

Malaysian Airlines MH-17 Trial at The Hague: Evidence based on Leaked Documents from the Public Prosecution Office

Lacks Evidence Is a Big Concern for Finding the Truth in a Political Show Trial

By [Sonja van den Ende](#)

Global Research, March 15, 2020

[OneWorld](#) 14 March 2020

Region: [Asia](#), [Europe](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media](#)
[Disinformation](#)

The MH-17 trial started on March 9 in a heavily guarded judicial complex in Scheveningen, The Hague. The process is being followed by a lot of media attention.

[Bonanza media](#), an independent company, presented new evidence based on leaked documents from the Public Prosecution Office and the JIT-team two days before the trial began. The results of the investigation contradict the [Ukrainian](#) and [Dutch](#) state media. Even the judge at the opening of the trial could not resist making a “political” statement: “There will still be many smokescreens raised”. Thus Bonanza media in advance is considered as a conspiracy outlet or “the long arm of the Kremlin trolls”.

Bonanza Media’s Evidence

After a thorough research on the spot, Bonanza Media consulted a Malaysian specialist [Akash Rosen](#) who investigated the six audio tapes which are the ultimate piece of evidence as seen by the JIT-team. Bonanza came to the conclusion that the tapes had been edited. Also, [Billy Sixt](#), an independent German journalist, had the tapes examined in Germany. He talked to many former GDR and post-GDR generals about BUK missile system installations and came to the same conclusion that manipulation of audiotapes really took place.

The Bonanza team has traveled to Ukraine many times, visited the site of the crash and spoke with witnesses, and these visits led to an astonishing conclusion. Almost all witnesses (no, they are not bribed, as the propaganda machine of the Netherlands immediately suggests) claim that two fighter jets flew not far from the wings of the MH-17, most likely Ukrainian fighter jets, just moments before the MH-17 was shot down.

In 2015 a villager responded to the call from Ukrainian TV which gathered information about the crash. He wanted to tell them what he had seen that day in 2014. He was then approached by the JIT-team and two conversations took place via SKYPE. The name of the witness was Alexander.

Witness Statement

Later, Alexander told Bonanza Media that the JIT-team asked him which direction the MH-17 plane was flying. He answered that it flew in the direction of [Petropavlivka](#) and not [Kirovsk](#) of Luhansk region, as the JIT-team suggested. They also asked about the BUK installation,

but according to Alexander, there was no BUK installation there. He was never called again by the JIT-team. According to the official version, the MH-17 crashed in [Hrabove – Kirovsk](#) .

He was also surprised by the audiotapes, which he later heard and which are now used by the court as evidence. Immediately after the crash of MH-17, members of the Ukrainian security service spoke about the place called Petropavlivka in Luhansk region and not about Petropavlivka in Donetsk region. Alexander heard the original version of the Ukrainian security services tapes and they differed from the manipulated tapes used in the court.

According to many witnesses, the position of the BUK in the area where the MH-17 was crashed is still a mystery to this day. Nobody has seen the BUK installation.

Leaked Documents From The Police In Driebergen, The Netherlands

In January 2018, there was a meeting of the investigation teams from the Netherlands, Belgium, Australia, and Ukraine, excluding Malaysia. The team members were worried that data from the US about the crash had not yet been received. But the US claimed that two years ago it had delivered it. An internal discussion took place to reassure the media and the public that the investigation teams had everything under control. Later, in a leaked memo they suggested that the Dutch state has not yet had a case law for similar cases and thus did not have enough evidence to that day.

The most bizarre thing about the leaked memo is its mentioning that members of the JIT-team were “intimidating witnesses”. All members of the team, in particular, the Belgians, were comfortable with that, the Ukrainians also thought it was fine but the Dutch had to fix it, the Australians had some trouble with it. The Malaysians were not asked for anything as they were not present at the meeting.

And there is also an investigation of [Ukr Leaks](#), which was not included as evidence. This video examined many things such as moving the BUK missile system, its installation, closing the airspace to a certain height, etc.

Conclusion

As it turns out, this one-sided trial lacks solid evidence. Normally, independent trials have two sides to be heard, otherwise, it will not be a democratic process. In this case, only one side is blamed. Immediately after the crash, Russia was called a culprit. One might think that the whole spectacle would be labeled as a media-hype, but the majority of the Dutch think it's fine. They are bombarded with media and state propaganda on a daily basis. For them, there is no doubt Russia is the culprit.

After a thorough investigation by Bonanza Media and Ukr Leaks, many questions remain unanswered along with the evidence that is not taken by the court or the JIT-team into consideration. For instance, the change of places where the plane flew, the position of the BUK. The plane was brought down over Ukraine and not over Russia. Flying above a war zone is also a gross negligence, but who allowed this mischief? The Netherlands, Malaysia or Ukraine? At least, not Russia. And now it appears that the manipulated audiotapes are not “relevant”.

Considering all these unanswered questions and oddities, one can not escape the impression that it is a political process with the culprit determined beforehand. The amateurish investigation of the Dutch police and JIT-team really represents a big concern for

finding the truth in a political show trial.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

The original source of this article is [OneWorld](#)
Copyright © [Sonja van den Ende](#), [OneWorld](#), 2020

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Sonja van den Ende](#)

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