

Camouflage and Coverup: The Dutch Commission Report on the Malaysian MH17 Crash is “Not Worth the Paper it’s Written On”

By [Peter Haisenko](#)

Global Research, September 11, 2014

[Anderweltonline.com \(German\) and Global Research](#)

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

“Weasel wording” consists in using “words and phrases aimed at creating an impression that a specific and/or meaningful statement has been made, when in fact only a vague or ambiguous claim has been communicated, enabling the specific meaning to be denied if the statement is challenged.” ... “Some weasel words may also have the effect of softening the force of a potentially loaded or otherwise controversial statement through some form of understatement.” (Gary Jason 1988)

One thing must be stated outright: This report does not lie.

It just can’t lie since there is nothing new in it. I myself have never seen such a meaningless plane crash report. What comes as a surprise, however, is the report’s diplomatic, sophisticated choice of words, which loses itself in ambiguous terminology.

It was probably planned this way, so each party can continue to defend their version of what happened with zeal.

Let’s take a closer look at this report.

At the beginning we find, as usual, detailed statements about the plane, who it belonged to,



that it was in perfect condition and details about the crew.

Technical issues or weather conditions are excluded as causes for the crash.

Image right: German pilot and author Peter Haisenko

Then, it confirms that the flight recorders were virtually undamaged and that they have not been tampered with.

The report continues with the description of the debris scattered over a vast area and from

this observation is drawn the amazing conclusion that this aircraft had blown up in the air.

I apologize for the slight sarcasm, but I will have no choice but to continue to make some sarcastic remarks about this “report”.

14 minutes of silence in the cockpit is absolutely impossible

It is reported that the cockpit section was probably completely broken off from the aircraft because it fell almost vertically from the point of shelling to the ground and was found at some distance from the rest of the debris.



The report indicates that the damages done by external forces were recorded almost exclusively in the front of the plane, namely the cockpit, and this led to the breakup of the aircraft.

So far so good, nothing new. Then there is a transcript of the radio communication between MH017 and air traffic control taken from the voice recorder.

At this point the expert starts to ask himself questions.

The transcript of the radio communication starts at 13:08:00 and ends at 13:22:02, a 14 minute time frame.

From my experience as an aircraft captain I cannot imagine that during 14 minutes no other dialogues or sounds were picked up in the cockpit by the voice recorder.

When the cockpit receives radio transmissions from other aircraft, those are also recorded by the device. As I said, there are no lies, but in all likelihood, not everything is being said. The published conclusion points out that:

“Crew communication gave no indication that there was anything abnormal with the flight.”

Everything was normal, but the possible (and very probable) conversation in the cockpit is concealed, as well as radio transmissions from other aircrafts.

High Energy Objects – and other hazy formulations

The conclusion of this report is a prime example of a situation in which one knows something with certainty, but the facts are presented in such a way that nothing is revealed:

The damage observed in the forward section of the aircraft appears to indicate that the aircraft was penetrated by a large number of high-energy objects from outside the aircraft. It is likely that this damage resulted in a loss of structural integrity of the aircraft, leading to an in-flight break up."

Aha! says the astonished reader. We knew that already. We must take a closer look at this conclusion. In fact, it is not a conclusion.

The report speaks of possibilities and probabilities: "appears to indicate", "it is likely". But this is the less enigmatic part.

The wordings "penetrated" and especially "high-energy objects" are interesting. It remains unclear how far these "objects" entered, or even if they went through the entire cockpit and came out on the other side of it, thus completely "penetrating" the cockpit. The background picture of the cockpit section shown in this report is of lower quality and in smaller scale than the one I provided myself and published in my analysis.

"Weasel Wording"

Again it must be noted: The report does not lie, but the Commission shows less information than it has at its disposal.

The term "high-energy objects" is totally "original". What is this?

I myself know this term from astrophysics or quantum physics. Otherwise, I have not commonly seen it in the context of aviation or plane accidents. So how should this concept be understood? I asked English speakers about this. They



spontaneously replied bullets, projectiles from a cannon or fast moving freight trains. They also noted that this term is unusual in "normal", colloquial terms, except in astrophysics or quantum physics. This strange wording leaves everything open.

License to interpretations – The explanation appears different

Those who want to follow the Western description can conclude that a surface-to-air missile discharges "high-energy-objects". This is precisely the interpretation that I observed in the German media today.

Our newspapers are reciting like a creed the American version of the cause of the disaster, issued immediately after the MH 017 crash, by claiming that the present report confirms that the Boeing 777 was shot down by a surface-to-air missile.

That is not exactly what the report states, but it allows this interpretation – and that's

probably the point of this very flexible choice of words. Everybody can interpret what they want to believe according to their own taste. Especially if they are not native English speakers who spontaneously think of bullets.

This “report” is not worth the paper it is written on.

This is not surprising, because the Kiev Maidan government had to give their OK to what could be published.

The report leaves open everything which could actually contribute to an explanation. The MH 017 could have been hit by a missile, whether surface-to-air or air-to-air. It could have been shot down by a fighter jet or, sarcastically, according to the astrophysics or quantum physics terms, by a large number of “high-energy objects” that rained down on the cockpit from the far reaches of the universe.

[You can download the report in the original PDF here to make up your own mind.](#)

More articles on MH 017:

Read Peter Haisenko’s earlier article:

[Shocking analysis for launching the Malaysian MH 017](#) – Here you will find the high resolution image of the cockpit section, of which only a portion is shown in the report.

Original in German.

translation: Julie Lévesque for Global Research

The original source of this article is [Anderweltonline.com \(German\) and Global Research](#)
Copyright © [Peter Haisenko, Anderweltonline.com \(German\) and Global Research](#), 2014

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Peter Haisenko](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of “fair use” in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than “fair use” you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca