airlines Flight 811.
3. The police, the RCMP, the FBI, Scotland Yard and prosecutors all welcome the inclusion of the high profile catastrophes into their jurisdiction so they can solve the crime and increase their budgets and staff to counter the threats. They would reject the mechanical cause as their general involvement would end.
4. The court system welcomes the chance to establish justice by punishing the criminals asserted by the law enforcement agencies. Vast amounts of bailiffs, new court facilities, numerous

attorneys, and much tax money goes into trials while a mechanical cause is relegated to settlement meetings between insurance attorneys.

5. The victims' families have turned their grief to anger to hate and want someone to vent their emotion of revenge against. They would prefer to believe their loved ones died in some vast international conspiracy which is part of a worldwide larger force instead of a trivial event such as bare wire shorting to metal and turning on a motor which is supposed to remain off while in flight.

6. The media such as TV, radio, and newspapers much prefer an emotional human tragedy interesting story to tell rather than a scientific story which requires education into basic laws of nature such as gravity, lift, thrust, drag, and pressure differential. Emotional stories require feelings which everyone has while science stories require education which is absent in many viewers, listeners, and readers. The media tells people what they want to hear and that is exciting, illogical, conspiracy stories, not boring mechanical proofs.

7. The government oversight agencies want to shift the blame of the crashes to foreign terrorists slipping through lax airport security and not their own failures as regulators and monitors of safety issues. The wiring/cargo door explanation reveals their failure to order the airlines and manufacturer to fix the documented problem of faulty wiring causing cargo doors to open in early model Boeing 747s such as Pan Am Flight 125 in 1987, United airlines preflight in 1991, and United Airlines Flight 811 in 1989.

8. The public demands revenge for a great loss of human life which was preventable. Dying in a bombed airplane crash offends two basic instincts of all humans at birth, a startle reflex shown by arms stretched wide and the falling reflex shown by grasping hands. The public pays money to hear what it wants and

rejects that which is unpleasant. The bombing explanation reinforces their prejudices of xenophobia and racism; it implies the event was a one off affair and not likely to reappear if only security were tighter. The bombing story gives an opportunity for revenge; it gives an exciting tale of intrigue, spying, shootouts, and chase scenes. The wiring/cargo door explanation is dry, has lots of charts and statistics, and implies the faulty wiring and dangerous non plug cargo doors are industry wide, not fixed, and the problems could reappear the next time they fly as a passenger.

I say again, there are no conspiracies among the principals, only people acting in their own perceived best interests which is essentially, "It's not my fault, nor my company's fault, nor my government's, nor the police, nor the airline, nor the media, nor the courts' fault; it's the fault of those revenge seeking turbaned terrorists over there."

And to support that blame shifting exculpatory bomb explosion explanation, vast illogical and science defying fantasies had to be devised and repeated until the myth of the Lockerbie bombing and the bombing of Air India Flight 182 was implanted into the public psyche. Debunking will be very difficult as myths are generated and believed by a people needing them.

However.....zealots defeat their cause eventually. Conspiracy guys are zealots. The continued controversies with Air India Flight 182 and Pan Am Flight 103 are evidence that something is not right and thus the trials, the appeals, the inquiries continue.

Summing Up:

This is your opportunity, gentlemen of the law and the defence.

You have been given the power to present the other side of the criminal prosecutions. You have authority to request certain documents and interview certain people. You have the responsibility to prevent innocent men from being punished unfairly.

You can:

1. Request all reports on the Narita explosion from RCMP and the Japanese police.
2. Request all reports on the staged Boeing 747 bomb explosion at Bruntingthorpe from Scotland Yard and AAIB.
3. Request all copies of the film and photographs of the wreckage of Air India Flight 182 and Pan Am Flight 103 now held by law enforcement and withheld from the public.
4. Request updated supplements from TSB and AAIB to the CASB AOR for Air India Flight 182 and the AAIB AAR for Pan Am Flight 103 based upon the twenty and sixteen year age of those reports and the subsequent similar accidents of United Airlines Flight 811 and TWA Flight 800 after which much was learned why early model Boeing 747s come apart in the air. The new findings for those similar events were not bomb explosions but electrical switch or faulty Poly X wiring.
5. Conduct interviews with previous AAIB and CASB officials to have them explain why they believe Air India Flight 182 and Pan Am Flight 103 were not bomb explosions but mechanical problems, as they have officially claimed in their reports.
6. Present the wiring/cargo door explanation to the aviation media in TV, newsletters, and magazines for their evaluations for credibility or rejection by their experienced and skeptical staff.
7. Seek expert outside opinion as to the actual causes of the aircraft crashes. There are many independent aviation accident investigators, such as myself, available for counsel.
8. Review my extensive websites at <http://>

www.montereypeninsulaairport.com and <http://www.ntsbt.org>. I suggest you download my many pdf files to include my three aircraft accident reports for Air India Flight 182, Pan Am Flight 103, and United Airlines Flight 811 which give details and supporting documents for the wiring/cargo door explanation.

The current emphasis is on the human victims and those accused of the deaths. The actual victims are the aircraft. If a dog drowns and the fleas it carries drown also, it can be said the fleas are victims although they were just along for the ride. So it is with the passengers. If the plane had not crashed, they would not be victims. Air India Flight 182 and Pan Am Flight 103 were airplane crashes first and always; they were the anthropomorphized victims. The emphasis needs to be why the airplanes crashed first and that was not done at any of the trials nor in the media. The assumption was the cause was a bomb explosion and that assumption is wrong as proven by evidence, not emotion.

Conclusion:

There were no bombs on Air India Flight 182 nor on Pan Am Flight 103. There were no crimes and no criminals and no conspiracies. There was and is a mechanical problem which exists to this day, aging and failing Poly X wiring which exploits design errors of non plug cargo doors and omitted midspan locking sectors allowing an explosive decompression when the forward cargo door ruptures open in flight.

To know the cause of Air India Flight 182 and Pan Am Flight 103, you must know the details of United Airlines Flight 811, the model and irrefutably explained event. All of those official AARs are available at <http://ntsbt.org>.

I appeal to you all to consider my suggested actions to confirm or rule out the wiring/cargo door mechanical explanation for the aircraft crash you are involved in. Please present my arguments to your clients for their consideration. They can be proven innocent which is a lot better than not guilty. Please communicate with each other although in different jurisdictions and time zones. Please realize you are similar in language and culture and you represent clients who are different from that culture, you are similar in being involved with similar type accident scenes with similar type vehicles under similar circumstances; you are similar in being part of a similar type British based justice system with its adversary relationships and discovery and disclosure rules for evidence. I implore you to reject conspiracy nonsense and consider a down to earth explanation with precedent.

My interest is aviation safety for millions first and justice for a few second. I believe your interests are reversed as it should be. Let us work together to accomplish both our goals.

I am available for consultations to clarify or further explain my mechanical premises for the crashes. Call, write, or email anytime.

Sometimes it's good to ask questions for which you do not already know the answers.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924

1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
montereypeninsulaairport.com
safety@ntsb.org

=====

On May 1, 2006, an Order in Council was issued defining the terms of reference for the Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Bombing of Air India Flight 182. The Honourable John C. Major, Q.C., was appointed Commissioner under Part 1 of the Inquiries Act.

=====

Air India bomb maker's perjury trial set for May
Canadian Press
VANCOUVER Ñ Convicted Air India bomb-maker Inderjit Singh Reyat will go to trial next May on perjury charges. Lawyers appeared in B.C. Supreme Court to set the date although they will return next month to confirm it before Associate Chief Justice Patrick Dohm.
Mr. Reyat was charged with perjury after his testimony in the trial of two men co-accused in the Air India case. Ripudaman Singh Malik and Ajaib Singh Bagri were acquitted in March 2005 of murder and conspiracy charges in the 1985 bombing of Air India Flight 182 that killed 329 people. The indictment filed against Mr. Reyat in B.C. Supreme Court lists 27 times where he allegedly misled the court during his testimony in September 2003.
Mr. Reyat is currently serving a five-year sentence for

manslaughter as part of a plea agreement for the deaths of those killed after the bomb exploded aboard the plane on June 23, 1985.

He could spend a maximum of 14 years in prison if convicted of perjury.

Before that, Mr. Reyat served 10 years for a blast at Tokyo's Narita airport the same day as Flight 182.

=====

By STAFF

The Toronto Star, Feb. 11, 2003

"Text of the agreed statement of facts submitted in B.C. Supreme Court

when Inderjit Singh Reyat pleaded guilty Feb. 10 to 329 counts of

manslaughter in the 1985 bombing of Air India Flight 182:"

"In May and Jun. 1985, in the province of British Columbia, Mr. Reyat

acquired various materials for the purpose of aiding others in the making of the explosive devices. Mr. Reyat was told and believed that

the explosive devices would be transported to India in order to blow up

property such as a car, a bridge or something 'heavy.' Although Mr.

Reyat acquired materials for this purpose, he did not make or arm an

explosive device, nor did he place an explosive device on an airplane,

nor does he know who did or did not do so. At no time did Mr.

Reyat
intend by his actions to cause death to any person or believe that
such
consequences were likely to occur. However, unbeknownst to
Mr. Reyat the
items that he acquired were used by another person or persons to
help
make an explosive device that, on or about Jun. 23, 1985,
destroyed Air
India Flight 182, killing all 329 people on board."

=====

Acquitted Air India suspect wins role in public inquiry

Ripudaman Singh Malik leaves B.C. Supreme Court in
Vancouver with supporters after he was found not guilty on
March 16, 2005 in the bombing of Air India flight 182 in 1985.

By Jim Brown, Canadian Press

Published: Tuesday, July 25, 2006

OTTAWA - A man once a prime suspect in the Air India bombing
has won the right to limited participation in a public inquiry into
the tragedy.

Ripudaman Singh Malik was granted intervenor status Tuesday
by former Supreme Court judge John Major, the head of the
inquiry.

In a brief written ruling, Major cautioned that Malik's
interventions will be limited to challenging "any evidence that
directly and adversely affects his reputation."

Any submissions by Malik or his lawyers will have to be made in
writing, at least to start. They will have to apply for leave if they

want to go further and participate in oral statements and examination of witnesses.

Malik and Ajaib Singh Bagri were acquitted last year -- after an 18-month trial -- of criminal charges stemming from the downing of Air India Flight 182 by a terrorist bomb off the coast of Ireland in 1985.

The bombing, believed to be work of Sikh extremists campaigning for a separate homeland in northern India, took the lives of 329 passengers, most of them Canadian citizens of Indian origin or descent.

It was the worst terrorist attack ever mounted from Canadian soil, and the worst involving civil aviation anywhere in the world until the 9-11 attacks in the United States in 2001.

Malik's lawyers had argued, in a written brief last week, that their client needed legal standing at the inquiry to protect his reputation and respond to any evidence that 'may impugn his character.'

They also warned that Malik may want to ask for some evidence to be heard behind closed doors "where he anticipates prejudice to his reputation or other intimate matters."

Major is required, under the inquiry's terms of reference, to hear some evidence in private if it endangers national security as defined by the federal government.

He can consider other requests to hold closed hearings, but commission counsel Mark Freiman has noted it would be unusual to do so.

Major has granted full standing at the inquiry to seven organizations and individuals, including the federal government, Air India and a number of family members who lost loved ones in the bombing.

Another nine groups and individuals, including Malik, will be permitted to play more limited roles.

Among them are a number of organizations with no direct link to

the Air India tragedy, but that want to have a say on more general questions of anti-terrorist policy.

They include the Canadian Jewish Congress, B'nai Brith, the Canadian Council on American Islamic Relations and the Canadian Muslim Civil Liberties Association.

Major will examine a range of issues, including investigative turf wars between the RCMP and CSIS, airline security, better protection of witnesses in terrorist cases, and the possibility of holding high-profile trials before a three-judge panel rather than a single jurist.

Testimony is to begin in September and run through next April. A report is due in September 2007.

=====

Lockerbie bomber appeal dates set

Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi

Megrahi was convicted of the Lockerbie bombing in 2001

The appeal launched by Lockerbie bomber Abdelbaset Ali

Mohmed al-Megrahi over his 27-year minimum prison sentence is to be heard in July, it has emerged.

An appeal by the Crown Office arguing for a longer sentence for the Libyan will also be heard at the same time.

The Crown will claim the minimum period Megrahi must serve is too lenient.

A panel of five judges will hear the case on 11 and 12 July, although it has not yet been decided whether it will take place in Edinburgh or Glasgow.

The High Court in Glasgow is closer to Greenock Prison, where

Megrahi is currently being held, if he wants to be present is likely to be used for security reasons.

The Libyan was found guilty in 2001 of killing 270 people in the 1988 bombing of PanAm flight 103.

He has claimed the 27-year minimum sentence is too long, having been told at his original trial that he should serve at least 20 years.

However, the Crown will argue that the maximum punishment period that courts can impose in murder cases should be raised and with it the length of time Megrahi should remain in prison before he can apply for release on parole.

The appeals will not affect the work of the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission which has been studying the case for almost two years to see if there was a miscarriage of justice. It said it would announce its decision in the summer.

=====

Lockerbie bomb appeal lined up for summer JOHN ROBERTSON LAW CORRESPONDENT

THE appeal launched by the Lockerbie bomber against the length of his sentence is due to be heard this summer, it emerged yesterday.

Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi's legal bid against his 27-year minimum prison sentence will be considered by a panel of five judges on 11 and 12 July, the Scottish Executive said.

At the same time, a counter-appeal by the Crown Office arguing

that the sentence was unduly lenient will also be heard.

Tony Kelly, Megrahi's solicitor, questioned the fixing of the hearing. "I find it illogical, when we are still waiting to hear whether there is to be an appeal against conviction," he said.

Megrahi has had an application before the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission since September 2003. It investigates possible miscarriages of justice and has the power to refer a case to the Court of Criminal Appeal, even if an appeal has previously been heard and refused, as happened to Megrahi.

Mr Kelly did not know when the commission might decide on a referral, but said the process must be in its closing stages. A successful appeal against conviction would make an appeal against sentence unnecessary.

"So what is the point in holding this hearing at this stage?" asked Mr Kelly.

A court spokesman said that as an appeal against sentence had been lodged and was outstanding, it was right to press on with it. He added: "There might be a referral from the commission, but there might not be."

Megrahi was convicted in 2001 of bombing Pan Am flight 103 and killing 270 people.

A fellow Libyan, Al-Amin Khalifa Fhimah, was acquitted.

=====

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On February 24, 1989, United Airlines flight 811, a Boeing

747-122, experienced an explosive decompression as it was climbing between 22,000 and 23,000 feet after taking off from Honolulu, Hawaii, en route to Sydney, Australia with 3 flightcrew, 15 flight attendants, and 337 passengers aboard. The airplane made a successful emergency landing at Honolulu and the occupants evacuated the airplane. Examination of the airplane revealed that the forward lower lobe cargo door had separated in flight and had caused extensive damage to the fuselage and cabin structure adjacent to the door. Nine of the passengers had been ejected from the airplane and lost at sea. A year after the accident, the Safety Board was uncertain that the cargo door would be located and recovered from the Pacific Ocean. The Safety Board decided to proceed with a final report based on the available evidence without the benefit of an actual examination of the door mechanism. The original report was adopted by the Safety Board on April 16, 1990, as NTSB/AAR-90/01.

Subsequently, on July 22, 1990, a search and recovery operation was begun by the U.S. Navy with the cost shared by the Safety Board, the Federal Aviation Administration, Boeing Aircraft Company, and United Airlines. The search and recovery effort was supported by Navy radar data on the separated cargo door, underwater sonar equipment, and a manned submersible vehicle. The effort was successful, and the cargo door was recovered in two pieces from the ocean floor at a depth of 14,200 feet on September 26 and October 1, 1990.

Before the recovery of the cargo door, the Safety Board believed that the door locking mechanisms had sustained damage in service prior to the accident flight to the extent that the door could have been closed and appeared to have been locked, when in fact the door was not fully latched. This belief was expressed in the report and was supported by the evidence available at the time. However, upon examination of the door, the damage to the

locking mechanism did not support this hypothesis. Rather, the evidence indicated that the latch cams had been backdriven from the closed position into a nearly open position after the door had been closed and locked. The latch cams had been driven into the lock sectors that deformed so that they failed to prevent the back-driving.

Thus, as a result of the recovery and examination of the cargo door, the Safety Board's original analysis and probable cause have been modified. This report incorporates these changes and supersedes NTSB/AAR-90/01.

The issues in this investigation centered around the design and certification of the B-747 cargo doors, the operation and maintenance to assure the continuing airworthiness of the doors, cabin safety, and emergency response.

The National Transportation Safety Board determines that the probable cause of this accident was the sudden opening of the forward lower lobe cargo door in flight and the subsequent explosive decompression. The door opening was attributed to a faulty switch or wiring in the door control system which permitted electrical actuation of the door latches toward the unlatched position after initial door closure and before takeoff. Contributing to the cause of the accident was a deficiency in the design of the cargo door locking mechanisms, which made them susceptible to deformation, allowing the door to become unlatched after being properly latched and locked. Also contributing to the accident was a lack of timely corrective actions by Boeing and the FAA following a 1987 cargo door opening incident on a Pan Am B-747.

As a result of this investigation, the Safety Board issued safety recommendations concerning cargo doors and other nonplug doors on pressurized transport category airplanes, cabin safety, and emergency response.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: info@lavex2006.com
Subject: Request to discuss aviation safety with Libyan safety official

Dear Mr. Adala, Monday, October 30, 2006

Thank you very much for the invitation. If I could attend I would present my AAR, Aviation Accident Report.

I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was caused by the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me so that I may discuss my research and conclusions with him?

Safety is very important to me and I would like to discuss it via email or in person with a Libyan aviation safety official, can you help me? I live near San Francisco, California.

Regards,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsب.org>

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: support@libya-canada.org
Subject: Please forward to info@wahaexpo.com Request to contact Libyan aviation safety official please.

To: info@wahaexpo.com
From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Subject: Request to discuss aviation safety with Libyan safety official

Dear Mr. Adala, Monday, October 30, 2006

Thank you very much for the invitation. If I could attend I would present my AAR, Aviation Accident Report.

I am an independent aircraft accident investigator. My research has shown that Pan Am Flight 103 was caused by the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

Can you refer a Libyan aviation safety official to me so that I may discuss my research and conclusions with him?

Safety is very important to me and I would like to discuss it via email or in person with a Libyan aviation safety official, can you help me? I live near San Francisco, California.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsbt.org>

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: mmacleod@scotlandonsunday.com
Subject: The scientific 'alternative explanation'

Dear Mr. MacLeod, Monday, October 30, 2006

My name is John Barry Smith and I am an independent aircraft investigator.

If another conspiracy 'alternative explanation' is in play and in

the media, then why not consider the scientific 'alternative explanation', the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation, especially since the wiring/cargo door explanation has facts, data, and evidence that can be irrefutably corroborated.

I'm hoping the 'vital new evidence' that is contained in the SCCRC report is the evidence of my Pan Am Flight 103 Aircraft Accident Report (AAR) I submitted to the Commission; regardless, I'm hoping for some sort of consideration for a down to earth explanation based on the precedent of United Airlines Flight 811.

Details at <http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com> and [ntsb.org](http://www.ntsb.org).

I can send you an overview of the wiring/cargo door explanation although I have to admit, spies, money laundering, plots, and coverups are more interesting than the factual trivial event of wiring shorting on a motor that was supposed to stay off while in flight. My Pan Am Flight 103 AAR is available upon request.

Are you a pilot perchance? Pan Am Flight 103 was an airplane crash first and foremost.

Article>Sources close to the SCCRC have admitted that vital new evidence is contained in its report and concede it is almost certain it will order a fresh appeal.

Some German technical documents also open up another possible alternative to the Crown's theory,

Another insider close to the defence said: "The papers do not absolutely 100% prove the Palestinian link, but that's not the defence's job. What they do is substantially boost the alternative explanation."

At 11:51 AM +0100 9/7/05, Robin Johnston wrote:
Reply-To: "Robin Johnston" <rjohnston@sccrc.org.uk>
From: "Robin Johnston" <rjohnston@sccrc.org.uk>
To: "John Barry Smith" <barry@qp6.com>
Subject: Re: PA103
Date: Wed, 7 Sep 2005 11:51:05 +0100
X-Nospam: None
Dear Mr Smith

I have asked a member of our team to look over your report to assess its contents. Any further submissions by you will not be considered by the Commission, for the reasons I have already given.

Yours sincerely
Robin Johnston
Solicitor
Senior Legal Officer
Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission
Glasgow

At 8:57 AM +0100 10/21/05, Robin Johnston wrote:
Reply-To: "Robin Johnston" <rjohnston@sccrc.org.uk>
From: "Robin Johnston" <rjohnston@sccrc.org.uk>
To: "John Barry Smith" <barry@qp6.com>
Subject: Re: Synopsis: Pan Am Flight 103
Date: Fri, 21 Oct 2005 08:57:46 +0100

X-Nospam: None

Dear Mr Smith

Thank you for your email. As you know we accepted your report on the basis that no further submissions from you would be considered. The report you submitted, which is being looked at by a member of the team, is very substantial, extending to hundreds of pages and is we have taken this as a comprehensive account of your views on the matter.

I trust you understand the position.

Robin Johnston (Mr)
Solicitor
Senior Legal Officer
Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission
Glasgow

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.nts.gov>
Commercial pilot, instrument rated, former FAA Part 135
certificate holder.

US Navy reconnaissance navigator, RA-5C 650 hours.
US Navy patrol crewman, P2V-5FS 2000 hours.
Air Intelligence Officer, US Navy
Retired US Army Major MSC
Owner Mooney M-20C, 1000 hours.
Survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet plane crash in RA-5C

Lockerbie retrial demand over new evidence

MURDO MACLEOD

THE Lockerbie bombing conviction seems certain to be sent back to the appeal court after it emerged Scottish prosecutors suppressed "absolutely crucial" German police evidence at the trial, Scotland on Sunday can reveal.

The evidence - papers suggesting a key prosecution witness was implicated in the mass murder - will form part of an official report by the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission (SCCRC).

The results of the German inquiry were passed to the Crown Office in Edinburgh years before the 2000 trial and translated into English at considerable public expense.

But lawyers for Abdelbaset ali Mohamed al-Megrahi, the Libyan serving life for the atrocity, were refused access to the documents by the Crown Office before the historic case opened in Holland. Scotland on Sunday has established that the defence was forced to obtain the papers direct from the German prosecutors just before Megrahi's trial but did not have the time or money to translate them.

The papers could, it is claimed, have transformed the outcome of

the case. German investigators established that a Palestinian terrorist called Abo Talb, funded by Iran, could have placed the bomb on board Pan Am flight 103. They also established that the Iranian government paid millions of dollars into a Swiss bank account belonging to one of Talb's colleagues two days after the Lockerbie bombing.

However, Talb was produced at the trial as a vital witness for the prosecution, in return for lifetime immunity from prosecution. Defence sources claim this provided the motive for the Crown to suppress the German evidence.

The Lockerbie disaster, on December 21, 1988, claimed the lives of 270 people in the aircraft and on the ground. Megrahi was found guilty in January 2001 after a three-month trial at Camp Zeist and his appeal dismissed the following year.

But a team of lawyers and investigators has continued working on the case. The SCCRC is due to complete a report on Megrahi's conviction early next year.

Sources close to the SCCRC have admitted that vital new evidence is contained in its report and concede it is almost certain it will order a fresh appeal. One source confirmed: "The documents are absolutely crucial. They would have proved very useful to the defence at the trial."

If, as expected, the case is referred back, it could result in the original decision being upheld, a retrial or even Megrahi's conviction being quashed.

Meanwhile, the Libyan's defence team is understood to be furious at the failure of the Crown to comply with standard trial procedure. A source close to the defence said: "The Crown refused to hand over these vital documents. That is unacceptable and a complete breach of all the rules about 'equality of arms' and disclosure and a fair trial."

Jim Swire, spokesman for the Lockerbie families, said: "We have always believed that the man in jail for the bombing should not

be there. This seems to be a very important step in proving that and getting justice for the victims of the bombing."

Tony Kelly, Megrahi's lawyer, said: "This case is being dealt with by the SCCRC, and we await its findings. Out of deference to it, I cannot comment on any aspect of the case."

No one from SCCRC was available and the Crown Office refused to comment.

A spokesman for the German federal police service confirmed it had carried out a number of investigations that were linked to the Lockerbie affair.

Missing evidence may free Megrahi

MURDO MACLEOD

(mmacleod@scotlandonsunday.com)

LONG before she saw anything, Majorie McQueen heard Pan Am flight 103 come apart and tumble through the night sky above Lockerbie.

"I was out in my garden at the time... I thought it was a clap of thunder, but it just carried on getting louder and louder all the time and there was an enormous crash."

Wreckage landed 200 yards from the home of McQueen. "We couldn't figure out what it was until my husband received a call from a colleague who said that the nose of a plane was lying in the field."

They knew it was an aircraft but, almost 18 years later, they are not sure much else is clear. Despite the conviction of Libyan Abdelbaset ali Mohamed al-Megrahi, the questions not only remain but continue to mount.

And early next year, it seems all but certain the doubters and conspiracy theorists will receive official backing when the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission (SCCRC) sends the conviction of Megrahi back to the appeal court.

Four years ago, at Camp Zeist in the Netherlands, three Scottish judges, sitting without a jury, accepted the Crown case that Megrahi was an intelligence officer working for Libyan Airlines in Malta, and that he planted the bomb by placing a suitcase on a connecting flight from Malta to Frankfurt, which ended up on the London Heathrow leg to New York.

But many people have long believed the attack was carried out by Palestinian terrorists working for the Iranians, who wanted revenge for the downing of an Iran Air airbus by a US warship in July 1988.

According to the theory, this line of inquiry was acceptable until the Gulf War when cooperation, rather than conflict, with Tehran became necessary.

The German federal police, the Bundeskriminalamt (BKA), were already investigating Palestinian terrorists, including the Swedish-based Abo Talb and a number of contacts in Malta.

Talb had been a Lockerbie suspect early in the investigation. A calendar was found in his Swedish flat with December 21 circled and he was known to have visited Malta in the months before the bombing.

Megrahi's team at the Lockerbie trial lodged a special defence, saying Talb was responsible. But Talb, who during the 1990s was jailed in Sweden, appeared at the Lockerbie trial as a prosecution witness, testifying that he was not responsible.

Until now, the defence have not had documentary evidence placing Talb in Malta at the precise time of the bombing.

But the BKA documents, gathered from investigations in Germany and Malta, are understood to provide that missing link. They are said to include surveillance reports which place Talb in Malta less than four weeks before the attack.

They also reveal crucial details about cash transactions which may be linked to Lockerbie. One account, held by Palestinian terrorists arrested by the Germans, was in Lausanne, Switzerland.

On December 23, two days after the bombing, the Iranian government deposited £5.9m into this account.

Some German technical documents also open up another possible alternative to the Crown's theory, that the device could have been planted at Frankfurt Airport rather than Malta. Such an explanation has always been ruled out by prosecutors.

The information from the BKA documents locate Talb in Malta on a date in the four weeks prior to the bombing.

Although Megrahi's defence are now in possession of this crucial detail, and it has been passed on to the SCCRC, it was never available at the trial because of what is claimed to have been obstructive behaviour by the Crown Office.

As the trial approached, Megrahi's defence knew the Crown had access to huge numbers of reports from the BKA. The defence demanded that all the documents were handed over as was normal in criminal trials to guarantee a fair hearing. If made available, they would have destroyed Talb's credibility and very possibly provided the doubt necessary to acquit Megrahi.

One source said: "The Crown said that they couldn't hand over anything which came from a 'foreign power' because it would be wrong without the permission of that 'foreign power'."

Eventually, with the trial just a few weeks away, the defence took things into their own hands and went to Germany to see the chief prosecutor in Frankfurt.

"They got all the papers, literally thousands and thousands and thousands of them. All in German," the source said. "From interviews and surveillance reports, many hand-written, to documents about the freight and baggage movements in and out of Frankfurt airport, and no one could figure out which ones were important to the case."

Another source close to the defence revealed that a frenzied attempt was made to translate the papers.

He said: "The Crown had had them translated at taxpayers'

expense, but wouldn't give the defence access to the translations. The papers had to be sent to professional translators, costing tens of thousands of pounds, and they began working with the trial just a couple of weeks away.

"The papers were still being translated during the trial and the costs were beginning to hit the hundreds of thousands of pounds. The defence had to go into court not having access to a lot of useful information."

Another insider close to the defence said: "The papers do not absolutely 100% prove the Palestinian link, but that's not the defence's job. What they do is substantially boost the alternative explanation."

In Lockerbie, the dispute over responsibility brings cynicism from McQueen. "I don't know who did it, but even if the guy who's in prison did it, he wasn't the main player," she say

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: onlineeditor@scotsman.com

Subject: Common Sense for PA 103 (short version)

Dear Sir, Monday, September 8, 2003 8:05 AM

Is it too late to put aside conspiracy and hate for a bit to examine a plausible mechanical explanation for a plane crash that has precedent?

I refer to Pan American World Airways Flight 103 and the precedent is United Airlines Flight 811.

www.corazon.com has details.

Let's look at reality above and not overheard conversation years ago. Above is a never released publicly picture of the starboard side of that infamous forward cargo hold of Pan American World Airways Flight 103. It is the forward cargo door side and shows the blown open bottom half of the door. This evidence matches other ruptured open cargo door of early model Boeing 747s that left a sudden loud sound on the CVR followed by an abrupt power cut to the recorders.

What caused the door to blow open? You might say a bomb did it. I would suggest a precedent of United Airlines Flight 811 in which the electrical system was the probable cause.

The implications of the shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is that Boeing is responsible for Lockerbie deaths because of faulty wiring and a design flaw of non plug cargo doors in their Boeing 747s.

I have been researching these crashes for 12 years. Is it too late for reason and common sense to present its case using facts, data, and evidence?

At 8:18 AM -0700 9/8/03,

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

I note above and below in your article that the Scots are dissatisfied with the official explanation. They are correct: No

bomb, no bombers, no crime, just nature trying to equalize pressure in a pressurized hull, similar to the Comet accidents of years ago (also originally thought to be bomb caused).

If you are fair you will consider all explanations that are reasonable. You may ask questions of me to determine the worth of my explanation. I offer a non-conspiracy mechanical explanation that can be confirmed and is supported by official documents, photographs, charts, and schematics. It's science. Pan American World Airways Flight 103 was a aircraft inflight breakup, not a bank robbery.

You might be particularly interested in my explanation of why a bomb is erroneously considered to be the probable cause. It's in my pdf file of my Aircraft Accident Report for Pan American World Airways Flight 103, sent to the 'letters' section of The Scotsman.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
831 659 3552
barry@corazon.com
<http://www.corazon.com>

Lockerbie relative rejects £4m pay-out as 'another step away from the truth'

DAN MCDUGALL

WHEN the fax arrived from the United NationsÕ headquarters in

New York at Marina de Larracoechea's Bilbao apartment, she was eating with her family.

She was soon to lose her appetite as she ran her eyes over the details of the settlement reached with the Libyan government for the compensation to be paid to families who had lost relatives in the destruction of flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988.

She had nothing but anger and contempt for the sum promised to her in recognition of the loss of her younger sister's life.

Nieves de Larracoechea, a stewardess with Pan-Am, was 39 when she was killed along with 269 others on 21 December, 1988 after a bomb concealed inside a Toshiba radio cassette recorder tore through flight 103, sending blazing wreckage raining down on Lockerbie.

As the compensation settlement with Libya appears finally settled, Ms de Larracoechea believes the relatives of the victims have never been further from the truth.

"Compensation has never been an issue for me or many others whose lives were blighted by these appalling events. I believe the money being offered represents nothing more than another step away from the truth. The figure of \$6.5 million dollars (£4.09 million) for each family affected by the atrocity means nothing to me and I have no intention of accepting any money, all I want is the truth."

She added: "Many people seem focused on the money, but the reality of the situation is it more than suits Libya to accept liability for the bombing, it means they can fully restore trade to the west. Their oil exports alone and the inward investment open

trade will bring will ensure they justify the Lockerbie pay-outs in a year.

"This isn't about accepting blame, or apologising, it's about oil trade and the families of the victims have been caught up in a huge diplomatic game. What we want to know is who was specifically responsible for this and how much forewarning did both the American and British governments have of a terrorist attack."

Ms Larracochea holds nothing but troubled memories of the trial of two suspects at Holland's Kamp van Zeist two years ago, a criminal process she claims was nothing more than a political and financial fix designed to speed up the removal of oil sanctions against Libya and bury the real story of the bombing. She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

She added: "I continue to believe they, particularly Megrahi since he was found guilty, were also victims of this tragedy. The fact that he is languishing in a Scottish prison is a source of great sadness to me and to many other relatives I have spoken to. In the circumstances he is nothing more than a scapegoat."

In the opening days of the trial, Ms de Larracochea recalls the chill that ran through the public gallery as television screens showed the moment when flight 103 disappeared off radar, to be replaced by ghostly green traces of wreckage spreading over south-west Scotland.

Susan Cohen, whose 20-year-old daughter, Theodora, was killed, was so upset by the image that she left the room. But Ms de Larracochea claims she found the image easier to deal with. Not only had she seen it at the fatal accident inquiry in Scotland, but she has made herself face far more graphic evidence since, such as the police photographs she still has of the carnage on the ground.

However, on the first Friday of the trial, the court listened for a full hour as the complete list of victims was read out. "That was difficult," Ms Larracochea recalled. "But not as difficult as living with it every day."

Only an independent inquiry, overseen by two delegated nations other than Britain or the US, can now address her allegations that Megrahi is innocent and the US government failed to make public warnings from terrorist groups in the run-up to the tragedy that a US airline would be targeted.

Ms de Larracochea said: "If my sister had told me that there had been bomb threats but she was going to get on the plane because she didn't take them seriously, then things would be completely different. At least she would have had the choice, she would have been in control of her own life. Instead, she and the other people on the plane were effectively allowed to be massacred."

She added: "Another issue that has to be scrutinised more closely is the fact that Abu Nidal admitted responsibility for the bombing on behalf of his Fatah Revolutionary Council in direct retaliation for America mistakenly shooting down an Iranian airbus. Why was his admission of culpability ignored?"

It seems increasingly unlikely that an independent inquiry will be

granted. Last year she took her case directly to the Scottish courts, petitioning the five judges in charge of the Lockerbie trial to agree to an independent inquiry.

In her petition, Ms de Larracochea told the judges, led by Lord Cullen, that "central aspects of the case were repeatedly shielded" during the fatal accident inquiry, adding that an independent review of all evidence of the criminal investigation was the only way to deliver answers to the families. The judges quickly rejected her submission as "incompetent".

Ms de Larracochea is not alone in her calls for a public inquiry. Mrs Cohen and her husband Dan last week said the settlement was a "bribe" and said they would accept only the first instalment of the \$6.5 million.

Mr Cohen, 67, of New Jersey, said: "If we were wealthy people we would turn the whole thing down, but we're not. The second and third payments will be worth a total of \$6 million (£3.77 million) but we won't be touching that."

Jim Swire, whose daughter Flora was on board flight 103, has also said that the families of the victims still wanted to know how the attack had been allowed to happen.

Yet, many Americans continue to believe full liability for the atrocity lies with Libya. George Williams, a spokesman for the US victims, said: "The only thing that would satisfy us more would be to have Gaddafi's head delivered on a platter over to the US."

LIBYAN DEAL FRENCH THREAT

SUSAN BELL

PARIS will use its veto at the United Nations security council vote tomorrow to block the British motion to lift sanctions against Libya after the Lockerbie settlement - unless Tripoli provides "sufficient guarantees" it will pay extra compensation to families of the 170 victims of the 1989 bombing of a French UTA jet.

"If a vote was held at the UN security council (now), we would have no option but to oppose it," said Renaud Muselier, French foreign secretary.

It is still unclear whether the UN vote will be delayed. Wary of another bitter UN row like that over the Iraq war, London has twice delayed introducing a motion to lift sanctions. However, it has said it can't wait indefinitely for a French UTA deal and risk jeopardising its hard-won deal for families of the Lockerbie disaster.

The British-US deal with Libya over Lockerbie left Paris severely embarrassed. It gives Pan-Am families 25 times more money than that received four years ago by the families of victims of UTA flight 772 from Paris to Brazzaville in Central Africa.

Libya has never admitted responsibility for blowing up the jet over the Sahara, but in 1999 paid \$33 million (£21 million) in compensation. In the same year a French court convicted, in absentia, six members of the Libyan intelligence services.

In theory, UTA families would have received around \$194,000 (£122,000) each. Guillaume Denoix de Saint Marc, a spokesman

for the families, said some have had nothing. Even more traumatising, he said, is the fact the six agents, including Colonel Gaddafi's brother-in-law, have remained free.

Mr Denoix de Saint Marc said: "We are not necessarily looking to get exactly the same as Lockerbie, but the agreed sum must be sufficiently important so we feel justice has been done."

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: onlineeditor@scotsman.com

Subject: Common Sense for PA 103 Part II

Dear Sir, Tuesday, September 9, 2003 7:44 AM

Britain Says to Go Ahead with Lockerbie UN Vote

Tue September 9, 2003 10:21 AM ET

UNITED NATIONS (Reuters) - Britain said on Tuesday it planned to go ahead with a Security Council vote on lifting sanctions on Libya over the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, despite a plea from France that the vote be put off.

"We are calling a meeting for 12:30," said a British official, speaking on condition of anonymity, after France said it had asked for a new postponement on the U.N. vote. Britain, the Security Council president for September, had initially set the vote for 10:30 a.m. EDT.

JBS>The shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan American World Airways Flight 103 makes sense.

www.corazon.com has details.

Does it not seem strange to you that the AAIB report has two pictures of the port side of Pan American World Airways Flight 103 yet none of the starboard? Here above is the starboard side and the hole is immensely larger than the port side hole and yet both happened at the same time, according to the wreckage reconstruction.

The implications of the shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is that Boeing is responsible for Lockerbie deaths because of faulty wiring and a design flaw of non plug cargo doors in their Boeing 747s. To put it another way, the victims on the ground would get their due compensation.

At 8:18 AM -0700 9/8/03,

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

I note above and below in your article that the Scots are dissatisfied with the official explanation. They are correct: No bomb, no bombers, no crime, just nature trying to equalize pressure in a pressurized hull, similar to the Comet accidents of years ago (also originally thought to be bomb caused).

If you are fair you will consider all explanations that are reasonable. You may ask questions of me to determine the worth

of my explanation. I offer a non-conspiracy mechanical explanation that can be confirmed and is supported by official documents, photographs, charts, and schematics. It's science. Pan American World Airways Flight 103 was a aircraft inflight breakup, not a bank robbery.

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

831 659 3552

barry@corazon.com

<http://www.corazon.com>

Lockerbie relative rejects £4m pay-out as 'another step away from the truth'

DAN MCDUGALL

WHEN the fax arrived from the United Nations's headquarters in New York at Marina de Larracochea's Bilbao apartment, she was eating with her family.

She was soon to lose her appetite as she ran her eyes over the details of the settlement reached with the Libyan government for the compensation to be paid to families who had lost relatives in the destruction of flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988.

She had nothing but anger and contempt for the sum promised to her in recognition of the loss of her younger sister's life.

Nieves de Larracochea, a stewardess with Pan-Am, was 39

when she was killed along with 269 others on 21 December, 1988 after a bomb concealed inside a Toshiba radio cassette recorder tore through flight 103, sending blazing wreckage raining down on Lockerbie.

As the compensation settlement with Libya appears finally settled, Ms de Larracoechea believes the relatives of the victims have never been further from the truth.

"Compensation has never been an issue for me or many others whose lives were blighted by these appalling events. I believe the money being offered represents nothing more than another step away from the truth. The figure of \$6.5 million dollars (£4.09 million) for each family affected by the atrocity means nothing to me and I have no intention of accepting any money, all I want is the truth."

She added: "Many people seem focused on the money, but the reality of the situation is it more than suits Libya to accept liability for the bombing, it means they can fully restore trade to the west. Their oil exports alone and the inward investment open trade will bring will ensure they justify the Lockerbie pay-outs in a year.

"This isn't about accepting blame, or apologising, it's about oil trade and the families of the victims have been caught up in a huge diplomatic game. What we want to know is who was specifically responsible for this and how much forewarning did both the American and British governments have of a terrorist attack."

Ms Larracoechea holds nothing but troubled memories of the trial of two suspects at Holland's Kamp van Zeist two years

ago, a criminal process she claims was nothing more than a political and financial fix designed to speed up the removal of oil sanctions against Libya and bury the real story of the bombing. She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

She added: "I continue to believe they, particularly Megrahi since he was found guilty, were also victims of this tragedy. The fact that he is languishing in a Scottish prison is a source of great sadness to me and to many other relatives I have spoken to. In the circumstances he is nothing more than a scapegoat."

In the opening days of the trial, Ms de Larracochea recalls the chill that ran through the public gallery as television screens showed the moment when flight 103 disappeared off radar, to be replaced by ghostly green traces of wreckage spreading over south-west Scotland.

Susan Cohen, whose 20-year-old daughter, Theodora, was killed, was so upset by the image that she left the room. But Ms de Larracochea claims she found the image easier to deal with. Not only had she seen it at the fatal accident inquiry in Scotland, but she has made herself face far more graphic evidence since, such as the police photographs she still has of the carnage on the ground.

However, on the first Friday of the trial, the court listened for a full hour as the complete list of victims was read out. "That was difficult," Ms Larracochea recalled. "But not as difficult as living with it every day."

Only an independent inquiry, overseen by two delegated nations other than Britain or the US, can now address her allegations that Megrahi is innocent and the US government failed to make public warnings from terrorist groups in the run-up to the tragedy that a US airline would be targeted.

Ms de Larracochea said: "If my sister had told me that there had been bomb threats but she was going to get on the plane because she didn't take them seriously, then things would be completely different. At least she would have had the choice, she would have been in control of her own life. Instead, she and the other people on the plane were effectively allowed to be massacred."

She added: "Another issue that has to be scrutinised more closely is the fact that Abu Nidal admitted responsibility for the bombing on behalf of his Fatah Revolutionary Council in direct retaliation for America mistakenly shooting down an Iranian airbus. Why was his admission of culpability ignored?"

It seems increasingly unlikely that an independent inquiry will be granted. Last year she took her case directly to the Scottish courts, petitioning the five judges in charge of the Lockerbie trial to agree to an independent inquiry.

In her petition, Ms de Larracochea told the judges, led by Lord Cullen, that "central aspects of the case were repeatedly shielded" during the fatal accident inquiry, adding that an independent review of all evidence of the criminal investigation was the only way to deliver answers to the families. The judges quickly rejected her submission as "incompetent".

Ms de Larracochea is not alone in her calls for a public inquiry.

Mrs Cohen and her husband Dan last week said the settlement was a "bribe" and said they would accept only the first instalment of the \$6.5 million.

Mr Cohen, 67, of New Jersey, said: "If we were wealthy people we would turn the whole thing down, but we're not. The second and third payments will be worth a total of \$6 million (£3.77 million) but we won't be touching that."

Jim Swire, whose daughter Flora was on board flight 103, has also said that the families of the victims still wanted to know how the attack had been allowed to happen.

Yet, many Americans continue to believe full liability for the atrocity lies with Libya. George Williams, a spokesman for the US victims, said: "The only thing that would satisfy us more would be to have Gaddafi's head delivered on a platter over to the US."

LIBYAN DEAL FRENCH THREAT SUSAN BELL

PARIS will use its veto at the United Nations security council vote tomorrow to block the British motion to lift sanctions against Libya after the Lockerbie settlement - unless Tripoli provides "sufficient guarantees" it will pay extra compensation to families of the 170 victims of the 1989 bombing of a French UTA jet.

"If a vote was held at the UN security council (now), we would have no option but to oppose it," said Renaud Muselier, French foreign secretary.

It is still unclear whether the UN vote will be delayed. Wary of another bitter UN row like that over the Iraq war, London has twice delayed introducing a motion to lift sanctions. However, it has said it can't wait indefinitely for a French UTA deal and risk jeopardising its hard-won deal for families of the Lockerbie disaster.

The British-US deal with Libya over Lockerbie left Paris severely embarrassed. It gives Pan-Am families 25 times more money than that received four years ago by the families of victims of UTA flight 772 from Paris to Brazzaville in Central Africa.

Libya has never admitted responsibility for blowing up the jet over the Sahara, but in 1999 paid \$33 million (£21 million) in compensation. In the same year a French court convicted, in absentia, six members of the Libyan intelligence services.

In theory, UTA families would have received around \$194,000 (£122,000) each. Guillaume Denoix de Saint Marc, a spokesman for the families, said some have had nothing. Even more traumatising, he said, is the fact the six agents, including Colonel Gaddafi's brother-in-law, have remained free.

Mr Denoix de Saint Marc said: "We are not necessarily looking to get exactly the same as Lockerbie, but the agreed sum must be sufficiently important so we feel justice has been done."

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: onlineeditor@scotsman.com

Subject: Not too late to do some investigative reporting for the benefit of your local readers.

Dear Sir, Wednesday, September 10, 2003 7:58 AM

Britain Says to Go Ahead with Lockerbie UN Vote
Tue September 9, 2003 10:21 AM ET

UNITED NATIONS (Reuters) - Britain said on Tuesday it planned to go ahead with a Security Council vote on lifting sanctions on Libya over the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, despite a plea from France that the vote be put off. "We are calling a meeting for 12:30," said a British official, speaking on condition of anonymity, after France said it had asked for a new postponement on the U.N. vote. Britain, the Security Council president for September, had initially set the vote for 10:30 a.m. EDT.

JBS>The shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan American World Airways Flight 103 makes sense.

www.corazon.com has details.

Does it not seem strange to you that the AAIB report has two pictures of the port side of Pan American World Airways Flight 103 yet none of the starboard? Here above is the starboard side and the hole is immensely larger than the port side hole and yet both happened at the same time, according to the wreckage reconstruction.

The implications of the shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/

explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is that Boeing is responsible for Lockerbie deaths because of faulty wiring and a design flaw of non plug cargo doors in their Boeing 747s. To put it another way, the victims on the ground would get their due compensation.

At 8:18 AM -0700 9/8/03,

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

I note above and below in your article that the Scots are dissatisfied with the official explanation. They are correct: No bomb, no bombers, no crime, just nature trying to equalize pressure in a pressurized hull, similar to the Comet accidents of years ago (also originally thought to be bomb caused).

If you are fair you will consider all explanations that are reasonable. You may ask questions of me to determine the worth of my explanation. I offer a non-conspiracy mechanical explanation that can be confirmed and is supported by official documents, photographs, charts, and schematics. It's science. Pan American World Airways Flight 103 was a aircraft inflight breakup, not a bank robbery.

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

831 659 3552

barry@corazon.com

<http://www.corazon.com>

Lockerbie relative rejects £4m pay-out as 'another step away from the truth'

DAN MCDUGALL

WHEN the fax arrived from the United Nations' headquarters in New York at Marina de Larracochea's Bilbao apartment, she was eating with her family.

She was soon to lose her appetite as she ran her eyes over the details of the settlement reached with the Libyan government for the compensation to be paid to families who had lost relatives in the destruction of flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988.

She had nothing but anger and contempt for the sum promised to her in recognition of the loss of her younger sister's life.

Nieves de Larracochea, a stewardess with Pan-Am, was 39 when she was killed along with 269 others on 21 December, 1988 after a bomb concealed inside a Toshiba radio cassette recorder tore through flight 103, sending blazing wreckage raining down on Lockerbie.

As the compensation settlement with Libya appears finally settled, Ms de Larracochea believes the relatives of the victims have never been further from the truth.

"Compensation has never been an issue for me or many others whose lives were blighted by these appalling events. I believe the money being offered represents nothing more than another step

away from the truth. The figure of \$6.5 million dollars (£4.09 million) for each family affected by the atrocity means nothing to me and I have no intention of accepting any money, all I want is the truth."

She added: "Many people seem focused on the money, but the reality of the situation is it more than suits Libya to accept liability for the bombing, it means they can fully restore trade to the west. Their oil exports alone and the inward investment open trade will bring will ensure they justify the Lockerbie pay-outs in a year.

"This isn't about accepting blame, or apologising, it's about oil trade and the families of the victims have been caught up in a huge diplomatic game. What we want to know is who was specifically responsible for this and how much forewarning did both the American and British governments have of a terrorist attack."

Ms Larracochea holds nothing but troubled memories of the trial of two suspects at Holland's Kamp van Zeist two years ago, a criminal process she claims was nothing more than a political and financial fix designed to speed up the removal of oil sanctions against Libya and bury the real story of the bombing. She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

She added: "I continue to believe they, particularly Megrahi since he was found guilty, were also victims of this tragedy. The fact that he is languishing in a Scottish prison is a source of great

sadness to me and to many other relatives I have spoken to. In the circumstances he is nothing more than a scapegoat."

In the opening days of the trial, Ms de Larracoechea recalls the chill that ran through the public gallery as television screens showed the moment when flight 103 disappeared off radar, to be replaced by ghostly green traces of wreckage spreading over south-west Scotland.

Susan Cohen, whose 20-year-old daughter, Theodora, was killed, was so upset by the image that she left the room. But Ms de Larracoechea claims she found the image easier to deal with. Not only had she seen it at the fatal accident inquiry in Scotland, but she has made herself face far more graphic evidence since, such as the police photographs she still has of the carnage on the ground.

However, on the first Friday of the trial, the court listened for a full hour as the complete list of victims was read out. "That was difficult," Ms Larracoechea recalled. "But not as difficult as living with it every day."

Only an independent inquiry, overseen by two delegated nations other than Britain or the US, can now address her allegations that Megrahi is innocent and the US government failed to make public warnings from terrorist groups in the run-up to the tragedy that a US airline would be targeted.

Ms de Larracoechea said: "If my sister had told me that there had been bomb threats but she was going to get on the plane because she didn't take them seriously, then things would be completely different. At least she would have had the choice, she would have been in control of her own life. Instead, she and the other people

on the plane were effectively allowed to be massacred."

She added: "Another issue that has to be scrutinised more closely is the fact that Abu Nidal admitted responsibility for the bombing on behalf of his Fatah Revolutionary Council in direct retaliation for America mistakenly shooting down an Iranian airbus. Why was his admission of culpability ignored?"

It seems increasingly unlikely that an independent inquiry will be granted. Last year she took her case directly to the Scottish courts, petitioning the five judges in charge of the Lockerbie trial to agree to an independent inquiry.

In her petition, Ms de Larracochea told the judges, led by Lord Cullen, that "central aspects of the case were repeatedly shielded" during the fatal accident inquiry, adding that an independent review of all evidence of the criminal investigation was the only way to deliver answers to the families. The judges quickly rejected her submission as "incompetent".

Ms de Larracochea is not alone in her calls for a public inquiry. Mrs Cohen and her husband Dan last week said the settlement was a "bribe" and said they would accept only the first instalment of the \$6.5 million.

Mr Cohen, 67, of New Jersey, said: "If we were wealthy people we would turn the whole thing down, but we're not. The second and third payments will be worth a total of \$6 million (£3.77 million) but we won't be touching that."

Jim Swire, whose daughter Flora was on board flight 103, has also said that the families of the victims still wanted to know how the attack had been allowed to happen.

Yet, many Americans continue to believe full liability for the atrocity lies with Libya. George Williams, a spokesman for the US victims, said: "The only thing that would satisfy us more would be to have Gaddafi's head delivered on a platter over to the US."

LIBYAN DEAL FRENCH THREAT SUSAN BELL

PARIS will use its veto at the United Nations security council vote tomorrow to block the British motion to lift sanctions against Libya after the Lockerbie settlement - unless Tripoli provides "sufficient guarantees" it will pay extra compensation to families of the 170 victims of the 1989 bombing of a French UTA jet.

"If a vote was held at the UN security council (now), we would have no option but to oppose it," said Renaud Muselier, French foreign secretary.

It is still unclear whether the UN vote will be delayed. Wary of another bitter UN row like that over the Iraq war, London has twice delayed introducing a motion to lift sanctions. However, it has said it can't wait indefinitely for a French UTA deal and risk jeopardising its hard-won deal for families of the Lockerbie disaster.

The British-US deal with Libya over Lockerbie left Paris severely embarrassed. It gives Pan-Am families 25 times more money than that received four years ago by the families of victims of UTA flight 772 from Paris to Brazzaville in Central

Africa.

Libya has never admitted responsibility for blowing up the jet over the Sahara, but in 1999 paid \$33 million (£21 million) in compensation. In the same year a French court convicted, in absentia, six members of the Libyan intelligence services.

In theory, UTA families would have received around \$194,000 (£122,000) each. Guillaume Denoix de Saint Marc, a spokesman for the families, said some have had nothing. Even more traumatising, he said, is the fact the six agents, including Colonel Gaddafi's brother-in-law, have remained free.

Mr Denoix de Saint Marc said: "We are not necessarily looking to get exactly the same as Lockerbie, but the agreed sum must be sufficiently important so we feel justice has been done."

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: onlineeditor@scotsman.com

Subject: Not too late to do some investigative reporting for the benefit of your local readers.

Dear Sir, Wednesday, September 10, 2003 7:58 AM

Is it too late to put aside conspiracy and hate for a bit to examine a plausible mechanical explanation for a plane crash that has precedent?

I refer to Pan American World Airways Flight 103 and the precedent is United Airlines Flight 811.

www.corazon.com has details.

Let's look at reality above and not overheard conversation years ago. Above is a never released publicly picture of the starboard side of that infamous forward cargo hold of Pan American World Airways Flight 103. It is the forward cargo door side and shows the blown open bottom half of the door. This evidence matches other ruptured open cargo door of early model Boeing 747s that left a sudden loud sound on the CVR followed by an abrupt power cut to the recorders.

What caused the door to blow open? You might say a bomb did it. I would suggest a precedent of United Airlines Flight 811 in which the electrical system was the probable cause.

The implications of the shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is that Boeing is responsible for Lockerbie deaths because of faulty wiring and a design flaw of non plug cargo doors in their Boeing 747s.

I have been researching these crashes for 12 years. Is it too late for reason and common sense to present its case using facts, data, and evidence?

At 8:18 AM -0700 9/8/03,

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

I note above and below in your article that the Scots are dissatisfied with the official explanation. They are correct: No bomb, no bombers, no crime, just nature trying to equalize pressure in a pressurized hull, similar to the Comet accidents of years ago (also originally thought to be bomb caused).

If you are fair you will consider all explanations that are reasonable. You may ask questions of me to determine the worth of my explanation. I offer a non-conspiracy mechanical explanation that can be confirmed and is supported by official documents, photographs, charts, and schematics. It's science. Pan American World Airways Flight 103 was a aircraft inflight breakup, not a bank robbery.

You might be particularly interested in my explanation of why a bomb is erroneously considered to be the probable cause. It's in my pdf file of my Aircraft Accident Report for Pan American World Airways Flight 103, sent to the 'letters' section of The Scotsman.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
831 659 3552
barry@corazon.com
<http://www.corazon.com>

Lockerbie relative rejects £4m pay-out as 'another step away from the truth'

DAN MCDOUGALL

WHEN the fax arrived from the United Nations's headquarters in New York at Marina de Larracochea's Bilbao apartment, she was eating with her family.

She was soon to lose her appetite as she ran her eyes over the details of the settlement reached with the Libyan government for the compensation to be paid to families who had lost relatives in the destruction of flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988.

She had nothing but anger and contempt for the sum promised to her in recognition of the loss of her younger sister's life.

Nieves de Larracochea, a stewardess with Pan-Am, was 39 when she was killed along with 269 others on 21 December, 1988 after a bomb concealed inside a Toshiba radio cassette recorder tore through flight 103, sending blazing wreckage raining down on Lockerbie.

As the compensation settlement with Libya appears finally settled, Ms de Larracochea believes the relatives of the victims have never been further from the truth.

"Compensation has never been an issue for me or many others whose lives were blighted by these appalling events. I believe the money being offered represents nothing more than another step away from the truth. The figure of \$6.5 million dollars (£4.09 million) for each family affected by the atrocity means nothing to me and I have no intention of accepting any money, all I want is the truth."

She added: "Many people seem focused on the money, but the reality of the situation is it more than suits Libya to accept

liability for the bombing, it means they can fully restore trade to the west. Their oil exports alone and the inward investment open trade will bring will ensure they justify the Lockerbie pay-outs in a year.

"This isn't about accepting blame, or apologising, it's about oil trade and the families of the victims have been caught up in a huge diplomatic game. What we want to know is who was specifically responsible for this and how much forewarning did both the American and British governments have of a terrorist attack."

Ms Larracochea holds nothing but troubled memories of the trial of two suspects at Holland's Kamp van Zeist two years ago, a criminal process she claims was nothing more than a political and financial fix designed to speed up the removal of oil sanctions against Libya and bury the real story of the bombing. She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

She added: "I continue to believe they, particularly Megrahi since he was found guilty, were also victims of this tragedy. The fact that he is languishing in a Scottish prison is a source of great sadness to me and to many other relatives I have spoken to. In the circumstances he is nothing more than a scapegoat."

In the opening days of the trial, Ms de Larracochea recalls the chill that ran through the public gallery as television screens showed the moment when flight 103 disappeared off radar, to be replaced by ghostly green traces of wreckage spreading over

south-west Scotland.

Susan Cohen, whose 20-year-old daughter, Theodora, was killed, was so upset by the image that she left the room. But Ms de Larracochea claims she found the image easier to deal with. Not only had she seen it at the fatal accident inquiry in Scotland, but she has made herself face far more graphic evidence since, such as the police photographs she still has of the carnage on the ground.

However, on the first Friday of the trial, the court listened for a full hour as the complete list of victims was read out. "That was difficult," Ms Larracochea recalled. "But not as difficult as living with it every day."

Only an independent inquiry, overseen by two delegated nations other than Britain or the US, can now address her allegations that Megrahi is innocent and the US government failed to make public warnings from terrorist groups in the run-up to the tragedy that a US airline would be targeted.

Ms de Larracochea said: "If my sister had told me that there had been bomb threats but she was going to get on the plane because she didn't take them seriously, then things would be completely different. At least she would have had the choice, she would have been in control of her own life. Instead, she and the other people on the plane were effectively allowed to be massacred."

She added: "Another issue that has to be scrutinised more closely is the fact that Abu Nidal admitted responsibility for the bombing on behalf of his Fatah Revolutionary Council in direct retaliation for America mistakenly shooting down an Iranian airbus. Why was his admission of culpability ignored?"

It seems increasingly unlikely that an independent inquiry will be granted. Last year she took her case directly to the Scottish courts, petitioning the five judges in charge of the Lockerbie trial to agree to an independent inquiry.

In her petition, Ms de Larracochea told the judges, led by Lord Cullen, that "central aspects of the case were repeatedly shielded" during the fatal accident inquiry, adding that an independent review of all evidence of the criminal investigation was the only way to deliver answers to the families. The judges quickly rejected her submission as "incompetent".

Ms de Larracochea is not alone in her calls for a public inquiry. Mrs Cohen and her husband Dan last week said the settlement was a "bribe" and said they would accept only the first instalment of the \$6.5 million.

Mr Cohen, 67, of New Jersey, said: "If we were wealthy people we would turn the whole thing down, but we're not. The second and third payments will be worth a total of \$6 million (£3.77 million) but we won't be touching that."

Jim Swire, whose daughter Flora was on board flight 103, has also said that the families of the victims still wanted to know how the attack had been allowed to happen.

Yet, many Americans continue to believe full liability for the atrocity lies with Libya. George Williams, a spokesman for the US victims, said: "The only thing that would satisfy us more would be to have Gaddafi's head delivered on a platter over to the US."

LIBYAN DEAL FRENCH THREAT SUSAN BELL

PARIS will use its veto at the United Nations security council vote tomorrow to block the British motion to lift sanctions against Libya after the Lockerbie settlement - unless Tripoli provides "sufficient guarantees" it will pay extra compensation to families of the 170 victims of the 1989 bombing of a French UTA jet.

"If a vote was held at the UN security council (now), we would have no option but to oppose it," said Renaud Muselier, French foreign secretary.

It is still unclear whether the UN vote will be delayed. Wary of another bitter UN row like that over the Iraq war, London has twice delayed introducing a motion to lift sanctions. However, it has said it can't wait indefinitely for a French UTA deal and risk jeopardising its hard-won deal for families of the Lockerbie disaster.

The British-US deal with Libya over Lockerbie left Paris severely embarrassed. It gives Pan-Am families 25 times more money than that received four years ago by the families of victims of UTA flight 772 from Paris to Brazzaville in Central Africa.

Libya has never admitted responsibility for blowing up the jet over the Sahara, but in 1999 paid \$33 million (£21 million) in compensation. In the same year a French court convicted, in absentia, six members of the Libyan intelligence services.

In theory, UTA families would have received around \$194,000 (£122,000) each. Guillaume Denoix de Saint Marc, a spokesman for the families, said some have had nothing. Even more traumatising, he said, is the fact the six agents, including Colonel Gaddafi's brother-in-law, have remained free.

Mr Denoix de Saint Marc said: "We are not necessarily looking to get exactly the same as Lockerbie, but the agreed sum must be sufficiently important so we feel justice has been done."

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: onlineeditor@scotsman.com
Subject: **Does anybody there know about why airplanes crash? Give this to your Pan American World Airways Flight 103 expert.**

Dear Sir, Thursday, September 11, 2003 7:21 AM

Britain Says to Go Ahead with Lockerbie UN Vote
Tue September 9, 2003 10:21 AM ET

UNITED NATIONS (Reuters) - Britain said on Tuesday it planned to go ahead with a Security Council vote on lifting sanctions on Libya over the 1988 bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, despite a plea from France that the vote be put off. "We are calling a meeting for 12:30," said a British official, speaking on condition of anonymity, after France said it had asked for a new postponement on the U.N. vote. Britain, the Security Council president for September, had initially set the vote for 10:30 a.m. EDT.

JBS>The shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive

decompression/inflight breakup explanation for Pan American World Airways Flight 103 makes sense.

www.corazon.com has details.

Does it not seem strange to you that the AAIB report has two pictures of the port side of Pan American World Airways Flight 103 yet none of the starboard? Here above is the starboard side and the hole is immensely larger than the port side hole and yet both happened at the same time, according to the wreckage reconstruction.

The implications of the shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is that Boeing is responsible for Lockerbie deaths because of faulty wiring and a design flaw of non plug cargo doors in their Boeing 747s. To put it another way, the victims on the ground would get their due compensation.

At 8:18 AM -0700 9/8/03,

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

I note above and below in your article that the Scots are dissatisfied with the official explanation. They are correct: No bomb, no bombers, no crime, just nature trying to equalize pressure in a pressurized hull, similar to the Comet accidents of years ago (also originally thought to be bomb caused).

If you are fair you will consider all explanations that are reasonable. You may ask questions of me to determine the worth of my explanation. I offer a non-conspiracy mechanical explanation that can be confirmed and is supported by official documents, photographs, charts, and schematics. It's science. Pan American World Airways Flight 103 was a aircraft inflight breakup, not a bank robbery.

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

831 659 3552

barry@corazon.com

<http://www.corazon.com>

Lockerbie relative rejects £4m pay-out as 'another step away from the truth'

DAN MCDUGALL

WHEN the fax arrived from the United Nations' headquarters in New York at Marina de Larracochea's Bilbao apartment, she was eating with her family.

She was soon to lose her appetite as she ran her eyes over the details of the settlement reached with the Libyan government for the compensation to be paid to families who had lost relatives in the destruction of flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988.

She had nothing but anger and contempt for the sum promised to

her in recognition of the loss of her younger sister's life.

Nieves de Larracochea, a stewardess with Pan-Am, was 39 when she was killed along with 269 others on 21 December, 1988 after a bomb concealed inside a Toshiba radio cassette recorder tore through flight 103, sending blazing wreckage raining down on Lockerbie.

As the compensation settlement with Libya appears finally settled, Ms de Larracochea believes the relatives of the victims have never been further from the truth.

"Compensation has never been an issue for me or many others whose lives were blighted by these appalling events. I believe the money being offered represents nothing more than another step away from the truth. The figure of \$6.5 million dollars (£4.09 million) for each family affected by the atrocity means nothing to me and I have no intention of accepting any money, all I want is the truth."

She added: "Many people seem focused on the money, but the reality of the situation is it more than suits Libya to accept liability for the bombing, it means they can fully restore trade to the west. Their oil exports alone and the inward investment open trade will bring will ensure they justify the Lockerbie pay-outs in a year.

"This isn't about accepting blame, or apologising, it's about oil trade and the families of the victims have been caught up in a huge diplomatic game. What we want to know is who was specifically responsible for this and how much forewarning did both the American and British governments have of a terrorist attack."

Ms Larracoechea holds nothing but troubled memories of the trial of two suspects at Holland's Kamp van Zeist two years ago, a criminal process she claims was nothing more than a political and financial fix designed to speed up the removal of oil sanctions against Libya and bury the real story of the bombing. She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

She added: "I continue to believe they, particularly Megrahi since he was found guilty, were also victims of this tragedy. The fact that he is languishing in a Scottish prison is a source of great sadness to me and to many other relatives I have spoken to. In the circumstances he is nothing more than a scapegoat."

In the opening days of the trial, Ms de Larracoechea recalls the chill that ran through the public gallery as television screens showed the moment when flight 103 disappeared off radar, to be replaced by ghostly green traces of wreckage spreading over south-west Scotland.

Susan Cohen, whose 20-year-old daughter, Theodora, was killed, was so upset by the image that she left the room. But Ms de Larracoechea claims she found the image easier to deal with. Not only had she seen it at the fatal accident inquiry in Scotland, but she has made herself face far more graphic evidence since, such as the police photographs she still has of the carnage on the ground.

However, on the first Friday of the trial, the court listened for a

full hour as the complete list of victims was read out. "That was difficult," Ms Larracochea recalled. "But not as difficult as living with it every day."

Only an independent inquiry, overseen by two delegated nations other than Britain or the US, can now address her allegations that Megrahi is innocent and the US government failed to make public warnings from terrorist groups in the run-up to the tragedy that a US airline would be targeted.

Ms de Larracochea said: "If my sister had told me that there had been bomb threats but she was going to get on the plane because she didn't take them seriously, then things would be completely different. At least she would have had the choice, she would have been in control of her own life. Instead, she and the other people on the plane were effectively allowed to be massacred."

She added: "Another issue that has to be scrutinised more closely is the fact that Abu Nidal admitted responsibility for the bombing on behalf of his Fatah Revolutionary Council in direct retaliation for America mistakenly shooting down an Iranian airbus. Why was his admission of culpability ignored?"

It seems increasingly unlikely that an independent inquiry will be granted. Last year she took her case directly to the Scottish courts, petitioning the five judges in charge of the Lockerbie trial to agree to an independent inquiry.

In her petition, Ms de Larracochea told the judges, led by Lord Cullen, that "central aspects of the case were repeatedly shielded" during the fatal accident inquiry, adding that an independent review of all evidence of the criminal investigation was the only way to deliver answers to the families. The judges

quickly rejected her submission as "incompetent".

Ms de Larracochea is not alone in her calls for a public inquiry. Mrs Cohen and her husband Dan last week said the settlement was a "bribe" and said they would accept only the first instalment of the \$6.5 million.

Mr Cohen, 67, of New Jersey, said: "If we were wealthy people we would turn the whole thing down, but we're not. The second and third payments will be worth a total of \$6 million (£3.77 million) but we won't be touching that."

Jim Swire, whose daughter Flora was on board flight 103, has also said that the families of the victims still wanted to know how the attack had been allowed to happen.

Yet, many Americans continue to believe full liability for the atrocity lies with Libya. George Williams, a spokesman for the US victims, said: "The only thing that would satisfy us more would be to have Gaddafi's head delivered on a platter over to the US."

LIBYAN DEAL FRENCH THREAT SUSAN BELL

PARIS will use its veto at the United Nations security council vote tomorrow to block the British motion to lift sanctions against Libya after the Lockerbie settlement - unless Tripoli provides "sufficient guarantees" it will pay extra compensation to families of the 170 victims of the 1989 bombing of a French UTA jet.

"If a vote was held at the UN security council (now), we would have no option but to oppose it," said Renaud Muselier, French foreign secretary.

It is still unclear whether the UN vote will be delayed. Wary of another bitter UN row like that over the Iraq war, London has twice delayed introducing a motion to lift sanctions. However, it has said it can't wait indefinitely for a French UTA deal and risk jeopardising its hard-won deal for families of the Lockerbie disaster.

The British-US deal with Libya over Lockerbie left Paris severely embarrassed. It gives Pan-Am families 25 times more money than that received four years ago by the families of victims of UTA flight 772 from Paris to Brazzaville in Central Africa.

Libya has never admitted responsibility for blowing up the jet over the Sahara, but in 1999 paid \$33 million (£21 million) in compensation. In the same year a French court convicted, in absentia, six members of the Libyan intelligence services.

In theory, UTA families would have received around \$194,000 (£122,000) each. Guillaume Denoix de Saint Marc, a spokesman for the families, said some have had nothing. Even more traumatising, he said, is the fact the six agents, including Colonel Gaddafi's brother-in-law, have remained free.

Mr Denoix de Saint Marc said: "We are not necessarily looking to get exactly the same as Lockerbie, but the agreed sum must be sufficiently important so we feel justice has been done."

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: onlineeditor@scotsman.com

Subject: Does anybody there know about why airplanes crash? Give this to your Pan American World Airways Flight 103 expert.

Dear Sir, Thursday, September 11, 2003 7:22 AM

Is it too late to put aside conspiracy and hate for a bit to examine a plausible mechanical explanation for a plane crash that has precedent?

I refer to Pan American World Airways Flight 103 and the precedent is United Airlines Flight 811.

www.corazon.com has details.

Let's look at reality above and not overheard conversation years ago. Above is a never released publicly picture of the starboard side of that infamous forward cargo hold of Pan American World Airways Flight 103. It is the forward cargo door side and shows the blown open bottom half of the door. This evidence matches other ruptured open cargo door of early model Boeing 747s that left a sudden loud sound on the CVR followed by an abrupt power cut to the recorders.

What caused the door to blow open? You might say a bomb did it. I would suggest a precedent of United Airlines Flight 811 in which the electrical system was the probable cause.

The implications of the shorted wiring/ruptured open cargo door/

explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is that Boeing is responsible for Lockerbie deaths because of faulty wiring and a design flaw of non plug cargo doors in their Boeing 747s.

I have been researching these crashes for 12 years. Is it too late for reason and common sense to present its case using facts, data, and evidence?

At 8:18 AM -0700 9/8/03,

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

I note above and below in your article that the Scots are dissatisfied with the official explanation. They are correct: No bomb, no bombers, no crime, just nature trying to equalize pressure in a pressurized hull, similar to the Comet accidents of years ago (also originally thought to be bomb caused).

If you are fair you will consider all explanations that are reasonable. You may ask questions of me to determine the worth of my explanation. I offer a non-conspiracy mechanical explanation that can be confirmed and is supported by official documents, photographs, charts, and schematics. It's science. Pan American World Airways Flight 103 was a aircraft inflight breakup, not a bank robbery.

You might be particularly interested in my explanation of why a bomb is erroneously considered to be the probable cause. It's in my pdf file of my Aircraft Accident Report for Pan American

World Airways Flight 103, sent to the 'letters' section of The Scotsman.

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

831 659 3552

barry@corazon.com

<http://www.corazon.com>

Lockerbie relative rejects £4m pay-out as 'another step away from the truth'

DAN MCDUGALL

WHEN the fax arrived from the United Nations's headquarters in New York at Marina de Larracochea's Bilbao apartment, she was eating with her family.

She was soon to lose her appetite as she ran her eyes over the details of the settlement reached with the Libyan government for the compensation to be paid to families who had lost relatives in the destruction of flight 103 over Lockerbie in 1988.

She had nothing but anger and contempt for the sum promised to her in recognition of the loss of her younger sister's life.

Nieves de Larracochea, a stewardess with Pan-Am, was 39 when she was killed along with 269 others on 21 December, 1988 after a bomb concealed inside a Toshiba radio cassette recorder tore through flight 103, sending blazing wreckage

raining down on Lockerbie.

As the compensation settlement with Libya appears finally settled, Ms de Larracochea believes the relatives of the victims have never been further from the truth.

"Compensation has never been an issue for me or many others whose lives were blighted by these appalling events. I believe the money being offered represents nothing more than another step away from the truth. The figure of \$6.5 million dollars (£4.09 million) for each family affected by the atrocity means nothing to me and I have no intention of accepting any money, all I want is the truth."

She added: "Many people seem focused on the money, but the reality of the situation is it more than suits Libya to accept liability for the bombing, it means they can fully restore trade to the west. Their oil exports alone and the inward investment open trade will bring will ensure they justify the Lockerbie pay-outs in a year.

"This isn't about accepting blame, or apologising, it's about oil trade and the families of the victims have been caught up in a huge diplomatic game. What we want to know is who was specifically responsible for this and how much forewarning did both the American and British governments have of a terrorist attack."

Ms Larracochea holds nothing but troubled memories of the trial of two suspects at Holland's Kamp van Zeist two years ago, a criminal process she claims was nothing more than a political and financial fix designed to speed up the removal of oil sanctions against Libya and bury the real story of the bombing.

She also maintains the conviction of Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi was a travesty: "From the start of that trial, I had great difficulty accepting these men were the bombers, and I had an even harder time believing they were acting alone if they were in it at all."

She added: "I continue to believe they, particularly Megrahi since he was found guilty, were also victims of this tragedy. The fact that he is languishing in a Scottish prison is a source of great sadness to me and to many other relatives I have spoken to. In the circumstances he is nothing more than a scapegoat."

In the opening days of the trial, Ms de Larracochea recalls the chill that ran through the public gallery as television screens showed the moment when flight 103 disappeared off radar, to be replaced by ghostly green traces of wreckage spreading over south-west Scotland.

Susan Cohen, whose 20-year-old daughter, Theodora, was killed, was so upset by the image that she left the room. But Ms de Larracochea claims she found the image easier to deal with. Not only had she seen it at the fatal accident inquiry in Scotland, but she has made herself face far more graphic evidence since, such as the police photographs she still has of the carnage on the ground.

However, on the first Friday of the trial, the court listened for a full hour as the complete list of victims was read out. "That was difficult," Ms Larracochea recalled. "But not as difficult as living with it every day."

Only an independent inquiry, overseen by two delegated nations other than Britain or the US, can now address her allegations that

Megrahi is innocent and the US government failed to make public warnings from terrorist groups in the run-up to the tragedy that a US airline would be targeted.

Ms de Larracochea said: "If my sister had told me that there had been bomb threats but she was going to get on the plane because she didn't take them seriously, then things would be completely different. At least she would have had the choice, she would have been in control of her own life. Instead, she and the other people on the plane were effectively allowed to be massacred."

She added: "Another issue that has to be scrutinised more closely is the fact that Abu Nidal admitted responsibility for the bombing on behalf of his Fatah Revolutionary Council in direct retaliation for America mistakenly shooting down an Iranian airbus. Why was his admission of culpability ignored?"

It seems increasingly unlikely that an independent inquiry will be granted. Last year she took her case directly to the Scottish courts, petitioning the five judges in charge of the Lockerbie trial to agree to an independent inquiry.

In her petition, Ms de Larracochea told the judges, led by Lord Cullen, that "central aspects of the case were repeatedly shielded" during the fatal accident inquiry, adding that an independent review of all evidence of the criminal investigation was the only way to deliver answers to the families. The judges quickly rejected her submission as "incompetent".

Ms de Larracochea is not alone in her calls for a public inquiry. Mrs Cohen and her husband Dan last week said the settlement was a "bribe" and said they would accept only the first instalment of the \$6.5 million.

Mr Cohen, 67, of New Jersey, said: "If we were wealthy people we would turn the whole thing down, but we're not. The second and third payments will be worth a total of \$6 million (£3.77 million) but we won't be touching that."

Jim Swire, whose daughter Flora was on board flight 103, has also said that the families of the victims still wanted to know how the attack had been allowed to happen.

Yet, many Americans continue to believe full liability for the atrocity lies with Libya. George Williams, a spokesman for the US victims, said: "The only thing that would satisfy us more would be to have Gaddafi's head delivered on a platter over to the US."

LIBYAN DEAL FRENCH THREAT SUSAN BELL

PARIS will use its veto at the United Nations security council vote tomorrow to block the British motion to lift sanctions against Libya after the Lockerbie settlement - unless Tripoli provides "sufficient guarantees" it will pay extra compensation to families of the 170 victims of the 1989 bombing of a French UTA jet.

"If a vote was held at the UN security council (now), we would have no option but to oppose it," said Renaud Muselier, French foreign secretary.

It is still unclear whether the UN vote will be delayed. Wary of another bitter UN row like that over the Iraq war, London has

twice delayed introducing a motion to lift sanctions. However, it has said it can't wait indefinitely for a French UTA deal and risk jeopardising its hard-won deal for families of the Lockerbie disaster.

The British-US deal with Libya over Lockerbie left Paris severely embarrassed. It gives Pan-Am families 25 times more money than that received four years ago by the families of victims of UTA flight 772 from Paris to Brazzaville in Central Africa.

Libya has never admitted responsibility for blowing up the jet over the Sahara, but in 1999 paid \$33 million (£21 million) in compensation. In the same year a French court convicted, in absentia, six members of the Libyan intelligence services.

In theory, UTA families would have received around \$194,000 (£122,000) each. Guillaume Denoix de Saint Marc, a spokesman for the families, said some have had nothing. Even more traumatising, he said, is the fact the six agents, including Colonel Gaddafi's brother-in-law, have remained free.

Mr Denoix de Saint Marc said: "We are not necessarily looking to get exactly the same as Lockerbie, but the agreed sum must be sufficiently important so we feel justice has been done."

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: mmacleod@scotlandonsunday.com
Subject: **The scientific 'alternative explanation' wiring/cargo door1**

Dear Mr. MacLeod, Thursday, November 2, 2006

Well, speak of the devil...of a dinosaur...and it looks like some Cambridge people are non myth believers and respect science. But oh so sad, don't we all want to believe in sea monsters? Don't we all want to believe in tragedies being someone else's fault? Yes.

Loch Ness Monster is tourist fun; Pan Am Flight 103 is life and death.

The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation is science; foreign terrorist bombers is myth.

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsbt.org>

Myth versus science. Conspiracy bombers versus professional accident investigators. Backroom plotter whisperers versus sudden loud sound on a cockpit voice recorder.

If you believe in the literal interpretation of the Loch Ness

monster, stick with pesky Palestinians or looney Libyans and check out The Da Vinci Code.

Scientist pours cold water on Loch Ness dinosaur theory

SHÂN ROSS

(sross@scotsman.com)

A LOCH Ness Monster theory which suggests the creature is a living dinosaur has been dealt a blow by scientists.

Many believe that Nessie is a plesiosaur, a long-necked marine reptile which sought refuge in Scotland's second-largest freshwater loch when most of the species died out 160 million years ago.

But Dr Leslie Noe, a palaeontologist at Cambridge University's Sedgwick Museum, discovered that the plesiosaur would have been unable to lift its head up, swan-like, out of the water.

Most scientists believe the creatures became extinct with the other dinosaurs, but some insist it is possible that after the last Ice Age, some plesiosaurs may have been stranded in the 23-mile-long loch, which was connected to the sea. The plesiosaur has a prominent small head on a long neck and a round body, and is the most popular explanation for mythical Nessie.

Dr Noe, whose findings are reported in this month's *New Scientist*, told experts at a meeting of the Society of Vertebrate Palaeontology in Canada, that plesiosaurs used their long necks to reach down and feed on soft-bodied animals living on the sea floor. By examining fossils of a plesiosaur,

Muraenosaurus, and by calculating the articulation of the neck bones, Dr Noe concluded the neck was flexible and could move most easily when pointing down.

Dr Noe said: "The neck was a feeding tube, collecting soft-bodied prey. The osteology of the neck makes it certain the plesiosaur could not lift its head up, swan-like, out of the water."

However, the findings did not surprise George Edwards, one of the world's foremost authorities on the monster, who took a photograph of a unknown "creature" with a black hump he spotted on the loch in June 1986.

Mr Edwards, from Drumnadrochit, who runs Loch Ness cruises on his boat, the Nessie Hunter, said: "Most people don't support the dinosaur theory. The creature is some entirely new species. When you consider that every year in the open seas thousands of new species are discovered, this is the most likely explanation. But there's no doubt that a creature, one with a single hump, which most people report, does exist."

Monstrous tale is centuries old

THE earliest reference to Nessie was in the life story of St Columba who, in August 565, apparently fought off a monster from Loch Ness that was attacking a Pict.

The first modern sighting was on 2 May, 1933, when the Inverness Courier reported a couple seeing "an enormous animal rolling and plunging on the surface". The London newspapers sent reporters to Scotland and a circus offered a £20,000 reward for the capture of the monster.

Related topic

¥ [Loch Ness Monster](#)

<http://heritage.scotsman.com/topics.cfm?tid=8>

This article: <http://thescotsman.scotsman.com/scotland.cfm?id=1620002006>

Last updated: 02-Nov-06 09:52 GMT

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: mmacleod@scotlandonsunday.com

Subject: Re: The scientific 'alternative explanation' wiring/cargo door

"When the legend becomes fact: Print the Legend" John Ford, movie director for The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance.

The Legend of Pan Am Flight 103, the prime conspiracy theory plot for terrorism. When the conspiracy nuts get to be in charge, science and reason take a walk.

I'm walking.

Regards,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

1 831 659 3552

1 831 241 0631 Cell

barry@johnbarrysmith.com

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.nts.gov>

Memorable Quotes from The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance (1962)

Ransom Stoddard: You're not going to use the story, Mr. Scott? Maxwell Scott: This is the west, sir. When the legend becomes fact, print the legend. ...

www.imdb.com/title/tt0056217/quotes - 38k - Cached - Similar pages

Althouse: "When the legend becomes fact, print the legend."

"When the legend becomes fact, print the legend." That's another quote that didn't make the AFI list. (I write about the movie, "The Man Who Shot Liberty ...

althouse.blogspot.com/2005/06/when-legend-becomes-fact-print-legend.html - 50k - Cached - Similar pages

Powell's Books - Print the Legend: The Life and Times of John Ford by

"When the legend becomes fact, print the legend." This line comes from director John Ford's film, The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance, but it also serves as an ...

www.powells.com/cgi-bin/biblio?inkey=1-0684811618-7 - 27k - Cached - Similar pages

Print the Legend: The Life and Times of John Ford by Scott Eyman ...

"When the legend becomes fact, print the legend." Ñ The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance (1962). Our vision of the American West is of flat, lonely mesas ...

www.popmatters.com/books/reviews/p/print-the-legend.shtml - 45k - Cached - Similar pages

MilkandCookies - Quotes

Dig your own grave and save! -Troy McLure video The Simpsons. This is the west, sir. When the legend becomes fact, print the legend. -Maxwell Scott ...

www.milkandcookies.com/quotes/ - 74k - Cached - Similar pages

Media Matters - Altercation: Still dysfunctional: The legend ...

"When the legend becomes fact, print the legend." -- John Ford. Yes, it was a good day and it's getting better, but the

central fact of American politics ...

mediamatters.org/altercation/200611080008 - 26k -

Cached - Similar pages

Nothing's Shocking: When the Legend becomes Fact, Print the Legend

When the Legend becomes Fact, Print the Legend. The Black Angels The Black Angels Download "Black Grease" (MP3, 192kbps) ...

[notshocking.blogspot.com/2006/04/when-legend-](http://notshocking.blogspot.com/2006/04/when-legend-becomes-fact-print-legend.html)

[becomes-fact-print-legend.html](http://notshocking.blogspot.com/2006/04/when-legend-becomes-fact-print-legend.html) - 17k - Cached - Similar pages

Amazon.com: Print the Legend: The Life and Times of John Ford ...

Borrowing his title from dialogue in John Ford's classic Western, *The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance* ("When the legend becomes fact, print the legend"), ...

www.amazon.com/Print-Legend-Life-Times-John/dp/0684811618 - 131k - Cached - Similar pages

Just An Amateur: When The Legend Becomes Fact, Print The Legend

When The Legend Becomes Fact, Print The Legend. THE MAN WHO SHOT LIBERTY VALANCE (John Ford, USA, 1962, A) On a level of fundamentals, you might suspect the ...

justanamateur.blogspot.com/2006/03/when-legend-becomes-fact-print-legend.html - 28k - Cached - Similar pages

'Print the Legend' - New York Times

As is clear from the film, and as Eyman makes clear in his book, the statement is "When the legend becomes fact, print the legend. ...

[query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9D01E0DA133DF933A05752C0A9669C8B63)

[res=9D01E0DA133DF933A05752C0A9669C8B63](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9D01E0DA133DF933A05752C0A9669C8B63) - 17k - Cached - Similar pages

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrismith.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: dianajohnstone@compuserve.com

Subject: Plausible explanation for Pan Am Flight 103

Dear Ms. Johnstone, Saturday, September 1, 2007

There is a plausible, reasonable, mechanical explanation for Pan Am Flight 103, the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation with the precedent of United Airlines Flight 811.

There was no bomb, no bombers, no conspiracy, no crime; the cause was what usually happens when airplanes crash: mechanical failure of one or more of the tens of thousands of parts in the airplane.

The wiring/cargo door explanation is not as exciting as the bomb explanation and points fingers at people that don't want fingers pointed at them, but science is correct in this case and the evidence speaks for itself.

Details at [ntsbt.org](http://www.ntsbt.org)

Regards,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

1 831 659 3552

1 831 241 0631 Cell

barry@johnbarrysmith.com

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.ntsbt.org>

Very discreetly, the conviction of the Libyan agent for the Lockerbie massacre has been unraveling. It may well be overturned in the near future.

Last June 28, the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission decided to let the case of the convicted Libyan go before an Appeal Court of five Scottish judges. The appeal court will not be under the heavy pressure from media, Western governments and victims' families that weighed on the Scottish judges who convicted Al Megrahi in a special court set up in the Netherlands specifically to confirm Libyan guilt.

Indeed, the mainstream media that for years trumpeted Gaddafi's responsibility for Lockerbie have so far looked the other way as leading actors in the case have openly admitted that the whole thing was a frame-up. [During the trial, CounterPunch's Andrew Cockburn scooped the world's press by detailing the whole deception and frame-up in our newsletter, Editors.]

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: lheard@gulfnews.com

Subject: Pan Am Flight 103 Mechanical explanation

Dear Ms. Heard, Monday, September 3, 2007

You ask: Was Libya framed for Lockerbie bombing?

The answer is Yes.

Airplanes usually crash because of mechanical problem. Pan Am Flight 103 was one such case. The cause was the shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

Details at

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.ntsب.org>

Regards,

John Barry Smith

541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924

1 831 659 3552

1 831 241 0631 Cell

barry@johnbarrysmith.com

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.ntsب.org>

Was Libya framed for Lockerbie bombing?

By Linda S. Heard Special to Gulf News

Published: September 04, 2007, 00:37

On December 21 1988, a Pan Am plane mysteriously exploded over Scotland causing the death of 270 people from 21 countries. The tragedy provoked global outrage. In 1991, two Libyans were charged with the bombing.

In the event, only Abdulbaset Ali Mohammad Al Megrahi, a Libyan agent, was pronounced guilty by a panel of three judges, who based their decision on largely circumstantial evidence. Al Megrahi and the Libyan government have protested their innocence all along.

Nevertheless, after suffering punitive UN sanctions which froze overseas Libyan bank accounts and prevented the import of spare parts needed for the country's oil industry, Tripoli reluctantly agreed to pay \$2.7 billion to victims' families (\$10 million per family), on condition the pay-out would not be deemed as admission of guilt.

In February, 2004, the Libyan prime minister told the BBC that his country was innocent but was forced to pay-up as a "price for peace".

Al Megrahi is currently serving a life sentence but earlier this year the Scottish Criminal Cases Review Commission ruled there may have been a miscarriage of justice on the basis of lost or destroyed evidence.

Later this month, a Scottish appeals court is due to revisit the case and is expected to overturn Al Megrahi's conviction as unsafe.

The Libyan leader's son Saif Al Islam recently said he is confident Al Megrahi will soon be found innocent and will be allowed to return home.

On Sunday, an Observer expose written by Alex Duval Smith reported "a key piece of material evidence used by prosecutors to implicate Libya in the Lockerbie bombing has emerged as a probable fake" with allegations of "international political intrigue and shoddy investigative work" levelled at

"the British government, the FBI and the Scottish police".

The Observer story maintains Ulrich Lumpert a Swiss engineer who was "a crucial witness" has now confessed that he lied about the origins of a timer switch.

Recently, Lumpert gave a sworn declaration to a Swiss court, which read "I stole a prototype MST-13 timing device" and "gave it without permission on June 22, 1989 to a person who was officially investigating the Lockerbie affair".

The owner of the company that manufactured the switch - forced into bankruptcy after being sued by Pan Am - says he told police early in the enquiry that the timer switch was not one his company had ever sold to Libya.

Moreover, he insists the timer switch shown to the court had been tampered with since he initially viewed it in Scotland, saying the pieces appeared to have been "carbonised" in the interim. He also says the court was so determined to prove Libya's guilt it brushed aside his evidence.

In 2005, a former Scottish police chief signed a statement alleging the CIA had planted fragments of a timer circuit board produced at trial, evidence supporting earlier claims by a former CIA agent to the effect his agency "wrote the script" to ensure Libya was incriminated.

There are also allegations that clothing allegedly purchased by the bomber in Malta before it was wrapped around the bomb, was intact when discovered but by the time it reached the court it was in shreds.

Life sentence

The shopkeeper who sold the item made a statement to the effect Al Megrahi had never been a customer. Instead, he identified an Egyptian-born Palestinian Mohammad Abu Talb - now serving a life sentence in Sweden for a synagogue bombing. Professor Hans Koechler, appointed by the UN to be an observer at the trial, has termed its outcome "a spectacular miscarriage of justice". Koechler has repeatedly called for an independent enquiry, which, to date, the British government has refused to allow.

Oliver Miles, a former British ambassador to Libya, insists "no court is likely to get to the truth, now that various intelligence agencies have had the opportunity to corrupt the evidence".

Jim Swire, the father of one of the Lockerbie victims, said "Scottish justice obviously played a leading part in one of the most disgraceful miscarriages of justice in history."

Craig Murray, a former British ambassador, who was earlier second-in-command of Britain's Aviation and Maritime Department from 1989 to 1992, writes about a strange incident on his website.

Murray says a colleague told him "in a deeply worried way" about an intelligence report indicating Libya was not involved in the Pan Am bombing.

When he asked to see it, his colleague said it was marked for named eyes only, which Murray describes as "extremely unusual". Earlier, a CIA report that had reached a similar conclusion had been conveniently buried.

If Al Megrahi walks, as is likely, Libya will be

vindicated and would presumably be able to reclaim monies paid in compensation along with its reputation.

This would also be a highly embarrassing turn of events for Britain and the US not to mention their respective intelligence agencies, and would leave the question of who bombed Pan Am Flight 103 unanswered.

In a perfect world, Libya should also receive an apology from its accusers and should be allowed to sue for damages for all that it lost as a result of UN sanctions.

But in a world where political expediency often triumphs, the appeal has no foregone conclusion despite the exposure of dubious "evidence" and suspect "witnesses".

Linda S. Heard is a specialist writer on Middle East affairs. She can be contacted at lheard@gulfnews.com. Response to this article may be considered for publication.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: crgeditor@yahoo.com

Subject: Pan Am Flight 103 for Edward S. Herman

<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>

<http://www.ntsب.org>

Regards,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924
1 831 659 3552
1 831 241 0631 Cell
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
<http://www.montereypeninsulaairport.com>
<http://www.ntsب.org>

The New York Times on the Libya-Pan Am 103 Case: A Study in Propaganda Service

by Prof. Edward S. Herman

[Global Research](#), September 22, 2007

[Email this article to a friend](#)

[Print this article](#)

New York Times propaganda service has often been dramatically displayed in connection with the shooting down of civilian airliners. The editors were hysterical over the Soviet shooting down of Korean airliner 007 on August 31, 1983: 270 articles and 2,789 column inches during September 1983 alone, along with an editorial designation of the incident as "cold-blooded mass murder." The paper took as truth the official and party line that the Soviets knew they were shooting down a civilian airliner. Several years later the editors acknowledged that their assumption had been wrong, but they blamed this on the government, not their own gullibility (ed., "The Lie That Wasn't Shot Down," Jan. 18,

1988). It had done no investigative work on the case in the interim, and the lie was shot down based on information developed outside the media. In a markedly contrasting response, when Israel shot down a Libyan airliner over the Sinai desert in February 1973, although in this case there was no question but that the Israelis knew they were downing a civilian airliner, the New York Times covered the incident much less intensively and without expressing the slightest indignation, let alone using words like "cold-blooded" or "murder."

Equally interesting, the paper recognized the political importance of their treatment of each of these events: in the Soviet case, in a year-later retrospective, Times reporter Bernard Gwertzman wrote that U.S. officials "assert that worldwide criticism of the Soviet handling of the crisis has strengthened the United States in its relations with Moscow." With the orchestrated intense and indignant coverage of this shutdown the Soviets had suffered not only harsh criticism but boycotts for its action. By contrast, Israel suffered not the slightest damage. The New York Times editorialized that "No useful purpose is served by an acrimonious debate over the assignment of blame for the downing of a Libyan plane in the Sinai peninsula last week" (ed., March 1, 1973). Within a week of the shutdown, the Israeli Prime Minister was welcomed in Washington without incident or intrusive questions. In short, blame and debate is a function of utility, which is to say, political advantage. Where it helps, as in putting the Soviets

in a bad light, we support assigning blame, indignation and debate; where it would injure a client, no useful purpose would be served by such treatment. And somehow the UN and international community react in ways that conform to what the U.S. government and New York Times perceive as useful.

In the case of Pan Am 103, the political aspect of assigning blame has been clearly and, arguably, overwhelmingly important. The plane was blown up over Lockerbie, Scotland on December 21, 1988, with 270 plane casualties (and 11 persons killed on the ground). This followed by only five and a half months the U.S. navy's shooting down of Iranian airliner 655 in July 1988, killing 290, mainly Iranian pilgrims. The link between the two events was quickly seen, and the likelihood that the later event was an act of vengeance by Iran was a working hypothesis, supported further by an unproven claim of Western security forces that Iran had offered a \$10 million reward for a retaliatory act. As the case developed it was soon a consensus of investigators that the Pan Am action had been the work of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (PFLP-GC) under the leadership of Ahmed Jibril, based in Syria, and responding to the Iranian offer.

But then, as relations with Saddam Hussein deteriorated in 1989 and 1990, and the United States sought better relations with Syria and Iran in the run-up to the first Persian Gulf War, Western officials became quiet on the Syria-Iran connection, followed by a fairly rapid shift from definitive

proof of PFLP-Syrian-Iranian involvement to
`definitive` proof that it was a Libyan act. As Paul
Foot noted, `The evidence against the PFLP which
had been so carefully put together and was so
immensely impressive was quietly but firmly
junked` (Lockerbie: The Flight From Justice,`
Private Eye, May/June 2001, p. 10). Libya provided
a suitable new culprit, as it was already on the
U.S.-UK hit list and had been subjected to a series
of efforts at `regime change,` a hostility based on
its independence, support of the Palestinians and
other dissident forces (including the ANC and
Mandela in their resistance to the apartheid
regime), as well as occasional support of anti-
Western terrorists. So Libya it was.

The Libyan connection lasted in pristine condition
from 1990 into 2007, during which time Libya was
subjected to intensive vilification, costly sanctions
imposed by the Security Council, and a highly
publicized trial in Scotland that resulted in the
conviction of a Libyan national for the Lockerbie
murders, with further bad publicity for Libya and
Kaddafi, and a payment of several billion dollars in
victim compensation that Libya felt compelled to
provide (although still denying any involvement in
the shootdown). All this despite the fact that many
experts and observers, including some victim
family members, felt that the trial was a political
event and a judicial farce that yielded an
unwarranted and unjust conviction.

This belief in the injustice of the court decision was
greatly strengthened in June 2007 when a Scottish
Criminal Cases Review Commission issued a

decision that found the 2001 trial and decision flawed and opened the way for a fresh appeal for the convicted Libyan. If this decision is validated, the world will be left without a party responsible for the Pan Am-103 bombing, but with the strong likelihood that attention will be refocused on the PFLP and its sponsors, Syria and Iran. Is it not an amazing coincidence that this second turnaround occurs as Libya becomes more acceptable to the United States and its allies and these Western powers are now retargeting Syria and Iran? We should note one other set of facts in this controversy that bears on the quality of international justice. That is, the treatment by the United States, New York Times, and international community of the shooting down of the Iranian airliner 655 by the U.S. warship Vincennes in July 1988 and the process of bringing justice to the families of the victims of that act. It is true that this was not a planned destruction of an airliner, but it was carried out by a U.S. naval commander noted for his "Rambo" qualities and the civilian airliner destroyed was closely following its assigned air space (in contrast with 007). A point rarely mentioned in the U.S. media is that the U.S. naval vessel that shot the plane down was on a mission in aid of Saddam Hussein in his war of aggression against Iran. The Reagan administration did express "deep regret" at the incident, although blaming Iran for hostile actions that provoked the U.S. action (which were later shown to have been non-existent) and for failing to terminate its war against Iraq--and as

the United States was supporting Iraq, by definition Iran was the aggressor. It also paid some \$132 million as compensation, including \$62 million for the families of the victims. This is, of course, substantially less than Kaddafi felt obligated to pay the victims of Pan Am 103, the ratio of payments to the respective victims being roughly 30 to 1. The New York Times, which had had an editorial entitled "Murder" in connection with the 007 shootdown, asserted back in 1983 that "There is no conceivable excuse for any nation shooting down a harmless airliner," but it predictably found one for the 655 case: "the incident must still be seen as not as a crime [let alone "murder"] but as a blunder, and a tragedy." Neither the UN Security Council nor International Civil Aviation Organization condemned the United States for this action, although both had done so as regards the Soviet Union in the case of Korean airliner 007, and of course the Security Council would eventually take severe action against Libya in regard to Pan Am 103. There was no punishment whatsoever meted out to Rambo Captain Will Rogers, who got a "hero's welcome" upon his return to San Diego five months after the shoot-down (Robert Reinhold, "Crew of Cruiser That Downed Iranian Airliner Gets a Warm Homecoming," NYT, Oct. 25, 1988), and was subsequently awarded a Legion of Merit award for "exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service." The Iranians were naturally angry at this reception and treatment of the man responsible for killing 290 mainly Iranian civilians, and were possibly a bit

resentful at the workings of the system of international justice as it impacted them. Polls indicated that the warm greeting Rogers got in San Diego was not an aberration—the public was pleased with his accomplishment. This reflected the fact that media coverage of the 655 shutdown had focused on official claims about the reason for the deadly act, not the plight of the victims and the grief of their families—which was the heavy and continuing focus of attention in both the 007 and Pan Am 103 cases. The alleged suffering of Captain Rogers got more attention than that of the 290 victims and their families. We are back to the contrast between “worthy” and “unworthy” victims, and the “useful purpose” of the focus of attention, as seen by the U.S. establishment and media.

One further note on international justice concerns the treatment of the U.S. bombing of Libya on April 14, 1986. That attack followed by little more than a week the bombing of a discotheque in Berlin that was quickly blamed by the Reagan administration on Libya, though proof of this connection was never forthcoming. The U.S. bombing attack targeted Kadafi’s residence, and, while failing to assassinate him, killed his young daughter along with 40 or more Libyan civilians. This was an act of state terrorism and a straightforward violation of the UN Charter, but here again a U.S. (along with supportive British and French) veto prevented any UN Security Council condemnation, let alone other action, in response to this terrorism. The UN can act only when the United States wants it to act; it

can never do anything in response to U.S. or U.S. client state violence, no matter how egregious. And the case of Libya and Pan Am 103 affords strong evidence that when the United States wants the UN to act against a target, serious penalties and other forms of damage can be inflicted that are based on false charges and a corrupted legal process (as described below).

We may note also that the New York Times editors were delighted with the 1986 terroristic attack on Libya. Their editorial on the subject stated that "The smoke in Tripoli has barely cleared, yet on the basis of early information even the most scrupulous citizen can only approve and applaud the American attacks on Libya" (ed., "The Terrorist and His Sentence," April 15, 1986), The "early information" showed only that while the assassination attempt had failed scores of what the editors would call "innocent civilians" in a reverse context were killed. Thus once again the editors expose their belief that international law does not apply to the United States, and it demonstrates once again that civilians killed by the U.S. government are "unworthy" victims whose deaths the editors can literally applaud.

As in the case of the shooting down of 007, on November 14, 1999 the New York Times had big headlines and lavished a great deal of attention and indignation on the U.S.-British indictment of two Libyans alleged to have been the bombers of Pan Am 103, and it provided similar headlines, attention and indignation when the Scottish court found one of the two Libyans guilty on January 31,

2001. By contrast, the report that the Scottish Review Court had found the trial of the Libyans badly flawed and suggested that justice called for a new trial, was given no editorial attention and a single question-begging article (Alan Cowell, "Lockerbie Ruling Raises Questions On Libyan Guilt," June 29, 2007).

At no time did any of the 15 Times editorials on the Pan Am 103 shutdown and Libya connection express the slightest reservation about the process or substance of the charges against the Libyans. As regards the politics of the case, with the seemingly strong case involving the PLP, Syria and Iran abandoned just when the United States was briefly cozying up to Syria and Iran, shifting to the continuing target Libya, the editors did refer to "cynics" who thought the administration "finds it convenient to downplay Syria's dreadful record now that Damascus has joined Middle East peace negotiations" (ed., "Seeking the Truth About Libya," March 30, 1992), but the editors refused to accept this cynical notion and, most important, it didn't cause them to examine the evidence against Libya more closely. This was their government, Libya was a villain, and patriotism and built-in bias kept their blinders firmly in place.

As regards legal process, following the U.S.-Scottish charges against the two Libyans, Libya immediately arrested the two suspects and started a judicial investigation, which followed precisely the requirements of the 1971 Montreal Convention dealing with acts of violence involving civil aviation. Libya promised to try the two men if evidence was

supplied it, and it offered to allow observers and requested international assistance in gathering evidence. The United States and Britain rejected this on the ground that Libya would never convict its own, although if the trial was flawed they could have demanded action from the World Court. An exceptional Times op-ed column by Marc Weller argued that what Libya did was in accord with international law and that the U.S.-UK action was not only illegal but also abused and politicized the Security Council (‘Libyan Terrorism, American Vigilantism,’ Feb. 15, 1992).

The Times’ editors ignored the Weller argument: as always, for the editors international law doesn’t apply to the United States. Also, it was clear to them that Libya could not be trusted to try its own—just as it never occurred to them that a trial of Libyans in the West could be anything but justice in action, even though the advance publicity by Western officials, once again demonizing the alleged villains and alleging ‘irrefutable evidence,’ put great pressure on judges and juries and made a fair trial problematic.

A standard form of propagandistic journalism is to provide ‘balance’ by citing on the ‘other side’ the villains and their sponsors rather than independent critics. In past years the New York Times regularly cited Soviet officials for balance, rather than dissident U.S. citizens who would have had more credibility with U.S. audiences. In the Libya-Pan Am 103 case, the Times regularly cited Kaddafi (‘ranting’) and other Libyans as charging political bias in the proceedings, while neglecting

Westerners with more authority. Most notorious, the Times has yet to cite Dr. Hans Kochler, a German legal scholar who was Kofi Annan's appointed observer at the trial of the two Libyans in the Netherlands (Camp Zeist) under Scottish law. Kochler produced a powerful "Report and Evaluation of the Lockerbie Trial" in February 2001 that was widely reported and featured in the Scottish and other European media, but was never once mentioned by the Times in its news or editorials. The other expert almost entirely ignored by the Times was Professor Robert Black, a Scottish legal authority who was an important contributor to the arrangements for the trial at Zeist, who followed it closely, and was immensely knowledgeable on both the trial and Scottish law. Black was mentioned briefly twice in Times news articles, but never in an editorial. It can hardly be a coincidence that the ignoring of Kochler and marginalizing of Black paralleled their finding the trial a travesty, badly politicized (Kochler) and with a judicial decision unsupported by credible evidence (Black ["a fraud"] and Kochler).

The Times has repeatedly claimed that the case against the Libyans resulted from a model police effort—they used the phrase "meticulous British and American police work" more than once—and it was allegedly supported by "hundreds of witnesses" and "thousands of bits of evidence." Thus, while the trial never yielded a smoking gun, it provided compelling "circumstantial evidence." At no point does the paper acknowledge any possible mismanagement or corruption in the

collection and processing of evidence. Among the points never mentioned are that:

--Not only "police" but the U.S. CIA and other personnel were on the crash scene on December 21, 1988 within two hours of the disaster, moving about freely, removing and possibly altering evidence in violation of the rules of dealing with crash-scene evidence, and over-riding the supposed authority of the Scottish police (for details, John Ashton and Ian Ferguson, *Cover-Up of Convenience*, chapter 12, "An Old-Fashioned Police Investigation"). Presumably, for the Times, just as international law doesn't apply to the United States, neither do the rules of proper assembling of evidence.

--The key piece of evidence, a fragment from a timer, was first marked "cloth, charred," but was later overwritten with the word "debris," a change never adequately explained. Some months later, upon examination by UK forensic expert Thomas Hayes, a note about this fragment was written by him, but the page numbers were subsequently overwritten and renumbered, again without explanation. Months later, marks on the timer were allegedly identified with MEBO, a Swiss firm that manufactured timers, and one that did business with Libya. This was "conclusive evidence," although MEMBO also sold the timers to East Germany, Libya might have provided the timer to others, MEMBO had reported several break-ins at its factory to the Swiss police between October 1988 and February 1989. Furthermore, when finally shown the fragment MEMBO's owner said it was a

different color from his own, and it turned out that the CIA had this very timer in its possession.

--All three forensic scientists who worked intensively on this case, one for the FBI (Tom Thurman) and two for a branch of the UK ministry of defense (Allen Fereday and Thomas Hayes) had run into trouble in the past for concealment of evidence (Hayes), wrong conclusions (in one case, false testimony on a explosive timer—Fereday), and fabrication of evidence (Tom Thurman). (See Foot, op. cit, App. 2, "The Three Forensic Geniuses.")

--The CIA had a major role in creating the case, their primary witness being the Libyan defector Majid Giaka. The CIA offered him to the prosecution even though years ago they had decided that he was a liar and con man. Giaka had said nothing about any Libyan connection to the Pan Am bombing for months after it took place, and he came through only when threatened with a funds cutoff. Paul Foot asks "Why was such an obviously corrupt and desperate liar produced by the prosecution at all?" It is also testimony to the quality of the legal process that for a while the CIA refused to produce cables and e-mail messages regarding Giaka, arguing that they were irrelevant. When finally reluctantly produced they were not irrelevant, but showed the CIA's own low opinion of Giaka. The Times did have a news article or two that described Giaka's poor record and malperformance on the stand, but none of the 15 editorials mentioned him or allowed this phase of the proceeding to limit their admiration for police and prosecution.

--Neither the U.S. nor UK governments nor the Zeist court was willing to explore alternative models, several of which were more plausible than the one involving Libya. The one already mentioned, featuring the PFLP-Syria-Iran connection, was compelling: PFLP's German members were found in possession of radio cassettes and workable timers; they had already used these in bombing attacks; they were known to have cased the Frankfurt airport just before the day of the bombing; one of their operatives had visited Malta and the shopkeeper who sold the clothes found in the Pan Am-103 debris first identified this individual (Abu Talb) as the purchaser; and there was evidence of this group's link to Iran and claims of a paid contract, among other points. In a related scenario, the bomb was introduced by the PFLP into the suitcase of Khalid Jaafar,, an agent in a drug-running operation, protected by the CIA as part of its hostage-release program. The CIA involvement in this drug-running operation may have been one reason for the hasty and aggressive CIA takeover of the search at the crash site; and it, and the closely related desire to avoid disturbing negotiations with Syrian and Iranian terrorists holding Western hostages, may also help explain why President Bush and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher apparently agreed in March 1989 to prevent any uncontrolled investigation of the bombing.

--Not only were these governments unwilling to look at alternatives, they actually blocked other inquiries and pursued and tried to damage

individuals who did so (see Ashton and Ferguson, Cover-Up, chap 8, "The Knives Come Out"). The Zeist court conformed to this program, with the result that actors for whom the "circumstantial evidence" was far more compelling than in the case of the Libyans were excluded from consideration.

The Times found the original U.S.-British charges and the Scottish court's decision satisfying, although based only on "circumstantial evidence." They provided no serious analysis of this evidence, and both Robert Black and Hans Kochler, among many others, found the evidence completely inadequate to sustain a conviction except in a court where a conviction was a political necessity.

Consider the following:

--Although the case was built on the argument that the two Libyans carried out the operation together as a team, only one was convicted. As Kochler said: "This is totally incomprehensible for any rational observer when one considers that the indictment in its very essence was based on the joint action of the two accused in Malta." This result can best be explained by the need to have somebody found guilty.

--There is no evidence that the convicted Libyan, Abdel Basset Ali Al-Megrahi, put a suitcase on the connecting flight from Malta to Frankfurt, where it was supposedly transferred to Pan Am 103. Air Malta is notable for its close checking of baggage, and when UK's Granada Television claimed that the death bag had gone through it to Pan Am 103, Air Malta sued. Its evidence that only 55 bags with

ascribed passengers—none of whom went on to London--were on that flight was so compelling that Granada settled out-of-court, paying damages and costs. This of course never made it into the New York Times, and had little effect on the Zeist court, which eventually said that how the unaccompanied bag was put on the plane "is a major difficulty for the Crown case," but it didn't interfere with the finding of guilt.

--The identification of al-Megrahi as the Malta purchaser of the clothing whose remnants were found in the wreckage was a travesty of judicial procedure. The selling storekeeper, Tony Gauci, originally said the buyer was six feet tall and 50 or more years old—al-Megrahi is 5-8 and was 37 years old in 1988. Gauci then identified Talb as the man, but eventually latched on to al-Megrahi after having seen his picture in the paper. There were many other weaknesses in this identification, including the timing of the purchase, so that like the disposition of the suitcase this also was another beyond-tenuous "circumstantial."

--The logic of the official scenario also suffers from the fact that putting a bomb-laden bag through from Malta that had to go through a second inspection and two stopovers in the delay-frequent Christmas season, would be poor planning as it risked either apprehension or a badly timed explosion; and including clothing that could be traced to Malta and with the alleged bomber (al-Megrahi) making his purchase openly would be extremely unprofessional. On the other hand, a timer frequently used by the PFLP was estimated

by a German expert to explode 38 minutes after takeoff, and Pan Am 103 exploded 38 minutes after takeoff.

--As noted earlier, the timer with the MEBO insignia came forth belatedly. It was gathered in a crash scene effort that violated all the rules and was then worked over in questionable circumstances by people who had an established record of creating and massaging evidence. These lags and problematics should have ruled out the acceptance of this evidence in a criminal trial by a non-political court. But even taking it at face value it fails to prove Libyan involvement in the bombing attack as this timer was available to others, and may have been stolen from the MEMBO factory in the 1988-1989 break-ins.

--The Times notes that prosecutors credibly linked him [al-Megrahi] to bomb-making materials and presented persuasive testimony that he worked for Libya's intelligence services. Yes, this goes beyond his Libyan citizenship, and the man was also sometimes in Malta! Imagine how the Times would treat an accusation against a CIA agent based on the fact that the accused had access to weapons and was in fact a member of the CIA! The Times doesn't ask for much in the way of evidence when in the patriotic mode.

--In its low-keyed news article on the Scottish Review Commission's repudiation of the Zeist court's decision ("Lockerbie Ruling Raises Questions on Libyan's Guilt," June 29, 2007), Times reporter Alan Cowell does a creditable job of protecting his paper for failing to question another

lie that wasn't shot down. The Review Commission apparently leaned over backwards to avoid charging the Zeist court with judicial malpractice, so Cowell latches on to the fact that the Review stresses new evidence that we have found and new evidence that was not before the trial court, as well as their denial that there was proof of fabricated evidence. But much of that new evidence was deliberately excluded by the trial court, and some of it was hidden by the prosecution and its U.S. and UK political and intelligence sponsors. And while there is perhaps no hard proof of fabricated evidence, there is solid documentation of its questionable handling and possible fabrication, which should have precluded its acceptance by the trial court.

Instead of citing Hans Kochler or Robert Black, Cowell quotes Dan Cohen, whose daughter went down with Pan Am 103, who expresses regret that al-Megrahi might go home a hero. Possibly more honorable would have been a Times apology and expression of sympathy for the Libyan victim, who will have spent 6 or 7 years in prison on the basis of manipulated and laughable evidence in another show trial, but which the Times repeatedly claimed was justice in action.

In her 1993 memoir *The Downing Street Years*, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher wrote that after the 1986 U.S. bombing of Libya, which used British airbases and in which Kaddafi's two-year old daughter was killed, "There were revenge killings of British hostages organized by Libya, which I deeply regretted. But the much

vaunted Libyan counter-attack did not and could not take place. Ms. Thatcher seems to have forgotten Pan Am 103, or could she have momentarily forgotten that Libya was supposed to have been guilty of this act, and, writing honestly but carelessly for the historical record implicitly acknowledged here that this was a fraud that she had helped perpetrate. This nugget was reported in South Korea's OhMyNews, but was somehow overlooked by the Paper of Record.

Edward S. Herman is a frequent contributor to Global Research. [Global Research Articles by Edward S. Herman](#)

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>

Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: MIKINVENT@aol.com

Subject: Re: 747s sudden airframe break-ups in flight

Your web site supports my view but lacks a contact phone number.

We need to talk and inform the families of victims, the courts and public.

All believe it was a bomb!

JBS>Dear Michael, Sunday, November 30, 2008 at 5:20 PM

I've been working on this 'inform the families, courts, and public' for eighteen years. They don't want to know the mechanical explanation and all prefer the conspiracy nonsense as they feel that explanation is in their best interest. It's not.

If you have any influence in the aviation press or government, I'll be glad to explain the shorted wiring/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation in detail for them.

Good Luck!

Cheers,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
831 659 3552
831 392 5013
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com

At 8:07 PM -0500 11/30/08, MIKINVENT@aol.com wrote:
Content-Type: text/html; charset="UTF-8"
Content-Language: en
THE INSTITUTE OF INVENTORS
19-21-23 FOSSE WAY, EALING, LONDON W13 0BZ
Tel: 020 8998 3540, 020 8998 4372, 020 8998 6372 Fax: 020
8998 1275
e-mail mikinvent@aol.com Webs www.gigadron.com
www.instituteofinventors.com
Hi Barry,

Re: AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800
sudden airframe break-ups in flight

I am pleased to have found a website supporting the true causes of 747 sudden airframe break-ups in flight fatal accidents.

My name is Michael V. Rodrigues; I am a professional aircraft design engineer inventor with a commendable track record see

[Profile - Inventor Michael Rodrigues](#)

www.gigadron.com and President [Institute of Inventors](#)

I have been on teams designing and on stress calculations of several aircraft <

Most notably the Lynx < still the fastest helicopter in the world.

My common sense, wisdom and evaluation are that all the above Sudden airframe break-ups in flight fatal air accidents were not bombs and were due to :-

- a) Out Opening Forward Cargo Door Failure caused by
- b) Hazardous defective designed C Latches uncommanded opening combined with
- c) Old Structural Fatigue Failure - excess of 10,000 pressurizing reversals.

Your web site supports my view but lacks a contact phone number.

We need to talk and inform the families of victims, the courts and public.

All believe it was a bomb!

Please phone me any time on

020 8998 3540, or 020 8998 6372 if phoning from the UK

or

00 44 208 998 3540 or 00 44 208 998 6372 if phoning from

outside the UK.
< or email your phone numbers.

Best regards

Michael

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: MIKINVENT@aol.com
Subject: Re: 747s sudden airframe break-ups in flight

At 12:24 PM -0500 12/2/08, MIKINVENT@aol.com wrote:

Content-Type: text/html; charset="UTF-8"

Content-Language: en

Hi Barry,

Below for your infor is a copy of my email to High Court
Scotland.

Thanks for your co-operation.

Best regards,
Michael

Dear Michael,

Below is the attorney for Megrahi, the man in prison in Scotland
and the only one convicted.

Tony Kelly is his name.

taylor&kelly
Court Solicitors
3 Main Street
Coatbridge
ML5 3AJ
T 01236 710999
F 01236 429080
tony@taylorkelly.co.uk

The man below is well informed also.

Professor Robert Black QC FRSE FFCS
The Edinburgh Law School
+44 (0)131 650 2021
+44 (0)131 650 6317 (School fax)
+44 (0)871 247 2026 (Personal e-fax)
+44 (0)7740 541495 (Mobile)

ksmart@aaib.gov.uk
>Ken Smart
>Chief Inspector of Accidents,
>Air Accident Investigations Branch
>AAIB
>DRA Farnborough
>Hants GU14 6TD
>United Kingdom

Good luck,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
831 659 3552
831 392 5013
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: media@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 was not a bomb but a mechanical problem.

Gaddafi International Charity and Development Foundation
(GICDF)

Dear Sir, Thursday, April 16, 2009

I agree with your founder that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. There were no bombs and no bombers. The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression, in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at ntsb.org and

montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

I invite your media to evaluate the mechanical explanation and enquire of me to answer any questions.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT

To: research@gdf.org.ly

Subject: Pan Am 103 was not a bomb but a mechanical problem.

Gaddafi International Charity and Development Foundation
(GICDF)

Dear Sir, Thursday, April 16, 2009

I agree with your founder that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. There were no bombs and no bombers. The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression, in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at ntsb.org and montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

I invite your aviation safety personnel to research my investigation and evaluate the mechanical explanation.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.nts.gov
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: projects@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 was not a bomb but a mechanical problem.

Gaddafi International Charity and Development Foundation
(GICDF)

Dear Sir, Thursday, April 16, 2009

I agree with your founder that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. There were no bombs and no bombers. The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to

explosive decompression, in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at ntsb.org and montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

I invite your aviation safety personnel to evaluate the mechanical explanation.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924

barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: civilsocieties@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 was not a bomb but a mechanical problem.

Gaddafi International Charity and Development Foundation
(GICDF)

Dear Sir, Thursday, April 16, 2009

I agree with your founder that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. There were no bombs and no bombers. The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression, in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at ntsb.org and montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical

explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

I invite your staff to evaluate the mechanical explanation and its implications for your society.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: foreignrelations@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 was not a bomb but a mechanical problem.

Gaddafi International Charity and Development Foundation
(GICDF)

Dear Sir, Thursday, April 16, 2009

I agree with your founder that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. There were no bombs and no bombers. The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression, in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at ntsb.org and montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

I invite your aviation safety personnel to evaluate the mechanical explanation and consider the consequences of Libya being proven innocent from the terrible blame of this horrible accident.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.nts.gov
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: foreignrelations@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 alternative explanation with precedent and proof.

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Wednesday, April 22, 2009

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given

the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: civilsocieties@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 alternative explanation with precedent and proof.

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Wednesday, April 22, 2009

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the

metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.nts.gov
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: projects@gdf.org.ly

Subject: Pan Am 103 alternative explanation with precedent and proof.

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Wednesday, April 22, 2009

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others

which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: research@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 alternative explanation with precedent and proof.

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Wednesday, April 22, 2009

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: media@gdf.org.ly
Subject: Pan Am 103 alternative explanation with precedent and proof.

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Wednesday, April 22, 2009

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open

forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L

position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsbt.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: media@gdf.org.ly
Subject: **Pan Am 103 new evidence proves no bomb.**

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Friday, April 24, 2009

New evidence shows there was no bomb because:

From article: "Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues."

There is an explanation that explains how Pan Am 103 was destroyed in flight and not caused by a bomb but by explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opened inadvertently in flight probably caused by faulty wiring.

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no

bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Below is from article in Scottish newspaper:

"New evidence suggests wrong suspects were pursued for Pan Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie
A film shown in the Scottish Parliament yesterday evening attacks the only remaining strong support for the prosecution case that Pan Am Flight 103 was blown up over Lockerbie by a

timer bomb put on the aircraft in Malta. Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues.

Information about a break-in at Heathrow Airport on the night before the bombing was recorded at once in the security log, but no trace was found of the person or persons responsible. Next morning (the Lockerbie disaster), the airport was allowed to function as usual.

We know of multiple warnings of the terrorist threats at the time, and any high-profile airport which has suffered a break-in could hardly have a more dangerous warning of possible terror to come. Had appropriate action been taken at Heathrow, our families might be alive today.

There is worse. A Heathrow security guard who said he knew about the break-in had been interviewed by the Met's anti-terror squad early in 1989, and the police investigated Heathrow closely in January 1989, even doing a re-run of the loading of the baggage container. They must surely have seen the previous night's security log.

This break-in evidence only became available to the rest of us after the Camp Zeist court had convicted Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al Megrahi.

The Heathrow break-in would have been the perfect scenario for the Syrian-backed PFLP-GC to put one of its bombs on the aircraft. I can think of potent reasons why both the UK and the United States were unwilling to confront Iran and/or Syria over Lockerbie. The evidence from the break-in strongly supported the use of a PFLP-GC (Syrian) bomb. The PFLP-GC was closely

associated with Iran and appeared to derive substantial financial reward from Tehran after the bombing.

For me, the passive attitude at Heathrow in not making a realistic response to the break-in with its terrible implications remains inexcusable. However, we also have a right to know who was behind the suppression of this material, which has undermined the trial, as well as our fatal accident inquiry.

It would appear that orders must have come from the very top. Margaret Thatcher was never prepared to meet us to discuss an objective inquiry, but later claimed in her book *The Downing Street Years* (1993) that the US Air Force bombing of Tripoli in 1986 had prevented further terrorist outrages by Libya.

By 1993, the indictments against the two Libyans were already two years old.

We were, I believe, right from the earliest days, pawns in a political scenario that had nothing to do with truth.

If the prisoner transfer agreement does abort the next appeal, we shall at last be free of any claims that "due UK process" has to continue. In that situation, I think we should discuss the immediate demand for a new inquest or fatal accident inquiry, and referral to the European courts on human rights grounds.

Dr Jim Swire, Isle of Skye."

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.nts.gov
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: research@gdf.org.ly
Subject: **Pan Am 103 new evidence proves no bomb.**

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Friday, April 24, 2009

New evidence shows there was no bomb because:

From article: "Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues."

There is an explanation that explains how Pan Am 103 was destroyed in flight and not caused by a bomb but by explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opened inadvertently in flight probably caused by faulty wiring.

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given

the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Below is from article in Scottish newspaper:

"New evidence suggests wrong suspects were pursued for Pan Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie
A film shown in the Scottish Parliament yesterday evening

attacks the only remaining strong support for the prosecution case that Pan Am Flight 103 was blown up over Lockerbie by a timer bomb put on the aircraft in Malta. Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues.

Information about a break-in at Heathrow Airport on the night before the bombing was recorded at once in the security log, but no trace was found of the person or persons responsible. Next morning (the Lockerbie disaster), the airport was allowed to function as usual.

We know of multiple warnings of the terrorist threats at the time, and any high-profile airport which has suffered a break-in could hardly have a more dangerous warning of possible terror to come. Had appropriate action been taken at Heathrow, our families might be alive today.

There is worse. A Heathrow security guard who said he knew about the break-in had been interviewed by the Met's anti-terror squad early in 1989, and the police investigated Heathrow closely in January 1989, even doing a re-run of the loading of the baggage container. They must surely have seen the previous night's security log.

This break-in evidence only became available to the rest of us after the Camp Zeist court had convicted Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al Megrahi.

The Heathrow break-in would have been the perfect scenario for the Syrian-backed PFLP-GC to put one of its bombs on the aircraft. I can think of potent reasons why both the UK and the United States were unwilling to confront Iran and/or Syria over

Lockerbie. The evidence from the break-in strongly supported the use of a PFLP-GC (Syrian) bomb. The PFLP-GC was closely associated with Iran and appeared to derive substantial financial reward from Tehran after the bombing.

For me, the passive attitude at Heathrow in not making a realistic response to the break-in with its terrible implications remains inexcusable. However, we also have a right to know who was behind the suppression of this material, which has undermined the trial, as well as our fatal accident inquiry.

It would appear that orders must have come from the very top. Margaret Thatcher was never prepared to meet us to discuss an objective inquiry, but later claimed in her book *The Downing Street Years* (1993) that the US Air Force bombing of Tripoli in 1986 had prevented further terrorist outrages by Libya.

By 1993, the indictments against the two Libyans were already two years old.

We were, I believe, right from the earliest days, pawns in a political scenario that had nothing to do with truth.

If the prisoner transfer agreement does abort the next appeal, we shall at last be free of any claims that "due UK process" has to continue. In that situation, I think we should discuss the immediate demand for a new inquest or fatal accident inquiry, and referral to the European courts on human rights grounds.

Dr Jim Swire, Isle of Skye."

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com

www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: projects@gdf.org.ly
Subject: **Pan Am 103 new evidence proves no bomb.**

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Friday, April 24, 2009

New evidence shows there was no bomb because:

From article: "Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues."

There is an explanation that explains how Pan Am 103 was destroyed in flight and not caused by a bomb but by explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opened inadvertently in flight probably caused by faulty wiring.

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight

destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Below is from article in Scottish newspaper:

"New evidence suggests wrong suspects were pursued for Pan

Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie

A film shown in the Scottish Parliament yesterday evening attacks the only remaining strong support for the prosecution case that Pan Am Flight 103 was blown up over Lockerbie by a timer bomb put on the aircraft in Malta. Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues.

Information about a break-in at Heathrow Airport on the night before the bombing was recorded at once in the security log, but no trace was found of the person or persons responsible. Next morning (the Lockerbie disaster), the airport was allowed to function as usual.

We know of multiple warnings of the terrorist threats at the time, and any high-profile airport which has suffered a break-in could hardly have a more dangerous warning of possible terror to come. Had appropriate action been taken at Heathrow, our families might be alive today.

There is worse. A Heathrow security guard who said he knew about the break-in had been interviewed by the Met's anti-terror squad early in 1989, and the police investigated Heathrow closely in January 1989, even doing a re-run of the loading of the baggage container. They must surely have seen the previous night's security log.

This break-in evidence only became available to the rest of us after the Camp Zeist court had convicted Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al Megrahi.

The Heathrow break-in would have been the perfect scenario for the Syrian-backed PFLP-GC to put one of its bombs on the

aircraft. I can think of potent reasons why both the UK and the United States were unwilling to confront Iran and/or Syria over Lockerbie. The evidence from the break-in strongly supported the use of a PFLP-GC (Syrian) bomb. The PFLP-GC was closely associated with Iran and appeared to derive substantial financial reward from Tehran after the bombing.

For me, the passive attitude at Heathrow in not making a realistic response to the break-in with its terrible implications remains inexcusable. However, we also have a right to know who was behind the suppression of this material, which has undermined the trial, as well as our fatal accident inquiry.

It would appear that orders must have come from the very top. Margaret Thatcher was never prepared to meet us to discuss an objective inquiry, but later claimed in her book *The Downing Street Years* (1993) that the US Air Force bombing of Tripoli in 1986 had prevented further terrorist outrages by Libya.

By 1993, the indictments against the two Libyans were already two years old.

We were, I believe, right from the earliest days, pawns in a political scenario that had nothing to do with truth.

If the prisoner transfer agreement does abort the next appeal, we shall at last be free of any claims that "due UK process" has to continue. In that situation, I think we should discuss the immediate demand for a new inquest or fatal accident inquiry, and referral to the European courts on human rights grounds.

Dr Jim Swire, Isle of Skye."

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive

Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@johnbarrysmith.com>
Date: September 6, 2009 12:01:24 AM PDT
To: foreignrelations@gdf.org.ly
Subject: **Pan Am 103 new evidence proves no bomb.**

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi,
President of the Gaddafi International Charity and Development
Foundation

Dear Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, Friday, April 24, 2009

New evidence shows there was no bomb because:

From article: "Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues."

There is an explanation that explains how Pan Am 103 was destroyed in flight and not caused by a bomb but by explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opened inadvertently in flight probably caused by faulty wiring.

I agree with you that Libya had nothing to do with the inflight destruction of Pan Am 103 and is totally innocent. I can prove it to you, sir, and to your aviation accident investigators if given the chance. You know Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al-Megrahi is innocent and so do I. I can prove it. There were no bombs and no bombers.

The mechanical cause was an inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight leading to explosive decompression; in other words: The shorted wiring/unlatch motor on/ruptured open forward cargo door/explosive decompression/inflight breakup explanation.

There were no conspiracies, only a mechanical problem which has happened before and after Pan Am 103 leaving matching evidence; specifically United Airlines UAL Flight 811. All parties are acting in their own perceived interest that it is better to blame terrorists than to fix the mechanical problems. I disagree. Aviation safety comes first.

Details of the mechanical explanation are at www.nts.gov and www.montereypeninsulaairport.com. There are downloadable Smith Accident Reports in pdf format for Pan Am 103 and others which contain photographs, schematics, graphs, text, and analysis to support the mechanical explanation.

One such document is below which is taken from the USA NTSB public docket for TWA 800 and shows the matching sounds on the CVR at initial event time. That sudden loud sound is not a bomb sound but is the sound of the explosive decompression when the forward cargo door opens in flight, as it did with the United flight, the only Boeing 747 to land safely after the event

and confirm the wiring/cargo door explanation as the cause.

From the AAIB Report on Pan Am 103, the 'bomb' shatter zone was described as if a shotgun had gone off, not a bomb.

"The material from this area, hereafter referred to as the 'shatter zone', was mostly reduced to very small fragments, only a few of which were recovered, including a strip of two skins [Appendix B, Figure B-15] forming part of the lap joint at the stringer 39L position.

Where these panels formed the boundary of the shatter zone, the metal in the immediate locality was ragged, heavily distorted, and the inner surfaces were pitted and sooted - rather as if a very large shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at close range."

Just opposite the small 'shatter zone' of Pan Am 103 was a huge shattered area called the forward cargo door, picture below from AAIB:

Mr. Saif Al-Islam Gaddafi, in my opinion, it's never too late to correct an injustice; it's never too late to solve this mystery, please give it one more effort by having your aviation accident investigators contact me for discussions about mechanical causes of fatal accidents of early model Boeing 747-100s.

Below is from article in Scottish newspaper:

"New evidence suggests wrong suspects were pursued for Pan Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie

A film shown in the Scottish Parliament yesterday evening attacks the only remaining strong support for the prosecution case that Pan Am Flight 103 was blown up over Lockerbie by a timer bomb put on the aircraft in Malta. Explosives tests by a number of independent experts have shown that a circuit board placed as close to the Semtex as the Malta device must have been could not have survived as the fragment was supposed to have survived. The 6000 degree C heat and the shock wave reduce circuit boards so close to that amount of Semtex to a powder. In addition, recent tests on the fragment itself are alleged to show that it bears no trace of explosives residues.

Information about a break-in at Heathrow Airport on the night before the bombing was recorded at once in the security log, but no trace was found of the person or persons responsible. Next morning (the Lockerbie disaster), the airport was allowed to function as usual.

We know of multiple warnings of the terrorist threats at the time, and any high-profile airport which has suffered a break-in could hardly have a more dangerous warning of possible terror to come. Had appropriate action been taken at Heathrow, our families might be alive today.

There is worse. A Heathrow security guard who said he knew about the break-in had been interviewed by the Met's anti-terror squad early in 1989, and the police investigated Heathrow closely in January 1989, even doing a re-run of the loading of the baggage container. They must surely have seen the previous night's security log.

This break-in evidence only became available to the rest of us after the Camp Zeist court had convicted Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al Megrahi.

The Heathrow break-in would have been the perfect scenario for the Syrian-backed PFLP-GC to put one of its bombs on the aircraft. I can think of potent reasons why both the UK and the United States were unwilling to confront Iran and/or Syria over Lockerbie. The evidence from the break-in strongly supported the use of a PFLP-GC (Syrian) bomb. The PFLP-GC was closely associated with Iran and appeared to derive substantial financial reward from Tehran after the bombing.

For me, the passive attitude at Heathrow in not making a realistic response to the break-in with its terrible implications remains inexcusable. However, we also have a right to know who was behind the suppression of this material, which has undermined the trial, as well as our fatal accident inquiry.

It would appear that orders must have come from the very top. Margaret Thatcher was never prepared to meet us to discuss an objective inquiry, but later claimed in her book *The Downing Street Years* (1993) that the US Air Force bombing of Tripoli in 1986 had prevented further terrorist outrages by Libya. By 1993, the indictments against the two Libyans were already two years old.

We were, I believe, right from the earliest days, pawns in a political scenario that had nothing to do with truth.

If the prisoner transfer agreement does abort the next appeal, we shall at last be free of any claims that "due UK process" has to continue. In that situation, I think we should discuss the immediate demand for a new inquest or fatal accident inquiry, and referral to the European courts on human rights grounds.

Dr Jim Swire, Isle of Skye."

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
541 Country Club Drive
Carmel Valley, California 93924
barry@johnbarrysmith.com
www.ntsب.org
www.montereypeninsulaairport.com.

From: Google Alerts <googlealerts-noreply@google.com>
Date: September 18, 2009 12:13:15 PM PDT
To: barry@johnbarrysmith.com
Subject: **Google Alert - Pan Am Flight 103**

Google News Alert for: **Pan Am Flight 103**

[Lockerbie bomber releases legal documents](#)

The Associated Press

All 259 people on board **Pan Am Flight 103** — mostly Americans — and 11 people on the ground died on Dec. 21, 1988 when a bomb exploded mid-**flight** as the ...

[See all stories on this topic](#)

[Salon](#)

[The somber beauty of air crash memorials](#)

Salon

As if there weren't enough disturbing connections between the UTA and **Pan Am 103** bombings, that picture is eerily reminiscent of the iconic photo of **Flight ...**

[See all stories on this topic](#)

This once a day Google Alert is brought to you by Google.

[Remove](#) this alert.

[Create](#) another alert.

[Manage](#) your alerts.