Eight years ago, on 17 July 2014, Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 (MH17) was shot down in Eastern Ukraine.

This background text was prepared in the context of the Kuala Lumpur MH17 Conference entitled MH17: The Quest for Justice, organized by JUST, the PGPF and the CRG in August 2019. This comprehensive report provides detailed evidence that Russia was not involved in the downing of MH17.

It also confirms the insidious role of Ukraine’s intelligence agency.

****

The underlying objective is to examine the evidence, reveal the truth and uphold the rule of law.

Today, July 29th 2021, our thoughts are with the families of the victims of the Malaysian Airlines MH17 tragedy.

The 2019 Conference was dedicated to the memory of the victims.

It is also a national tragedy for the people of Malaysia. The downing of MH17 with 283 passengers and 15 crew on board, took place barely a few months following the mysterious disappearance of Malaysian Airlines flight MH370 after departing on March 8, 2014 from Kuala Lumpur for Beijing, with 227 passengers and 12 crew members on board.

It is worth recalling that immediately after the MH17 plane crash on July 17 2014, prior to the conduct of a preliminary investigation, Secretary of State John Kerry and US Ambassador to the UN Samantha Power pointed their finger at Moscow without a shred of evidence. In turn, the allegations directed against Russia were used to justify the imposition of sweeping economic sanctions against the Russian Federation.

According to President Obama (hours after the tragedy):

“... the downing of MH17 should be “a wake-up call” to Europe to get serious about confronting Russia over Ukraine after EU leaders have proved reluctant to impose tough sanctions.” (Telegraph, July 18,2019)

The Wall Street Journal reports (July 18, 2014) that “Obama is getting his wish and Brussels
European governments, jolted by the downing of a passenger plane over eastern Ukraine that killed nearly 300 people, are contemplating a major expansion of sanctions on Russia as early as next week.

European Union leaders decided in recent days to expand the penalties to a broad new category of people and companies. But the apparent shooting down of a plane carrying more than 200 EU citizens has intensified a desire to act quickly and forcefully, including sanctions against oligarchs with ties to the Kremlin.

In Brussels, some diplomats described the incident as a game-changer. “It would have major consequences if it was certain it came from the rebels—major consequences,” said one official. (WSJ, July 18, 2014)

On July 22, 2014, The European Union decided to expand its sanctions blacklist against Moscow including Vladimir Putin’s inner circle.

EU foreign ministers decided to “draw up further broad measures including an arms embargo and financial restrictions on Russian businesses, ... following the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17.” (Guardian, July 22, 2019)

Michel Chossudovsky, August 2019, updated July 17, 2020, July 16, 2022

According to the official narrative, Malaysian Airlines MH 17 was downed by a BUK anti-aircraft missile by “pro-Russian separatists” with the support of Moscow.

The MH17 Inquiry has been conducted in an insidious fashion, largely responding to political
Important pieces of evidence including eye witness reports, audio and video material transmitted through Ukraine Intelligence (SBU) have either been manipulated or excluded from the Dutch inquiry, which largely endorses Washington's accusations directed against Moscow.

According to Prime Minister Tun Dr. Mahathir Mohamad in a statement at the Prime Minister’s office in May 2019:

“They never allowed us to be involved from the very beginning. This is unfair and unusual. So we can see they are not really looking at the causes of the crash and who was responsible. But already they have decided it must be Russia. So we cannot accept that kind of attitude. We are interested in the rule of law, in justice for everyone irrespective of who is involved.

“They [the West] are accusing Russia but where is the evidence?
**Introduction**

The Dutch investigation

Moscow was accused without evidence of being behind the downing of MH17 from the very outset. Both Kiev and Washington concluded prior to the conduct of an investigation that:

> “MH17 had likely been brought down by a ground-to-air missile fired from separatist-controlled territory in eastern Ukraine.”

There are three distinct reports:

- Ukraine government report prepared by Ukraine’s Secret Service (SBU), August 7, 2014 (text in annex)
- The Dutch Safety Board report, September 15, 2015
- JIT: several reports (criminal investigation).

The first official report on behalf of the Ukrainian government was released by Ukraine’s SBU secret service on August 7 2014, barely three weeks after the MH 17 tragedy (July 17, 2014).

The SBU report (which is discussed later in more detail) accuses pro-Russian rebels of having downed the plane with Moscow’s support.

The Dutch Safety Board Report released in September 2015 largely endorses the BUK missile narrative.

And, a year later in September 2016, The Dutch Joint investigation Team (JIT) as part of a criminal investigation “confirmed” that the Malaysian airlines plane was “hit by a Russian-made BUK surface-to-air missile that was brought into Ukraine from Russia before the shootdown and subsequently taken back across the border.”

The assumption prior to the conduct of the DSB investigation was that a BUK missile had brought down MH17, and Russia was behind it.

Concrete evidence supporting other interpretations (including on site testimonies and the presence of a second aircraft) was casually dismissed by the DSB:

> The in-flight disintegration of the aeroplane near the Ukrainian/Russian border was the result of the detonation of a warhead. The detonation occurred above the left hand side of the cockpit. The weapon used was a 9N314M-model warhead carried on the 9M38-series of missiles, as installed on the Buk surface-to-air missile system.

> Other scenarios that could have led to the disintegration of the aeroplane were considered, analysed and excluded based on the evidence available.

Dutch Safety Board, September 2015 report (p 9)

The inquiry became increasingly politicized.
President Barack Obama had called up Malaysia’s (former) Prime Minister Najib Razak. At a press conference (July 18, 2014), “Najib told the press that he had spoken to the Dutch prime minister and the Ukrainian president; In subsequent developments, Prime Minister Najib Razak tacitly accepted the consensus imposed by Washington prior to the conduct of an investigation.

‘Obama and I agreed that the investigation will not be hidden and the international teams have to be given access to the crash scene.’

In August 2016, Ukraine president Poroshenko visited Malaysia for discussions with Prime Minister Razak Najib:

Prime Minister Datuk Seri Najib Razak said Malaysia will work with Ukraine to bring the perpetrators to justice. “We will do whatever we can to find the truth for the sake of families who lost their loved ones in this tragic incident. “We are waiting for the criminal investigation report, which is expected to be tabled by the year-end, followed by a meeting to decide on the next course of action,” said Najib. (New Straits Times, August 4, 2016)

Washington’s agenda in liaison with the Kiev regime was to blame Russia. This agenda was never questioned by the Najib government.

Erasing the Initial Evidence

Much of the initial evidence and testimony including eyewitness reports (from various independent sources), recorded in July-August 2014 (in the immediate wake of the event) contradicts the official version. This body of evidence has been dismissed and in some cases destroyed.

In September 2015, in its final report, the Dutch Safety Board presented its findings regarding the Buk TELAR surface-to-air missile system which allegedly shot down MH-17 over eastern Ukraine on July 17, 2014.

Flash forward to 2018

On 24 May 2018 the Joint Investigation Team (JIT) published an update of its findings pointing (without firm evidence) to the role of the 53 Anti-Missile Brigade of the Russian Army. In May 2018, they launched an appeal for people in Donesk to come forward to corroborate their “findings” re. the deployment of the BUK missile system:
Update in criminal investigation MH17 disaster

24 mei 2018 - Landelijk Parket

This morning, the Joint Investigation Team (JIT), which investigates the MH17 crash on 17 July 2014, gave an update of the state of affairs in the criminal investigation. During the meeting for both the national and international press in Bunnik (province of Utrecht), various findings of the investigation were presented. Relatives of the passengers who died in the disaster could follow the presentation through livestream.

Because the findings lead to new questions, the JIT makes an appeal to insiders and eyewitnesses who may be able to tell more about the events on and around the downing of flight MH17.

The 53rd brigade

The JIT is convinced that the BUK-TELAR that was used to down MH17, originates from the 53rd Anti Aircraft Missile brigade (hereinafter 53rd brigade), a unit of the Russian army from Kursk in the Russian Federation. The JIT reached this conclusion after extensive comparative research. During today’s meeting, an animation of this comparative research was shown. Several images of the BUK-TELAR with which MH17 was downed are available. Analysis of those produces a number of characteristics. The combination of those is so special that that can be considered as a fingerprint. This fingerprint has been compared with numerous images of BUK-TELARS, both Ukrainian and Russian ones. The only BUK-TELAR on which this combination of characteristics also was found, is a BUK-TELAR that was recorded several times when it joined a convoy of the 53rd brigade on 23 – 25 June 2014.

Consequently, the JIT presumes that within the 53rd brigade and within the circle around it, people have knowledge about the operation in which that particular BUK-TELAR was deployed and about the persons that were involved in it. Therefore, the JIT calls on insiders and eyewitnesses to share their information with the investigation team. Also information about the instruction of the BUK-TELAR’s crew matters greatly for the criminal investigation.

The head of the National Investigation Service of the Dutch police, Wilbert Paulissen: "Who formed part of the crew? With which instruction did they set out? Who was responsible for the operational deployment of this BUK-TELAR on 17 July 2014? We are convinced that many people have this information. That may be members of the 53rd Brigade, but also relatives, friends or acquaintances. And even people who have nothing to do with the 53rd Brigade. Please do not keep that information to yourself but contact the JIT. Our investigators can speak with you in several languages, among which Russian and Ukrainian."

On the following day, the governments of Australia and the Netherlands officially declared that “they hold Russia responsible for the incident”. (see Polygraph Info, May 25, 2018)

Moscow remains the “main suspect” in this politically twisted investigation, which has now led to a legal procedure in the Netherlands directed against the alleged perpetrators.
On June 19, 2019, the International Joint Investigation Team (JIT) announced (video) that international arrest warrants have been issued against four “separatist commanders” of the Donetsk People’s Republic (DNR). These warrants concern Ukrainian citizen Leonid Kharchenko, and Russian citizens Sergei Dubinsky, Oleg Pulatov, and Igor Girkin.

Moreover, Britain’s Foreign Secretary Jeremy Hunt announced in mid-July 2019 that “the UK will provide financial support to the specialist criminal court in the Hague” which is slated to host the trial of the four suspects.

In this report we will first focus on the Timeline as well as selected evidence which has been suppressed including the presence of a second aircraft.

We will then review the official report of the Kiev government prepared by Ukraine’s intelligence service (SBU) as well as the role of the SBU in feeding “evidence” to the Dutch Safety Board (DSB) and the Joint Investigation Team (JIT)

**Analysis of the Evidence**

**Timeline**

July 15, 2014. Two Days Before the Tragic Event

A division of Buk missile systems of the Ukrainian Armed Forces was, according to Pravda, deployed to the Donetsk Oblast on July 15, two days before the downing of the Malaysian airlines MH17 flight. The Buk missile system has the capabilities of downing an aircraft flying at 35,000 feet.

Russian Defense sources confirmed the presence of several Ukraine missile batteries in the Donesk oblast operated by the Ukraine armed forces:

‘The Ukrainian military has several batteries of Buk surface-to-air missile systems with at least 27 launchers, capable of bringing down high-flying jets, in the Donetsk region where the Malaysian passenger plane crashed, Russian Defense Ministry said’ (RT, July 17, 2014)
The Prosecutor General of Ukraine Vitaliy Yarema confirmed that the Donest rebels did not have [Ukrainian] Buk or S 300 ground to air missiles which could have downed the plane, which suggests that the missiles of the Ukraine armed forces had been deployed but they were not in the possession of the rebels, a premise which remains central to the US-Kiev official version that the rebels, supported by Moscow, were responsible for attacking Malaysian Airlines MH17.

According to the Kiev Post report: “Ukrainian prosecutor general says militants did not seize Ukrainian air defense launchers”:

“Members of illegal armed units have not seized air defense launchers of the Ukrainian Armed Forces in Donetsk, Ukrainian Prosecutor General Vitaliy Yarema said.” (Kiev Post, July 19, 2014)

According to Russia’s Itar-Tass report (July 2014)

“After the passenger airliner was downed, the military reported to the president that terrorists do not have our air defense missile systems Buk and S-300,” the general prosecutor [of Ukraine] said. “These weapons were not seized,” he added.

Ukrainian Interior Minister Anton Gerashchenko said on July 17 that the Malaysia Airlines Boeing 777 airliner had been downed by an air defense missile system Buk.

From both Russian and Ukrainian sources there was evidence of Ukrainian BUK missiles deployed in Eastern Ukraine and official statements that the Donest rebel forces had no access to the Ukraine Buk air missiles. The Kiev Post report did not (in this July 19 report) mention the presence of Russia BUK missiles in Donestk oblast.

July 17, 2014. Day of the MH17 Tragedy

The Boeing-777 of the Malaysian Airlines flight MH17 from Amsterdam to Kuala Lumpur “disappeared from the radars and crashed on Thursday evening July 17 near Grabovo in Ukraine’s Donetsk oblast.

The Flight Path of MH17 Was Changed? July 17 Plane Route was over the Ukraine War-zone

The maps below clearly indicate a change in flight path for Malaysian airlines MH17 on July 17. They also indicate on the map the two regions of Ukraine which are part of the warzone, namely Donetsk and Lugansk.

The first dynamic map compares the two flight paths:

It indicates the regular flight path on July 16th which takes the plane in a Southeasterly direction across the Sea of Azov.

The second flight path which is that of July 17th takes the plane over the Donest oblast warzone, bordering onto Lugansk oblast.
The four static images indicate screen shots of the Flight Paths of MH17 for July 14-17, 2014. The information conveyed in these maps suggests that the flight path on July 17 was changed. MH17 was diverted from the normal South Easterly route over the sea of Azov to a path over the Donetsk oblast. Who was behind the change of the flight path? And why was the flight path changed? CLICK IMAGES TO ENLARGE

Changing MH17 Route From July 14, 2014 to July 17, 2014

Screenshots of Flight Paths of MH17 for July 14-17, 2014
The Presence of a Second Aircraft

The presence of another aircraft is corroborated by the Russian Ministry of Defense which pointed to the presence of a Ukrainian Su-25 jet in the flight corridor of the MH17, within proximity of the plane.

While Russian official sources may be considered unreliable and politically inclined, the presence of a second aircraft was also confirmed by numerous witnesses in Donesk oblast as well as by a BBC report conducted at the crash site on July 23.

"eyewitnesses in the Donetsk region saw Ukrainian warplanes near the passenger jet. They say they heard sounds of powerful blasts and saw a Ukraine warplane shortly before the crash. (ITAR Tass)

The presence of a second aircraft was also confirmed by air traffic controller Luis Lopez reporting in real time (on his twitter) from the Borisopol airport. This source is controversial and cannot be corroborated. His twitter account was closed down. He was reported to have left Ukraine. He gave a couple of interviews and then disappeared. Was his life threatened?

Suppressed BBC Report

All the eyewitnesses interviewed by the BBC confirmed the presence of a Ukrainian military aircraft flying within proximity of Malaysian Airlines MH17 at the time that it was shot down:

Eyewitness #1: There were two explosions in the air. And this is how it broke apart. And [the fragments] blew apart like this, to the sides. And when ...

Eyewitness #2: ... And there was another aircraft, a military one, beside it. Everybody saw it.

Eyewitness #1: Yes, yes. It [second aircraft] was flying under it, because it could be seen. It was proceeding underneath, below the civilian one.

Eyewitness #3: There were sounds of an explosion. But they were in the sky. They came from the sky. Then this plane [second plane] made a sharp turn-around like this. It changed its trajectory and headed in that direction [indicating the direction with her hands].

BBC Report below (removed by BBC) scroll down for alternative youtube version

The original BBC Video Report published by BBC Russian Service on July 23, 2014 was
removed by the BBC.

In a bitter irony, The BBC is suppressing its own news productions.

This is the BBC Report which is still available on Youtube

BELOW SCREENSHOT OF BBC TV REPORT ENTITLED “AND THERE WAS ANOTHER AIRCRAFT” SUPPRESSED BY THE BBC

It had been blocked [March 8, 2016] once more by the BBC. The BBC censors its own reports.

Several other reports and eyewitness testimonies confirm the presence of a second aircraft. Of significance is a December 2014 report by Komsomolskaya Pravda which conducted an interview with a Ukrainian serviceman.

While the substance of the interview (translated from Russian) is contradictory it nonetheless suggests the presence of a second aircraft as confirmed by the suppressed BBC report.

The BBC Refutes and Confirms its Own Lies

It is worth noting that subsequent BBC reports tend to refute the substance of their first onsite investigation in Donesk Oblast with the exception of a May 2016 BBC documentary which puts forth “several theories”. The documentary puts forth evidence which initially refutes the official story while also intimating and concluding that Russia might have been behind the MH17 tragedy.

The official investigation report into MH17 flight argues that only a powerful ground-to-air missile could be responsible. Yet, there are eyewitness accounts of other aircrafts seen flying next to MH17 close to impact. To further fuel the conspiracies, Russia and Ukraine blame each other but both countries are unable to provide all the critical radar data from that day. (See BBC notice here).

According to Australia News in a review of the May 2016 BBC documentary, the Kiev regime is identified as the culprit:

A CONTROVERSIAL new documentary will investigate claims that Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 was shot down by a Ukraine fighter jet, instead of a Russian missile. In a new BBC documentary titled ‘The Conspiracy Files: Who Shot Down MH17’, eyewitnesses will share their accounts of how they saw the aircraft being downed by a nearby fighter jet.

“There are eyewitness accounts of other aircraft seen flying next to MH17 close to impact,” a statement from the BBC said.

MH17 plane crash: New BBC documentary to air new claims the flight was targeted by a Ukraine jet
Link to the May 2016 BBC Documentary

Bullet Sized Holes

According to the report of German pilot and airlines expert Peter Haisenko, the MH17 Boeing 777 was not brought down by a missile.

What he observed from the available photos were perforations of the cockpit:

The facts speak clear and loud and are beyond the realm of speculation: The cockpit shows traces of shelling! You can see the entry and exit holes. The edge of a portion of the holes is bent inwards. These are the smaller holes, round and clean, showing the entry points most likely that of a 30 millimeter caliber projectile. (Revelations of German Pilot: Shocking Analysis of the “Shooting Down” of Malaysian MH17. “Aircraft Was Not Hit by a Missile” Global Research, July 30, 2014)

Based on detailed analysis Peter Haisenko reached the conclusion that the MH17 was not downed by a missile attack:

This aircraft was not hit by a missile in the central portion. The destruction is limited to the cockpit area. Now you have to factor in that this part is constructed of specially reinforced material

Peter Haisenko’s study is consistent with the BBC report conducted at the crash site on July 23. (which was subsequently suppressed by the BBC).

The OSCE Mission

It is worth noting that the initial statements by OSCE observers (July 31) broadly confirm the findings of Peter Haisenko:

Monitors from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe reported that shrapnel-like holes were found in two separate pieces of the fuselage of the ill-fated Malaysia Airlines aircraft that was believed to have been downed by a missile in eastern Ukraine.

Michael Bociurkiw of the OSCE group of monitors at his daily briefing described part of the plane’s fuselage dotted with “shrapnel-like, almost machine gun-like holes.” He said the damage was inspected by Malaysian aviation-security
The monitoring OSCE team has not found evidence of a missile fired from the ground as conveyed by official White House statements. As we recall, the US ambassador to the UN Samantha Power stated –pointing a finger at Russia– that the Malaysian MH17 plane was “likely downed by a surface-to-air missile operated from a separatist-held location”:

The team of international investigators with the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) are uncertain if the missile used was fired from the ground as US military experts have previously suggested, the Wall Street Journal (WSJ) reported. (Malay Mail online, emphasis added)

The initial OSCE findings dispelled the claim that a BUK missile system brought down the plane.

Evidently, inasmuch as the perforations are attributable to shelling, a shelling operation conducted from the ground could not have brought down an aircraft traveling above 30,000 feet.

No firm evidence that a BUK missile had actually been fired on July 17th 2014

Expert analysis confirms that the firing of a BUK missile would have left a visible white vapor trail in the sky for about ten minutes after firing (see below).

According to witnesses in Donesk oblast, no vapor trail was seen in the sky on that day. What they saw was a second plane.

There were various images of smoke trails presented and analyzed. (see the BBC documentary). These pictures however do not correspond to a clearcut white vapor trail associated with the launching of a BUK missile.

There were no satellite images or photographic evidence of a vapor trail.

The following images (from BUK missile tests) indicate the nature of the vapor trail.
Screenshots of RT documentary, October 22, 2019

Report of the Russian Union of Engineers (RUE)

A detailed and comprehensive report by the Russian Union of Engineers (English translation) largely corroborates the presence of a Second Aircraft (confirmed by eye witnesses, BBC interviews).

“... Russian air traffic control recorded the ascent of a Ukrainian Air Force aircraft, presumably an Su-25, in the direction of the Malaysian Boeing 777. The distance between the SU-25 aircraft from the Boeing 777 was between 3 and 5 km.”
The RUE report also corroborates the “bullet hole” analysis as well as the statements of the OSCE and Peter Haisenko (mentioned above):

A detailed analysis of its fragments can provide a more complete picture of the causes of the crash. … you can see the different forms of damage to its shell or skin – tears and fractures, holes with folds on the outer and the inner sides of the fuselage, tell-tale signs of a powerful external impact on the plane.

Of particular note are the holes folded inward in the fuselage. They are round-bored, and usually grouped. Such holes can only be formed by metal objects with a circular cross-section, possibly rods or shells from an aircraft gun. The question arises: who could deliver such projectiles to the aircraft, by what means, and what might they look like?

The report also focusses on the absence of photographic evidence of a visible vapor trail of a BUK missile. In this case there has been no evidence of a trail of white condensation which would be by-product of the consumption of rocket fuel which would appear and persist for some minutes after the launch and be visible to those standing in a radius of within 10 km from the missile launch-site. (RUE report, p. 7)

It concludes after careful investigation that the MH17 Boeing 777 was “not brought down by the means of anti-aircraft missile fire from a BUK-M1 installation.”

According to the Russian Union of Engineers: the MH17 Boeing 777 “flying a horizontal course at 10000 metres could quite feasibly find itself within range of the Rocket / Cannon armament of a fighter, either a MIG-29 or an SU-25.”
Thus, according to the analysts from the Russian Union of Engineers, we have the complete destruction of the Boeing 777 as a result of missile systems using “air-to-air” close-combat missiles as well as a 30-mm aircraft cannon or an SPPU-22 container with GSh-23L 23-mm dual-barrel guns. At the same time, when firing on a target, a laser rangefinder can be used, or a laser sight, that allows for significantly improved accuracy. This is indicated by the pattern of damage and the dispersal of the fragments: there are round holes, which are typically produced as a result of gun shots, and discontinuous holes characteristic of flechette rockets. (RUE report, page 12)

Media Spin: Shrapnel, Bullet Holes, “High Energy Objects”

The media has reported that a BUK surface to air missile was indeed fired and exploded before reaching its target.

According to the official explanation (DSB), it was not the missile that brought down the plane, it was the shrapnel resulting from the missile explosion (prior to reaching the plane) which punctured the plane and then led to a loss of pressure.

This is largely the position of the Dutch Safety Board which explains the holes as a result of the explosion of the missile. This is analysis is tenuous. A shelling operation from a jet fighter was simply not considered by the DSB.

The holes according to the DSB report were the result of so-called “high energy objects coming from the warhead [Buk missile]” (i.e shrapnel from the missile). This assessment was used to dispel the evidence concerning the second aircraft.

According to a BBC report (September 9, 2014) “Cockpit window contained numerous small puncture holes suggesting small objects entered from above level of cockpit floor. Damage to forward section indicates plane penetrated by large number of high energy objects from outside”.

The holes from outside were presented as the result of the explosion of the missile, according to the DSB (13 October 2015)

At 13.20 UTC (Coordinated Universal Time) a 9N314M warhead, launched by a Buk surface-to-air missile system from a 320-square-kilometre area in the eastern part of Ukraine, detonated to the left and above the cockpit. The forward section of the aircraft was penetrated by hundreds of high-energy objects coming from the warhead.

The statement of the OSCE observer Michael Bociurkiw is not acknowledged by the Dutch Safety Board and JIT reports.

According to Ukraine’s National Security and Defence Council spokesman Andriy Lysenko

“... international investigators believed data from the flight recorders show “the reason for the destruction and crash of the plane was massive explosive decompression arising from multiple shrapnel perforations from a rocket explosion”.

Surface-to-air missiles such as the Buk system widely believed to have shot the passenger jet down can explode near their targets, blasting a cloud of shrapnel
In a report, the BBC quoting the official Ukraine statement says that:

"The downed Malaysia Airlines jet in eastern Ukraine suffered an explosive loss of pressure after it was punctured by shrapnel from a missile.... They say the information came from the plane’s flight data recorders, which are being analysed by British experts."

“Machine Gun Like Holes” Caused by a Second Aircraft or a BUK Missile?

The shrapnel marks should be distinguished from the small entry and exit holes “most likely that of a 30 millimeter caliber projectile” fired from a military aircraft. According to the findings of Peter Haisenko:

If we now consider the armament of a typical SU 25 we learn this: It is equipped with a double-barreled 30-mm gun, type GSh-302 / AO-17A, equipped with: a 250 round magazine of anti-tank incendiary shells and splinter-explosive shells (dum-dum), arranged in alternating order. The cockpit of the MH 017 has evidently been fired at from both sides: the entry and exit holes are found on the same fragment of it’s cockpit segment.

Our review of the evidence points to

1. the presence of a second aircraft,
2. “bullet like holes” pointing to the possibility of an attack by a second aircraft
3. No firm evidence of a BUK missile attack directed against MH17.
4. Absence of photographic evidence of a vapor trail from a BUK style missile on July 17, 2014

The Official Kiev Government Report Prepared by Ukraine Intelligence (SBU)

Of significance, Ukraine’s Secret Service (SBU) was given the mandate by the Ukraine authorities of coordinating and gathering the evidence in Eastern Ukraine as well as transmitting it to the Dutch Safety Board and the JIT.

According to the official SBU report entitled Terrorists and Militants planned cynical terrorist attack at Aeroflot civil aircraft published on August 7, 2014, the SBU accused Russia of having ordered a false flag attack involving the shooting down of its own Aeroflot plane leading to the death of its own citizens, and then blaming it on Kiev, with Russia using the tragedy as a casus belli pretext to invade Ukraine. According to the report: The Donetsk militia were aiming at a Russian Aeroflot passenger plane and shot down the Malaysian MH17 airliner by mistake.

That’s the official Ukraine government story which was acknowledged by the Ukrainian as well as several Western media. See below.
SBU chief: Mercenaries planned terrorist attacks against Russian aircraft on day of MH17 crash

By Interfax-Ukraine. Published Aug. 7, 2014 at 3:56 pm

"Ukraine’s law enforcement and intelligence agencies have established during the investigation into a terrorist attack on the Boeing... that on that day, July 17, and at that time military mercenaries and terrorists from the Russian Federation planned to carry out a terrorist attack against a passenger aircraft of Aeroflot en route from Moscow to Lamaca... as a pretext for the further invasion by Russia," Nalyvaichenko said at a briefing in Kyiv on Aug. 8.

"This cynical terrorist attack was planned for the day when the [Malaysia Airlines] plane happened to fly by, planned by war criminals as a pretext for the further military invasion by the Russian Federation, that is, there would be a casus belli," he added.

Thus, according Nalyvaichenko, the terrorists downed the Malaysian airliner by mistake.

Kiev Post August 7, 2014

According to Britain’s foremost news tabloid, The Mail on Sunday, quoting the head of Ukraine intelligence, the insidious design of the pro-Russian rebels (allegedly supported by
Moscow) was to shoot down a Russian commercial airline plane with tourists en route to Cyprus, with a view to blaming the Ukrainian government. The objective of this alleged “false flag” covert op was to create a justifiable and credible pretext for Vladimir Putin to declare war on Ukraine.

In an utterly twisted logic, according to Ukraine’s head of intelligence:

“the [Donesk] rebels were meant to down [the] Aeroflot plane... to justify the invasion [of Ukraine by Russia],”

Valentyn Nalyvaichenko (right), head of Ukraine intelligence (24 February 2014 – 18 June 2015) that the pro-Russian rebels were “aiming at a Russian passenger plane “so Putin had reason to invade”.

“the crime was planned as a ground for bringing of Russian troops into Ukraine, that is – CASUS BELLi for the Russian military invasion.” (Official statement of Ukraine Security Service, in annex below)

In a bitter irony, according to the report, the alleged “false flag” covert op got muddled. The Donesk rebels got it all wrong and hit the MH17 plane by mistake.

That’s the “official line” which was made public by the Kiev government on August 7, 2014, 3 weeks after the MH17 tragedy.

The former head of Ukraine’s secret service has claimed rebels intended to down a Russian airliner to give Vladimir Putin a pretext for invasion – but blasted Flight MH17 out of the sky by mistake.

Why on earth would pro-Russian rebels who are at war with the Kiev regime shoot down a Russian passenger plane AFL-2074 allegedly with a view to harnessing Russia’s support? It does not make sense.

What’s more, according to SBU Chief Valentyn Nalyvaichenko’s statement, Moscow was helping the pro-Russian rebels in their alleged false flag op to shoot down Russia’s Aeroflot plane by providing them with a Buk missile system, which allegedly had been discreetly smuggled across the border to the Donesk region of Eastern Ukraine. The Aeroflot plane was slated to be “shot down over territory controlled by Ukrainian government troops” with the support of Russia:

Valentyn Nalyvaichenko said that Russian-backed fighters were supposed to
take their BUK rocket launcher – which had been transported across the Russian border – to a village called Pervomaiskoe in Ukrainian-held territory west of Donetsk.

But they “screwed up”. The Buk rocket launcher was apparently positioned in the wrong rural location and because of that it targeted the MH17 by mistake:

Instead, they mistakenly positioned it in a rebel-controlled village of the same name to the east of the city.

Got it wrong? Valentyn Nalyvaichenko claims pro-Russian rebels targeted the wrong civilian airliner

If they had gone where they had been ordered, he said, they would have hit an Aeroflot flight carrying civilians travelling from Moscow to Larnaca in Cyprus.

Crucially, the crash site would have been in Ukrainian-held territory. (Mail on Sunday, August 9, 2014)

Scroll down for video

Got it wrong? Valentyn Nalyvaichenko claims pro-Russian rebels targeted the wrong civilian airliner

The August 2014 “intelligence” report released by SBU Chief Nalyvaichenko bordered on ridicule and incompetence to say the least.

(Since its release in August 2014, the link to the original SBU report is no longer available. The text of the SBU report (press release) is published in annex to this article.

Who is Valentyn Nalyvaichenko. His role in the MH17 investigation

Valentyn Nalyvaichenko commissioned the SBU report on behalf of the Kiev government in July 2014 in coordination with The National Security and National Defense Committee (RNBOU) of which the Secretary General was Andriy Parubiy (February 27, 2014 — August 7, 2014), followed by the appointment of Oleksandr Turchynov (December 16, 2014 — 19 May 2019)
The RNBOU oversees National Security and Intelligence (SBU), the Ministry of Defense, the Armed Forces, Law Enforcement.

Parubiy who became president (chair) of the Ukrainian Parliament is the co-founder of the Neo-Nazi Social-National Party of Ukraine (subsequently renamed Svoboda). He has been routinely received with red carpet treatment in Canada, the US and the European Union.

Both Nalyvaichenko and Parubiy are followers of Ukrainian Nazi leader Stepan Bandera, who collaborated in the mass murderer of Jews, Russians and Poles during World War II. (For more details on Parubiy click here)

Can we trust the SBU?

Following the MH17 tragedy, the head of Ukraine’s SBU was entrusted with the gathering and feeding of evidence to the Dutch inquiries. In fact most of the information and analysis (including recordings of telephone conversations, video, audio material) transmitted to the JIT emanated from the SBU.

Is the information and evidence transmitted by the SBU reliable?

An indepth forensic analysis conducted by OG IT Forensic Service led by Akash Rosen points to the manipulation of telephone conversations, video and audio material by the SBU. The OG IT report confirms unequivocally that the “evidence” submitted by Ukraine’s SBU to the JIT has been manipulated.

Akash Rosen was interviewed in the MH17 documentary entitled MH17 Call for Justice, directed by Yana Yerloshova, which sheds light on the deceptive role of Ukraine’s Secret Service.

Fraud and Corruption within the SBU. The Neo-Nazi connection

While the media has remained silent on the matter, the insidious and corrupt role of the SBU has nonetheless been acknowledged. A December 2015 report in the Irish Times suggests that:

The Dutch government has been warned that the criminal case against those who shot down Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17 could be undermined because the Ukrainian security service, the SBU, which has provided key evidence, is widely regarded as institutionally corrupt.

Both justice minister Ard van der Steur and the Dutch public prosecutor’s office are coming under increasing pressure to make statements about the integrity of the evidence gathered by the SBU following a string of scandals, including the sacking of its boss, Valentyn Nalyvaichenko.

The SBU has played a crucial role in two elements of the MH17 investigation. It has handed over phone conversations between pro-Russian rebels intercepted shortly before the jet, ... It was also responsible for securing the main elements of the Boeing 777’s shattered fuselage in the hours after it crashed in the Donetsk region of eastern Ukraine, spreading debris over 50 sq km.
“Institutionally corrupt” is an understatement. The former head of the SBU is an avowed Nazi. Ukraine’s intelligence service not to mention the National Guard and elements within the military in 2014-2015 were largely under the control of the two neo-Nazi parties: Svoboda and Right Sector.

The SBU was also in permanent liaison with Western intelligence including the CIA and MI6.

The head of Ukraine intelligence Valentyn Nalyvaichenko appointed by the Kiev regime worked in tandem with the Neo-Nazi Right Sector leader Dmitro Yarosh who in turn played a key role in setting up the Azov Battalion (see image right), a National Guard entity integrated by Neo-Nazis, operating in Eastern Ukraine in so-called “anti-terrorist” operations. Dmitro Yaroch, who became member of parliament was appointed advisor to the Chief of general staff of the Ukrainian army.

Eduard Dolinsky, director of the Ukrainian Jewish Committee, “made the accusation on Facebook against Valentyn Nalyvaichenko, head of the Security Service of Ukraine (see the news website evreiskiy.kiev.ua report) after Nalyvaichenko said his organization [the SBU] needed to base its work on the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, or UPA, which murdered thousands of Jews in the ‘40s. The UPA under the leadership of Stepan Bandera collaborated with the Third Reich during World War II” ( quoted in The Times of Israel 15 April 2015)

In an [April 2015] interview with the local media ... Nalyvaichenko said the Security Service “does not need to invent anything new, it is important to build on the traditions of the [Nazi] Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and UPA in the 1930-1950 years.”

The popularity of UPA, which for a time collaborated with the Nazi occupation to further UPA’s ambitions of sovereignty from Russia, has soared in Ukraine since a 2013 revolution that led to armed conflict with pro-Russian militias in Ukraine’s east.

Earlier this month [April 2015], the Ukrainian Parliament passed a bill that opened the door to state recognition of UPA, previously a taboo because of the widespread war crimes committed by its troops. The Times of Israel (15 April 2015)

Those war crimes have not ceased. The Atlantic Council, (June 18, 2015) a Washington Think Tank with close links to both the Pentagon and the US State Department acknowledged that the Right Sector had permeated Ukraine’s military intelligence apparatus:

Poroshenko Bloc MP Serhiy Leshchenko released a document confirming old rumors that Right Sector’s Dmitro Yarosh [Neo-Nazi leader] worked for Nalyvaichenko when he was a member of parliament from 2012 to 2014. While the connection between the two raises some questions about the events of Euromaidan and the origins of Right Sector, this attack alone wasn’t enough to
Yarosh is now a member of parliament and an advisor to the chief of general staff of the Ukrainian army. In other words, Yarosh has been legitimized by the political establishment.

**Details of the SBU Report**

While the SBU report focusing on an alleged false flag was casually acknowledged by the Western media, Washington remained silent on the matter. Nobody in the US intelligence community acknowledged or corroborated the statement of their Ukrainian counterparts.

Moreover, while the SBU was feeding “evidence” to the Dutch inquiries, the SBU report (August 7, 2014) was not acknowledged or mentioned in the reports of the Dutch Safety Board and the JIT.

As we recall, immediately after the MH17 plane crash on July 17 2014, Secretary of State John Kerry and US Ambassador to the UN Samantha Power pointed their finger at Moscow without a shred of evidence. In the wake of this official and “authoritative” SBU August 7 2014 announcement by the Kiev regime, Obama, Kerry, Samantha Power et al, chose to remain mum. The Ukraine Secret Service’s official statement concerning the crash of Malaysian Airlines MH17 was so outlandish. It simply did not fit the usual mold of media disinformation.

In a new and rather unusual twist, however, according to the Kiev regime, the Donetsk militia did not intend to shoot down Malaysian Airlines MH17.

What the “pro-Russian rebels” (according to the SBU report) were aiming at was a Russian Aeroflot passenger plane. The MH17 was shot down “by mistake” according to an official statement by the head of Ukraine’s Secret Service, Valentyn Nalyvaichenko (Ukraine News Service, August 7, 2014).

According to SBU Chief Nalyvaichenko:

> “Ukraine’s law enforcement and intelligence agencies have established during the investigation into a terrorist attack on the Boeing... that on that day, July 17, and at that time military mercenaries and terrorists from the Russian Federation planned to carry out a terrorist attack against a passenger aircraft of Aeroflot en route from Moscow to Larnaca... as a pretext for the further invasion by Russia,”

> “This cynical terrorist attack was planned for the day when the [Malaysia Airlines] plane happened to fly by, planned by war criminals as a pretext for the further military invasion by the Russian Federation, that is, there would be a casus belli,” he added.

Thus, according Nalyvaichenko, the terrorists downed the Malaysian airliner by mistake.” (Ukraine Interfax News, August 8, 2014)

According to the **Daily Mail** (August 9, 2014):

> The head of Ukraine’s secret service has claimed rebels intended to down a Russian airliner to give Vladimir Putin a pretext for invasion – but blasted Flight MH17 out of the sky by mistake.
Valentyn Nalyvaichenko said pro-Russian rebels hit wrong civilian plane
Claims they were aiming for Moscow airliner so Putin had reason to invade
Would have hit an Aeroflot flight from Moscow to Larnaca in Cyprus, he says

By WILL STEWART FOR MAILONLINE
PUBLISHED: 18:22 EDT, 9 August 2014 | UPDATED: 08:45 EDT, 10 August 2014

The head of Ukraine’s secret service has claimed rebels intended to down a Russian airliner to give Vladimir Putin a pretext for invasion – but blasted Flight MH17 out of the sky by mistake.

Valentyn Nalyvaichenko said that Russian-backed fighters were supposed to take their BUK rocket launcher – which had been transported across the Russian border – to a village called Pervomaiskoe in Ukrainian-held territory west of Donetsk.

Instead, they mistakenly positioned it in a rebel-controlled village of the same name to the east of the city.

Nalyvaichenko said that the Kiev government reached this conclusion “in the course of its own investigation into the downing of MH17”.
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Had the terrorists succeeded in downing the Aeroflot jet, not the MH17, to invade Ukraine.

“Ukraine has additional evidence of Russia’s implication in the shooting down of Malaysia Air 17 (MH-17). It is vital for us to begin a public trial and to bring this evidence to light. All of the evidence released to the public is at the disposal of the Joint International Group; but I can confirm that Ukraine has additional information that has not yet been released and that there are many excellent witnesses Ukraine could call in court.

It’s vital that it is Ukraine names both who ordered the crime, and who perpetrated it.

The Boeing of Malaysia Airlines was shot down by a missile fired from a BUK missile system located in the area of the village of Pervomayske. There is no doubt it was this specific Russian weapon. This weapon of mass destruction was brought into Ukraine and was the instrument used to shoot-down the Malaysia Airlines jetliner. All 298 people aboard died; among them were 80 children. Thereafter, the instrument of destruction was moved back to Russian territory.

Importantly, as I have said since 2014, as has been confirmed by international experts, Russia’s intention was to shoot down not the MH17, but rather a Russian Aeroflot jet to create the casus belli, or justification, for a full out invasion of Ukraine.

Both the MH17 and Aeroflot planes were painted in the same colors. There is more than one Pervomayske in Donetsk region. The BUK was moved to the east of Donetsk and the international commission confirmed our evidence. If the BUK had been moved to Pervomayske in the west, the missile would have targeted the Russian Aeroflot jet - a liner flying from Moscow to Cyprus at the same time and approximately at the same altitude with 157 passengers aboard, and again, with many children.

Had the terrorists succeeded in downing the Aeroflot jet, it would have created the needed casus belli for Russia to invade Ukraine from its East to its West. This would have been a response to our alleged military aggression against Russia”

While Nalyvaichenko was dismissed by Poroshenko from the SBU in June 2015, much of the “evidence” of MH17 had been gathered and processed during his mandate. There was no visible shift in direction of the SBU following his dismissal. Nalyvaichenko’s Deputy Vasyl Hrytsak was appointed head of SBU (July 2015- May 2019)

The so-called “pro-Russian rebels” had allegedly planned an Operation Northwoods type “false flag” with utmost proficiency. The covert op allegedly consisted in downing a Russian passenger plane with Moscow’s support. The alleged objective was for Moscow to place the
blame on the government of Ukraine for having ordered the downing of the Aeroflot plane (resulting in the deaths of Russian tourists), thereby creating a “useful wave of indignation” across the Russian Federation.

The alleged “false flag” slated to be implemented by the Donetsk “terrorists and mercenaries” would then, according to the scenario depicted by Ukraine’s Chief Spy, spearhead public support for a Russian invasion of Ukraine, with patriotic Russian troops coming to the rescue of the “pro-Russian separatists”:

The mass killing of Russian tourists could then have been blamed on the Ukrainian army, giving Moscow a justification for invasion, said Mr Nalyvaichenko, head of the Ukrainian intelligence service, the SBU. (Daily Mail, August 9, 2014)

The official SBU report states that the:

“The Russian side would need a compelling argument for such a step, for example accusation of the Ukrainian government in mass murder of the Russian citizens [on the plane]” (See complete SBU statement in Annex below).

According to the head of Ukraine’s Secret Service: “It is incredibly cynical that the act of terrorism was planned [by the rebels] against peaceful innocent Russian citizens who were on the way to their holidays with children”:

‘This cynical terrorist act was intended to justify an immediate military invasion by the Russian Federation,’ he said.

Aeroflot flight AFL2074 was close to Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 when it was blown out of the sky on July 17, killing all 298 on board, he said.

... He claimed this was a significant conclusion of Kiev’s probe into MH17’s downing. (Daily Mail, August 8, 2019)

A Russian invasion plan had allegedly been scheduled –according to the official SBU report– to commence on July 18, on the day following the planned downing of Aeroflot flight 2074. But when the MH17 flight was downed by mistake, the Russian invasion plan scheduled for July 18, according to the Kiev scenario, was cancelled.

This whole scenario was fabricated. There were no indications or evidence that Russia was preparing to invade Ukraine on July 18th, 2014.

Mainstream Media Response to Kiev Regime’s Accusations

Normally, the Western media would provide ample coverage and commentary to an official Kiev statement pertaining to MH17 accusing Russia. It’s part of the MSM routine of “Russia bashing” and demonizing president Vladimir Putin.

With the exception of Ukraine News Service and London’s Daily Mail, however, the official statement of the head of Ukraine’s Secret Service went largely unnoticed. Normally, a declaration of this nature would be picked up by the wire services with syndicated reports
flooding the front page of the Western news chain.

MH17 rebels meant to down Aeroflot plane... to justify invasion: Astonishing claim by respected head of Ukraine intelligence service

- Valentyn Nalyvaichenko said pro-Russian rebels hit wrong civilian plane
- Claims they were aiming for Moscow airliner so Putin had reason to invade
- Would have hit an Aeroflot flight from Moscow to Larnaca in Cyprus, he says

By WILL STEWART FOR MAILONLINE
PUBLISHED: 18:22 EDT, 9 August 2014 | UPDATED: 08:45 EDT, 10 August 2014

The head of Ukraine’s secret service has claimed rebels intended to down a Russian airliner to give Vladimir Putin a pretext for invasion – but blasted Flight MH17 out of the sky by mistake.

Valentyn Nalyvaichenko said that Russian-backed fighters were supposed to take their BUK rocket launcher – which had been transported across the Russian border – to a village called Pervomaiske in Ukrainian-held territory west of Donetsk.

Was the mainstream media instructed to temporarily “put a hold” on reporting the “revelations” of Ukraine’s Secret Service.

The Kiev regime’s allegations are far-fetched to say the least: the Donesk rebels -largely involved in combat operations- had neither the capabilities nor the desire to undertake a complex intelligence operation of this nature. What purpose would it serve? Cui Bono?

Does Russia require a fake humanitarian pretext to intervene when several thousand civilians in the Donbass region had been killed by the Azov Battalion (image right, flag with Nazi SS symbol) and Ukrainian Armed Forces, not to mention the Odessa massacre perpetrated by the Kiev regime’s Neo-Nazi national guard.

Ironically, barely four days after being accused by Kiev of planning to invade Ukraine, Russia’s President Putin agreed with European Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso that Moscow would not only collaborate with the Red Cross on channeling humanitarian aid
to Eastern Ukraine through Russian territory, but that the agreement reached with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), had the support of the Kiev government.

It is worth noting that neither the Russian government nor the Russian media have commented extensively on (or responded to) the accusations directed against Moscow contained in Ukraine’s dodgy Secret Service’s MH17 report.

Dodgy Ukraine MH17 Intelligence Report: Kiev’s Western “Allies”

Was Washington consulted before the release of the dodgy SBU False Flag report?

Did Washington give them the “Green Light” to release the SBU report as a means of “Framing Russia”? Or did the White House or the State Department decide that the SBU’s “fake intelligence” was visibly flawed and could not effectively be used for propaganda purposes against Russia?

Were the CIA and MI6 consulted? Britain’s Secret Service MI6 subsequently had access to the plane’s black box, which was handed over by a Malaysian official to the Dutch task force and which in turn was entrusted to an unnamed partner entity in the UK.

Concluding Remarks

The Day After

According to the SBU in its August 7, 2014 official report on behalf of the Ukraine government, the Kremlin’s planned “false flag” to bring down a commercial Aeroflot flight en route to Cyprus and blame the tragedy on the Kiev regime, was to be used to justify the launching of a major war against Ukraine.

the crime was planned as a ground for bringing of Russian troops into Ukraine, that is – CASUS BELLI for the Russian military invasion. ...

“the [Donesk] rebels were meant to down [the] Aeroflot plane... to justify the invasion [of Ukraine by Russia]” (see complete text in Annex)

These statements border on ridicule. They reveal the corrupt and criminal nature of the SBU.

If a Russian military invasion of Ukraine had been planned to commence on July 18th, 2014 there would have been ample evidence of deployment and movement of Russian forces in proximity of the border in the days prior to the July 17th tragedy. Sloppy intelligence? No such evidence was forthcoming indicating the movement of Russian forces.

It is worth noting that the only movement of military hardware documented by both Ukrainian and Russian sources was the deployment of a BUK missile system belonging to the Ukrainian armed forces, reported on July 15, 2014.
According to Ukrainian sources, the Prosecutor General of Ukraine Vitaliy Yarema confirmed that “the Donesk rebels did not have [Ukrainian] Buk or S 300 ground to air missiles which could have downed the plane”, which suggests that the missiles of the Ukraine armed forces had been deployed but they were not in the possession of the rebels, a premise which remains central to the US-Kiev official version that the rebels, supported by Moscow, were responsible for attacking Malaysian Airlines MH17.

A final note:

The alleged Russian Invasion Plan was slated to start on the 18th according to SBU Chief Nalyvaichenko.

Intelligence data proved that on July 18 the militants have already waited for the introduction of Russian Armed forces into the territory of Ukraine. (See official report of Ukraine Security Service (SBU, in annex below)

This account seems to be at odds with both the SBU and JIT statements that the alleged Russian BUK Missile had been brought in secretly on the 16th of July into Donesk, and was planned to be discreetly moved back across the border into Russia on the 17th or 18th.

If Russia had been planning an invasion to commence on July 18th, why on earth would they need to discreetly move their military hardware back across the border to Russia.

Annex

Official Statement of Ukraine’s Security Service (August 7, 2014)

sбу.gov.ua/.../article;jsessionid=73352780A12C97E27DD0BF852482D3C0.app1

Terrorists and Militants planned cynical terrorist attack at Aeroflot civil
During the investigation of Malaysia Airlines Boeing-777 downing the law enforcement and intelligence bodies established that terrorists and militants have cynically planned the terrorist attack at Aeroflot civil aircraft, AFL-2074 Moscow-Larnaca, which was flying over the territory of Ukraine at that moment. Hereof informed the Head of the Security Service of Ukraine Mr. Valentyn Nalyvaichenko during the briefing today.

He underlined – the crime was planned as a ground for bringing of Russian troops into Ukraine, that is – CASUS BELLI for the Russian military invasion.

According to the official Ukrainian data, June 17, 2014, at the mentioned time two regular international flights were operating over the territory of Ukraine following the filed requests for aircraft clearance – MAS17 plane of the Malaysia Airlines and AFL-2074 one of Aeroflot.

The routes of the mentioned international flights were approaching the sky over Donetsk. At 16:09 in the area of Novomykolaivka town the routes of the mentioned flights crossed. It is worth noting that the flight specifications of the aircrafts were almost identical – the Malaysian aircraft flew at a height of 10,100 m at a speed 909 km/h, while the Russian one – at a height of 10,600 m at a speed 768 km/h.

At 16:20 from the area of ‘Pervomaiske’ village, north-east from Donetsk, near the town of Torez, terrorists shot down the Malaysian jet, which then crashed near Grabove, Donetsk region.
According to the intercepted and published data about the ‘Buk’ missile system, the terrorists had received an order to place the system near ‘Pervomaiskoe’ village, V. Nalyvaichenko mentioned. The namesake village is located about 20 km to the north-east from Donetsk.

The terrorists (most of them are not locals, but the Russian mercenaries) misrecognized the namesake villages and moved the other way, the SSU Head said. The odd route of the ‘Buk’ missile system on the territory of Ukraine proves that fact. The system crossed the Russia-Ukraine border in Luhansk region, then was deployed westward to Donetsk and moved back to the border between Donetsk and Luhansk regions afterwards.

By setting up the ‘Buk’ missile system in ‘Pervomaiske’ village located to the west from Donetsk and taking into consideration the military specifications of the weapon, the terrorists could have shot down the Russian civilian jetliner with its further crashing on the Ukrainian territory controlled by the ATO [Ukraine] forces.

In that case Russia would receive an opportunity to accuse the Ukrainian authorities of downing the Russian plane, assaulting the Russian citizens and would use this irresistible proof for its invasion into Ukraine.

Russian side would need a compelling argument for such a step, for example accusation of the Ukrainian government in mass murder of the Russian citizens.

“A peculiar cynicism appears in the fact that the terrorist act was planned just against the peaceful, innocent Russian citizens, who were flying with their children on vacation”, – V. Nalyvaichenko, stressed.

Intelligence data proved that on July 18 the militants have already waited for the introduction of Russian Armed forces into the territory of Ukraine. The Russian side had been giving grounding for such developments for the several previous days. The Russian Mass Media had massively published information about the alleged shelling of the RF territory from the Ukrainian side.

For further details see [link no longer available]

http://www.sbu.gov.ua/sbu/control/en/publish/article;jsessionid=73352780A12C97E27DD0BF852482D3C0.app1?art_id=129860&cat_id=35317

can be retrieved at the WayBack archive
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