

Talk:Malaysia Airlines Flight 17/Archive 16

< Talk:Malaysia Airlines Flight 17



This is an **archive** of past discussions. **Do not edit the contents of this page.** If you wish to start a new discussion or revive an old one, please do so on the **current talk page**.

[Archive 10](#) ← [Archive 14](#) [Archive 15](#) **[Archive 16](#)** [Archive 17](#) [Archive 18](#) → [Archive 20](#)

Chernukhino as the second possible missile launch spot

Currently, Chernukhino's roadblock and Chernukhino is not mentioned as a possible launch spot, despite that it was mentioned three times in the recordings distributed by the Security Service of Ukraine / SBU. A reference to Chernukhino should be added, and Chernukhino should be marked at the map.

(<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/malaysia-airlines-crash-prorussian-separatists-discuss-downing-of-flight-mh17-in-leaked-audio-released-by-ukraine-security-service-9613893.html>

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/video/2014/jul/18/mh17-recording-russian-colonel-rebels-discuss-disaster-video> at 0:30

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/ukraine/10975218/Malaysia-Airlines-crash-Intercepted-call-suggests-rebels-to-blame.html> at 0:50) — Preceding unsigned comment added by [Usernick](#) (talk • contribs) 12:03, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

As the plane was hit from the left [1] (<http://theaviationist.com/2014/07/24/mh-17-puncture-marks/>), Snizhne can be ruled out, while the Chernukhino (which is 20 km to the north) would match the damage pattern on the left side. --[PM3](#) (talk) 16:39, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

Not sure whether Snizhne can be ruled out because this requires definite knowledge on location of the plane when it was hit and more knowledge on how the missile "works". Would such conclusion be OR?

In any case, the distance between Snizhne and Chernukhino is closer to 35 km on a direct line. The distance between Pervomais'ke and Chernukhino is closer to 40 km. The distance between Pervomais'kyi and Chernukhino is about 42 km.

Hence, I believe, Chernukhino should be mentioned, possibly with a note that this possible launch spot does not coincide with Snizhne, Pervomais'ke or Pervomais'kyi, and possibly with a mentioning of distances between them.

[Usernick](#) (talk) 18:03, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

That's original research. It's not our job. Find a [reliable source](#) that mentions it. [HiLo48](#) (talk) 18:28, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

The last known position of MH17 was 2 km west of Roszypne and 8.5 km to 260° of the crash site near Hrabove, according to [this reliable source](https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/uploads/phase-docs/701/b3923acad0ceprem-rapport-mh-17-en-interactief.pdf) (<https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/uploads/phase-docs/701/b3923acad0ceprem-rapport-mh-17-en-interactief.pdf>) on page 21. From there, Snizhne is ~20 km to the south east, and Chernukhino is ~20 km to the north. Going detours to hit the target from the opposite side would not make any sense for a SAM, because the annihilation probability decreases with distance. But ok, this conclusion is OR, too. --[PM3](#) (talk) 18:47, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

What specific statement is original research? Chernukhino is mentioned three times on the recording, and I have given three links to major British newspapers above. Hence, **Chernukhino should be mentioned as a launch spot per Ukrainian Security Service's second audio recording.**

Here is one more link: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-28362872> :

"[Male voice, captioned as "The Greek"] Yes, Major.

[Major] Well, the Chernukhino lads shot down the plane.

[Greek] Who shot it down?

[Major] From the Chernukhino roadblock. The Cossacks at Chernukhino.

[Greek] Yes, Major."

Did you mean that the distances are a result of the original research? I measured them with google map tool. I believe it is worth noting that **the launch spot per US intelligence sources, i.e. Snizhne area, is about 35 km away from the launch spot per Ukrainian Security Service's second audio recording, i.e. Chernukhino area.**

[Usernick](#) (talk) 18:55, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

What [original research](#) means is that you've analysed a primary source yourself (in this case, the recording transcripts) and come to a conclusion from them. It wouldn't be original research if the

BBC had a statement like *"From the recordings, it appears the missile was fired from Chernukhino"*, but they don't. They only have the transcript itself. [Stickee \(talk\) 22:41, 14 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Audio recordings presented by Ukrainian military have been shown to be fake, so they can not be used as a reliable source. See discussion above. [14.2.46.246 \(talk\) 22:59, 14 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

WP:FRINGE. Also, pure nonsense. [Volunteer Marek 03:02, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Stickee: Then, I suggest phrasing the information on the second possible launch spot like this:

According to the Economist, *it appears that the missile was launched from Chernukhino, near Snezhnoye, about 80km from Donetsk, in territory controlled by Russian separatists* (<http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2014/07/flight-mh17>). — Preceding unsigned comment added by [Usernick \(talk • contribs\) 23:49, 14 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Furthermore, according to the Independent, phone calls, distributed by the Ukrainian security service, *indicate that the plane was shot down by a Cossack detachment based at Chernukhino* (<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/malaysia-airlines-mh17-crash-collateral-damage-is-inevitable-in-the-chaos-of-proxy-war-9615823.html>) [Usernick \(talk\) 00:05, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Hence, **this can be summarized in the following way "In some sources it was suggested that the plane was shot from Chernukhino"**. Also, it would be convenient to show Chernukhino on the same map where the Snizhne's suspected launch spot is marked.

— Preceding unsigned comment added by [Usernick \(talk • contribs\) 00:17, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

OP proposal is [WP:OR](#). Need secondary sources which state this. [Volunteer Marek 03:02, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Let me quote the Economist: *it appears that the missile was launched from Chernukhino, near Snezhnoye, about 80km from Donetsk, in territory controlled by Russian separatists* (<http://www.economist.com/blogs/easternapproaches/2014/07/flight-mh17>).

Also, let me quote the Independent: "phone calls, distributed by the Ukrainian security service, indicate that the plane was shot down by a Cossack detachment based at Chernukhino" (<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/malaysia-airlines-mh17-crash-collateral-damage-is-inevitable-in-the-chaos-of-proxy-war-9615823.html>)

Hence, *in some sources it was suggested that the plane was shot from Chernukhino*. [Usernick \(talk\) 07:59, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Good find, those are certainly some secondary sources stating that now, rather than the [OR](#) you were presenting earlier. If it was to be included in the article, should it be attributed to anyone in particular, or just kept at "some sources"? [Stickee \(talk\) 10:04, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Stickee: I think, "in some sources" or "in some publications" is acceptable. Why would not it be? If you have experience and rights to amend the article, please do. [Usernick \(talk\) 11:17, 15 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Yeah I guess that would be okay. Which part of the section should it go in? I think at the end of the paragraph that begins with *"US officials said that satellite data from infrared..."* since that paragraph mainly discusses the launch spot. [Stickee \(talk\) 04:38, 16 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

I totally agree, but maybe not as the last sentence in that paragraph, but in a separate paragraph after that paragraph. [Usernick \(talk\) 10:00, 16 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

A separate paragraph for a single sentence isn't a good idea though (the reason being is that the media has given the idea of Chernukhino fairly low attention, so it should only get a very brief mention in the article, per [WP:BALASPS](#)). What about after the sentence ending in *"epicentre of the crash site"* (same paragraph, but not the very end)? [Stickee \(talk\) 23:48, 16 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

This would be fine. But the whole organization of the article is strange. It would be clearer if there was a paragraph reporting on versions "from where", then a paragraph reporting on versions "by whom", etc [Usernick \(talk\) 07:22, 17 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Okay, I've added a sentence there using similar wording to what the economist source used. [Stickee \(talk\) 12:27, 17 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Thank you! I have a further suggestion: after the sentence on Chernukhino, there should be some text based on this source

<http://www.themalaysianinsider.com/malaysia/article/dutch-say-need-to-know-mh17-missile-launch-site-to-prosecute> .

For example, **I would suggest**: *Prosecutors in the Netherlands said that they needed to know where a missile that may have shot down Malaysia Airlines flight MH17 was fired from in eastern Ukraine before criminal charges could be laid. Dutch chief investigator Fred Westerbeke said "When we know from where it was fired, then we can find out who controlled that area"*.

The last sentence in the same paragraph, i.e. the sentence "A number of other media outlets including The Guardian, The Washington Post and the Sydney Morning Herald have reported that the airplane is believed to have been downed by a rebel-fired missile.[143][144][145]" would then better fit elsewhere. For example, it can be moved one paragraph up or down.

The sentence "The British Foreign Office stated that it was "highly likely" that the missile was fired from area controlled by Russian-backed separatists.[146]", from the next paragraph, can be moved to a position before the sentence on Chernukhino. [Usernick \(talk\)](#) 23:35, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

Possibly some good ideas there. I'll take a look soon at let you know my thoughts. [Stickee \(talk\)](#) 13:22, 18 September 2014 (UTC)

Actually, Chernukhino is not the second possible missile launch spot but the third. US satellite intel puts it between Torez and Snizhne, whereas the SBU launch photo puts it south of Snizhne, near Saur Mogila.[2] (<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/ukraine/10984530/MH17-the-clues-which-may-lead-to-missile-launch-site.html>)[3] (http://www.sbu.gov.ua/sbu/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=129099&cat_id=39574) - [-82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 19:16, 18 September 2014 (UTC)

with so many RSs saying that it was launched from the Snizhne area, based on US Intel/satellite imagery and SBU-supplied evidence etc, Chernukhino can't be a serious possibility. Probably just a glitch in thr SBU wire-taps. --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 17:59, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Or perhaps the militant that was taped had the wrong information when he attributed it to "Cossacks from Cherukhino". Or maybe if it was downed by "Cossacks from Cherukhino", the actual launch site was somewhere else? This is OR from misinterpreting a primary source. [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 18:37, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Fair point, best to stick with what the RSs say: that it was shot down from at least two locations. --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 19:03, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

What Malaysia said

There is a sentence in the head section, which seems to be **wrong**: "Malaysia said intelligence reports on the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 were "pretty conclusive" and investigators believed the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists.[12]".

The source [12] (<http://m.europe.wsj.com/articles/malaysia-says-intelligence-reports-on-flight-17-crash-pretty-conclusive-1409983490?mobile=y>) includes the phrase "Investigators have said they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists.", but it does not include a statement that *Malaysia said that investigators believed the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists*.

Hence, the wikipedia page should be corrected, probably by shortening, for example, in this way: "*Malaysia said intelligence reports on the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 were "pretty conclusive" "*". [Usernick \(talk\)](#) 00:52, 15 September 2014 (UTC)

It says: *Investigators have said they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists.. Then it has response from Malaysia*. Obviously the "pretty conclusive" is referring to this statement by the investigators. [Volunteer Marek](#) 02:55, 15 September 2014 (UTC)

This is not obvious, this is your OR, and **this sentence leads to the drastic loss of neutrality** which can not be justified by guesses and appeals to the obviousness of these guesses. In the source [12] there is no statement that investigators have said **in the reports** that they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists. [Usernick \(talk\)](#) 07:50, 15 September 2014 (UTC)

Looks like a good pick-up by Usernick. Mr Najib appears to have carefully chosen his words and is only quoted here and elsewhere as saying that "the plane had been shot down by [heavy] missile". The intelligence report Najib refers to are Malaysia's, to which (obviously) the reporter Jason Ng has no direct knowledge. Ng has not made it clear in his article which "investigators" he is referring to in "investigators have said", and obviously it's a stretch to infer much from the ordering of paragraphs in a journalist's article. See other articles, for example (<http://m.themalaymailonline.com/malaysia/article/mh17-investigation-teams-pushing-to-assemble-physical-evidence>). So for the benefit of accuracy may I suggest "Malaysia said intelligence reports on the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 were "pretty conclusive" and that it believes tha the plane has been shot down by a missile". — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [Jen galbraith \(talk • contribs\)](#) 04:53, 15 September 2014 (UTC)

"The intelligence report Najib refers to are Malaysia's"? Is that so? Based on what? Look at the context here and the source is not being misrepresented, that context including "...at a joint news conference with Australia Prime Minister Tony Abbott on his first official visit to Malaysia. Both prime ministers reiterated their call for justice..." If Najib meant to "carefully chose his words" in the way you contend why didn't he distinguish his view from Abbot's view? The bottom line is that you're speculating that there's more going on here than meets the eye. In the mean time, a plain reading of the source that does not engage in original research about what "reporter Jason Ng" has "direct knowledge" of supports having the text read as given. It looks to me like your main grievance is with the fact "Investigators have said they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists" appears in a reliable source and you want that phrase excluded from the article. If that's not your problem, I think you could come up with a suggestion that retains the phrase.--[Brian Dell \(talk\)](#) 06:32, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

While the source states "Investigators have said they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists", it does not state that **Malaysia said** that investigators have said they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists. Furthermore, in the source [12] there is no statement that investigators have said **in the reports** that they believe the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists.

Hence, in the sentence "Malaysia said intelligence reports on the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 were "pretty conclusive" and investigators believed the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists.[12]" *both parts may be reliably sourced*, but their synthesis is not based on any source (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:No_original_research#Synthesis_of_published_material). Usernick (talk) 07:41, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

The only potential "synthesis" going on there is juxtaposition (Wikipedia is not adding additional language that draws inferences not found in the source), and since the two phrases are juxtaposed in the source, it's simply not true that there is synthesis going on that is not based on any source. In any case, like I suggested before, if you don't like the juxtaposition then separate the two instead of calling for the elimination of the one solidly sourced phrase.--Brian Dell (talk) 08:25, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

In the source, the statements regarding *what Malaysia said* and the statement "*investigators believed ...*" are not juxtaposed: they are not only in separate sentences, but **they are even in separate paragraphs**. Hence, they at least should be separated, preferably put into separate paragraphs, in the Wikipedia article on MH17. Bringing them closer than they are in the source is not only OR, but it is OR which leads to the drastic loss of neutrality, and therefore is completely against the rules. If you want the statement "investigators believed ..." to remain in this article, it is up to you to suggest where it should go. This statement does not belong to the head section, however, since there is no any source connecting it with the official position of Malaysia. **With regard to what Malaysia said**, only the part *intelligence reports on the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 were "pretty conclusive"* may properly remain. 62.8.231.162 (talk) 08:48, 17 September 2014 (UTC) — Preceding unsigned comment added by Usernick (talk • contribs)

re "Bringing them closer than they are in the source is not only OR..." it's time to start quoting OR policy here, something I don't believe you'll do because you are misrepresenting OR policy. At issue is whether the source thematically links the two. In my opinion the source presents the two as at least somewhat related, however reasonable people can disagree about how closely. If you believe there is no connection, then go ahead and replace "and" with a period. If you want "the statement" excluded from the article, it is in fact up to YOU to come up with a reason for exclusion when it is not disputed that it is a notable statement coming from a reliable source. "[C]onnecting it with the official position of Malaysia" is your own idiosyncratic interpretation, since the ordinary reasonable reader does not connect the two phrases as strongly and inextricably as you contend.--Brian Dell (talk) 09:16, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

With regard to the rules, please note: "Neutral point of view" is one of Wikipedia's three core content policies. The other two are "Verifiability" and "No original research". These three core policies **jointly determine** the type and quality of material that is acceptable in Wikipedia articles. Because these policies work in harmony, **they should not be interpreted in isolation** from one another ..." (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Neutral_point_of_view).

Hence, a drastic loss of neutrality, occurring when the material is interpretable as meaning that Malaysia said that investigators believed the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists, despite that the source does not state this, should be eliminated.

Possibly, we would reach a compromise with the following: "Malaysia said intelligence reports on the downing of Malaysia Airlines Flight 17 were "pretty conclusive" and investigators were working on assembling physical evidence that could be presented to court, so that it could be proven beyond any doubt that the plane was shot down by a missile. Investigators have said they believed the plane was brought down by a surface-to-air missile from an area controlled by pro-Russian separatists. The comments came ahead of the release of a preliminary report by the Dutch Safety Board on Flight 17's crash." — Preceding unsigned comment added by Usernick (talk • contribs) 11:19, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

Going back a step, I'm not sure the statements are separate. Other sources appear to be making the link: "*Mr Najib said the evidence, which points to Russian-backed rebels shooting the passenger plane down, was "pretty conclusive" but that they needed to gather proof to use in a court of law.*" (Link (<http://www.news.com.au/travel/travel-update/s/australia-malaysia-pms-new-bid-to-find-mh17-victims-remnants/story-fnizu68q-1227050060060>)). So other source are saying that's what the Malaysian PM was referring to. Stickee (talk) 12:29, 17 September 2014 (UTC)

Indeed, this sentence is closer to making this link, but it is the only source which comes that close. However, even this sentence is ambiguous, since only words "evidence" and whatever follows after "pretty conclusive" are directly attributed to Mr Najib, while the part "which points ..." is to some extent attributable to Mr. Najib, but may be an addition made by a journalist.

We can compare the above with other reports.

For example, from <http://tvnz.co.nz/world-news/malaysia-aiming-prove-mh17-shot-down-6074396> :

"Najib said the government has "pretty conclusive" intelligence reports about what happened to the jet carrying 298 people but evidence must be collected so that its downing can be proved beyond a doubt if the case goes to court.

"That's why we are very, very keen to re-enter the crash site before winter sets in. We need at least a few weeks not only to search for the body parts of victims but to assemble physical evidence," Najib said at a joint press conference with visiting Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott.

"Once that process is completed, we will look at the criminal side, who is responsible for this atrocious crime," Najib said."(<http://tvnz.co.nz/world-news/malaysia-aiming-prove-mh17-shot-down-6074396>)

For another example, from <http://www.dw.de/malaysia-wants-further-search-at-mh17-eastern-ukraine-crash-site/a-17905527>:

"Speaking at a joint press conference with visiting Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott (pictured left) near Kuala Lumpur on Saturday, Malaysian Prime Minister Najib Razak (pictured right) said his country wants to send investigators back to the crash site in eastern Ukraine to gather further evidence.

Najib said the Malaysian government had "pretty conclusive" intelligence reports about what happened to the passenger jet, which crashed in conflict-ridden eastern Ukraine on July 17, killing all 298 people on board. However he said further physical evidence must be collected so it could be proven in court that the plane was shot down.

"That's why we are very, very keen to re-enter the crash site before winter sets in. We need at least a few weeks not only to search for the body parts of victims but to assemble physical evidence," Najib said.

In yet another example, from <http://www.bangkokpost.com/most-recent/430820/najib-mh17-evidence-pretty-conclusive>:

"Malaysia aims to send a search team to the crash site in Ukraine of Malaysia Airlines Flight MH17 before winter sets in to gather physical evidence to prove that it was shot down, Prime Minister Najib Razak said on Saturday.

Najib said the government had "pretty conclusive" intelligence reports about what happened to the jet carrying 298 people but evidence must be collected so that its downing can be proved beyond a doubt if the case goes to court.

"That's why we are very, very keen to re-enter the crash site before winter sets in. We need at least a few weeks not only to search for the body parts of victims but to assemble physical evidence," Najib said at a joint press conference with visiting Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott.

"Once that process is completed, we will look at the criminal side, who is responsible for this atrocious crime."

"The intelligence reports are pretty conclusive. But what we need to do next is to assemble physical evidence that can be brought to court when time comes so that will be proven beyond any doubt that the plane was shot down," Najib said.

See also <http://www.thestar.com.my/News/Nation/2014/09/07/PM-Vital-to-get-physical-proof-Evidence-necessary-to-confirm-that-plane-was-shot-down-by-missile/> , <http://www.asianewsnet.net/KL-to-see-access-for-MH17-probe-team-64226.html> , http://www.shanghaidaily.com/article/article_xinhua.aspx?id=239704 .

Hence, it is doubtful that the link, which I criticized above, really exists, due to ambiguities. How many sources do show this link even in the ambiguous form? If the article is to refer to them, then it probably should be not "Malaysia said ...", but "Some sources reported that Malaysia said ...".

In any case, much more can be said about Malaysia position. In particular, at the very least it should be added that **Malaysia said that evidence must be collected so that downing of the plane can be proved beyond a doubt if the case goes to court and "Once that process is completed, we will look at the criminal side, who is responsible for this atrocious crime"**. The comments came ahead of the release of a preliminary report by the Dutch Safety Board on Flight 17's crash. [Usernick \(talk\) 00:24, 18 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

The point from all of these sources is that whatever classified intelligence reports Malaysia has are not significantly different from what is being published in the mainstream press. That's because the only qualification the PM gave was that he wants more physical evidence so something can stick in court. If the meaning of this is understood, then there is no need to parse journalists' paraphrasing like it's somebody's holy writ. Usually this leads to private interpretations. [Geogene \(talk\) 15:28, 18 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

The PM has not referred to the "mainstream press" as a point of reference, and even at all, and therefore your idea on what the **classified** intelligence reports include is just a wild guess. Also, the mainstream press has conflicting statements, for example, on the missile launch spot. In any case, I have shown that there are many reports quoting, rather than paraphrasing, Mr. Najib. Of course, such sources should be given preference. In any case, the following has been reported in many sources: **Malaysia said that evidence must be collected so that downing of the plane can be proved beyond a doubt if the case goes to court and Mr. Najib said: "Once that process is completed, we will look at the criminal side, who is responsible for this atrocious crime"**. Thus, this information should be added to the article where it reports on what Malaysia said. [Usernick \(talk\) 16:22, 18 September 2014 \(UTC\)](#)

Please present a rationale for including that. And no, I don't agree that sources that quote Najib should be given precedence. That we are having this discussion proves that we shouldn't interpret those particular remarks ourselves. Geogene (talk) 16:42, 18 September 2014 (UTC)

I suspect that you are playing stupid... I cited three sources and provided three more, from Germany, China, New Zealand, Malaysia, Thailand. This of course shows that the statements of Mr. Najib are **notable**. Also, Deutsche Welle is definitely a major source.

With regard to the precedence of the sources, we seem to agree that we should not interpret Mr. Najib remarks. Hence, your suggestion that Mr. Najib referred to "mainstream press" was out of place. Please note that I interpreted not Mr. Najib comments, but the journalist's paraphrasing of them. Clearly, it would be better to use direct and notable quotes of Mr. Najib in the Wikipedia article, so as to avoid the discussion on the accuracy of the paraphrases.

Additionally, those quotes of Mr. Najib appear in the US and UK sources: see <http://www.fox23.com/ap/ap/international/malaysia-to-send-team-to-jet-crash-site-in-ukraine/nhG9D/> , http://www.heraldstandard.com/headlines_ap/malaysia-to-send-team-to-jet-crash-site-in-ukraine/article_5664e668-e4c4-59a5-95a0-27c3b1508c2c.html , <http://www.dnaindia.com/world/report-malaysia-will-send-search-team-to-crash-site-of-mh17-in-ukraine-2016600> , <http://www.sfgate.com/news/world/article/Malaysia-to-send-team-to-jet-crash-site-in-Ukraine-5737922.php> , <http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/malaysia-send-team-jet-crash-site-ukraine-25309094> , <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/mh17-malaysia-sending-search-team-to-crash-site-before-winter-to-gather-evidence-9716103.html> Usernick (talk) 01:56, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

Sensors, missile, shrapnel - or aircraft autocannon / machine gun?

What kind of sensor can differentiate between a surface-to-air and an air-to-air missile? How do you differentiate holes made by shrapnel and 30mm aircraft autocannon? — Preceding unsigned comment added by Rob.HUN (talk • contribs) 08:06, 13 September 2014 (UTC)

As this is not a discussion forum you will have to use your favourite search engine to find if it is being discussed elsewhere. MilborneOne (talk) 10:30, 13 September 2014 (UTC)

Yeah not a forum, but I think Rob's comments were in relation to these (<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=&diff=prev&oldid=625342078>) taggings (<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=&diff=prev&oldid=625341603>). The tags don't really belong since as you say, this isn't a forum, and it's exactly what the source given says. Stickee (talk) 14:36, 13 September 2014 (UTC)

So in an age a falsifiable digital material you treat claims of one side as facts and claims of the other merely as blaming. That's the true Wikipedia spirit. Rob.HUN — Preceding undated comment added 09:26, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

The Russian Federation pressconference on the 21 July made no straight claims on who did what. They told the world that there were ukrainian Su-25 aircraft in the area and that was it. Then private weblogs and forums jumped in and began to interpret visual damage on the wreck to be a result of cannonfire. Since inapplicable facts to that theory are simply ignored by those sources, its hard to see why they should be used for this article. Alexpl (talk) 09:58, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

Rob.HUN, please get consensus before re-ordering the section again. It's been reverted by both myself and Volunteer Marek, so please discuss it first. Thanks, Stickee (talk) 22:43, 14 September 2014 (UTC)

I opened this section NOT for the "Cause" section of the article. Please discuss the "Cause" section in a separate Talk section!--Rob.HUN (talk) 01:36, 15 September 2014 (UTC)

This is what the DSB preliminary report says:

Damage observed on the forward fuselage and cockpit section of the aircraft appears to indicate that there were impacts from a large number of high-energy objects from outside the aircraft.

There is nothing there about "the direction of the blast from above with shrapnel entering through the roof and leaving through the floor of the cockpit". That is original research. If the DSB wanted to rule out bullets as opposed to shrapnel producing the holes in the fuselage, it would have written "shrapnel" instead of the strangely ambiguous phrase "a large number of **high-energy objects**". On a side note, as I noted in [this edit \(https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&curid=43326718&diff=626512066&oldid=626454920\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&curid=43326718&diff=626512066&oldid=626454920) which I just made, if a Buk had been fired, it would have left a prominent contrail which witnesses would have seen. There's a Russian language BBC report in which several witnesses say that they saw MH17, and also a military jet or jets flying near it; they also saw and heard the explosion. They did not, however, say anything about a contrail. Finally, as I noted in [this edit \(https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&diff=626406999&oldid=626401466\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&diff=626406999&oldid=626401466), NATO apparently has no evidence from military radar that a missile was fired, although it did detect radar from a missile system being activated. All this taken together makes it highly unlikely that a Buk downed MH17. And that was reflected in the Western media's virtually ignoring the DSB preliminary report when it came out. And the only member of the [UNSC](#) who shows any interest in a thorough investigation being carried out is Russia. – [Herzen \(talk\)](#) 19:45, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

\$30 million dollar reward

Let's see it in there; might help put to end the theorizing. [The Independent \(http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/30m-reward-offered-to-catch-the-killers-of-298-people-on-flight-mh17-9739627.html?printService=print\)](http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/30m-reward-offered-to-catch-the-killers-of-298-people-on-flight-mh17-9739627.html?printService=print), [USA Today \(http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/09/17/malaysia-airlines-mh17-ukraine-reward-30m/15778011/\)](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/09/17/malaysia-airlines-mh17-ukraine-reward-30m/15778011/), and lots of other smaller RS sources in a search. [Carolmooredc \(Talkie-Talkie\)](#) 04:23, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

The info was removed by user:Volunteer Marek [4] (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&diff=625994800&oldid=625990088) pointing to [WP:undue](#). Which is a bid weird. [Alexpl \(talk\)](#) 11:57, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Oppose, seems more like a news item than an encyclopedic entry, unless/until something tangible comes of it. [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 15:16, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Osama bin Laden reward mentioned a few times and no one got it. Well, it will be interesting to see, anyway. [Carolmooredc \(Talkie-Talkie\)](#) 15:33, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Ok, I agree. Whoever was involved on the ground is likely to be dead by now anyway. If something new comes up we can discuss this again. [Alexpl \(talk\)](#) 20:19, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Basically what [Geogene](#) said. If something comes of it, we can put it in. As it is right it's just the equivalent of "trivia". [Volunteer Marek](#) 20:00, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Some Cause content in the Reactions section

The Reactions section contains comments from Vladimir Putin and from Tony Abbott which are clearly making statements about the cause of the crash. That content should be moved to the Cause section. [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 00:47, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

I think the cause section should help readers to find out what might be the cause of the accident and therefore rely on experts and other people who are *competent* in the field of aviation safety, SAMs etc. Politicians are regularly not, and they usually say what fits their political goals best. No good advisors on the cause of an aircraft accident. --[PM3 \(talk\)](#) 02:02, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

I agree. But to nitpick, I think everyone agrees that the crash of MH17 was not an accident, but was caused by some kind fire being directed at the aircraft. The DSB preliminary report was clear about that. What remains to be determined is whether MH17 was deliberately downed or whether it was downed unintentionally – either because the intention was to down another plane or because a missile was fired inadvertently – and which side did it. The current Ukrainian position is that the rebels downed MH17 inadvertently – their intention was to down a Russian airliner in order to blame this on the Ukrainians and hence give Russia a pretext for invading Ukraine. The prevailing Russian position is that the Ukrainians downed MH17 deliberately, because they began being defeated by the Novorossian army, and to give the US a pretext for applying further economic sanctions against Russia. And indeed, the EU initially did not join the US in imposing a new round of sanctions; in response downing of MH17, the EU changed its position and joined the US in imposing new sanctions. Thus, Ukrainians downing MH17 in a false flag is completely understandable. What motive the rebels could have had to down it, in contrast, is perplexing. Certainly the rebels would have known that they would instantly be blamed for this tragedy. As I explained with [this edit \(https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&diff=626384734&oldid=626370943\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&diff=626384734&oldid=626370943), Kiev's current story is that the rebel's downed MH17 by mistake; their intended target was a Russian airliner, as a false flag to provide Russia with a pretext to invade Ukraine. But that story doesn't make any sense, since, by bombing its own people, Kiev had already provided Russia with all the justification it could possibly need to intervene militarily in Ukraine on humanitarian grounds. Note also that Kiev's current story contradicts Kiev's original story, which was that the rebels thought they were shooting down a Ukrainian military plane. – [Herzen \(talk\)](#) 02:48, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

That's not nitpicking. It's simply way off-topic. [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 02:53, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

The cause of an airplane crash is a scientific fact that does not allow for "mights" and "mays". That cause is not determined yet. What might is speculation. Either we keep the cause section extremely short (like my edit yesterday) or we go back to the mess of theories (from all sides) in which case the whole section is about speculations about the cause, and any further subdivision is useless; and even worse likely to have a bias to some point of views. [Amouff \(talk\)](#) 08:23, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Thanks for the removal of the subdivision; the "pro & con"-like section splitting and titles should be avoided, as discussed in [this archived discussion](#). The information inside it has been covered significantly in the sources as being information pertaining to the cause of the crash. [Stickee \(talk\)](#) 08:47, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

I have restored the subdivision, adding Russia as a possible suspect along with the rebels, in response to an edit summary. I really don't see how the article can provide clarity for readers without these subheadings. German Wikipedia has subheadings for the various scenarios of who shot the plane down and how; it has three subheadings, distinguishing between the theory that the Ukrainians shot down MH17 with a Buk and the theory that they did it with a fighter jet. Immediately after MH17 crashed, both Kiev and Washington accused the rebels and Russia of being responsible for the downing, without providing the least bit of credible evidence. Thus, Kiev and Washington put the issue of who was responsible out there. That the DSB preliminary report was completely neutral on who was responsible for the downing does not change that in the least. Thus, the only way Wikipedia can responsibly inform its readers about how what is known about the downing of MH17 currently stands is to make clear that there are rival theories of who the guilty party was. Having section headings for the two possible guilty parties is how one makes that clear.

Please, do not remove the subsection headings without first making an argument for why that is called for in this Talk section. I really think that not having these subsection headings just leads to obfuscation of where public knowledge about the downing of MH17 currently stands. – [Herzen \(talk\)](#) 09:39, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

The article cannot show clarity at all, because who did it is unknown. Anything we include, apart from the official report, is POV. Your little game with headings is pointless. [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 09:56, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Are you suggesting that all social media narratives, and purported witness statements to the effect that the rebels had a Buk launcher on the day that MH17 was shot down, should be deleted from the article? As the article stands, it contains mostly unsubstantiated allegations against the rebels. If you think the article should mention nothing but the official report, I would be fine with that. – [Herzen \(talk\)](#) 10:18, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Yes, that's precisely what Wikipedia should be doing. [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 11:13, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

They've all received significant coverage in the media sources. The article is to reflect what they're saying on the matter. For more info, see a discussion at [archive 15](#). [Stickee \(talk\)](#) 10:26, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Coverage by the media, all of which has its own biases, is necessary, but never sufficient to require us to include it. And as you can probably guess, I don't care what you think past discussions have agreed on, because I have never agreed to including all the propaganda driven bullshit. [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 11:13, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Coverage in the media is exactly what makes something notable. I can see you don't like what's being said, but the article is to reflect what they're saying. [Stickee \(talk\)](#) 13:46, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Yes, I said that, but I said more than that. Why did you ignore the rest of my post? [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 21:19, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

trophy cup

is this worth a mention. a Russian boasts of his 'trophy' cup malaysia Airlines cup- if you boast of a trophy that's for something your side did isn't it? if nothing else it reveals the mentality. - "This is my trophy from Malaysia" - #Russ terr Sergei Danilov posts photo of #MH17 cup [Russia trophy Malaysia airlines cup \(https://twitter.com/ukr_shuster/status/514063459013918720/photo/1\)](#)[Sayerslle \(talk\)](#) 17:01, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

No. But if there were desire to, an article could be written: "looted items from MH17 documented on social media". [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 17:12, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Not unless reliable sources cover it, which they probably won't. [Volunteer Marek](#) 17:13, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

o.k. [Sayerslle \(talk\)](#) 17:19, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Unlikely indeed reliable media will cover it; and without it neither notable nor reliable (although it is an international crime to loot such items of course; so if the police in the region does its job we might learn more of this). [Arnouff \(talk\)](#) 18:05, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Report by Russian Engineers Union, full version. Technical point of view.

Here is the report prepared by Russian Engineers Union. They are re-constructing the attack on Boeing, compare possibilities, analyze the facts and photos. The report presents technical point of view on what happened.

Google translation: https://translate.google.com/translate?sl=ru&tl=en&js=y&prev=_t&hl=ru&ie=UTF-8&u=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.odnako.org%2Fblogs%2Frossiyskiy-soyuz-inzhenerov-rekonstrukciya-ataki-na-boing%2F&edit-text=&act=url

Original text in Russian: <http://www.odnako.org/blogs/rossiyskiy-soyuz-inzhenerov-rekonstrukciya-ataki-na-boing/> — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [46.39.247.53 \(talk\)](#) 18:10, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

I am not at all convinced this is sufficiently relevant / reliable and would rather wait for the official investigation. As far as I understand this (through the large untranslated sections) this report suggests that the plane was shot down by cannonfire from a fighter plane; as they more or less conclusively rule out the air to air missiles (too weak) and doubt the BUK scenario. The plane would have been a Mig29 (as the Su25 cannot maintain the cruising altitude of MH17 long enough to effectively use the gun). Apparently the Mig29 has a similar radar profile as Su25. Wow and all that without access to anything but freely available internet information (their claim). Arnouf (talk) 18:45, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

Obviously you were too busy to actually read the report because you are misinterpreting it. I have just checked: the report is fully translated in English by Google translate, and authors did not rule out Su25 plane as you mention, neither they insisted on using gun only. The report is written in a neutral manner and logically explains probability of different options, whether BUK or plane. Until the official results published, which may be not soon, this report is a good review of the facts community already have. Apparently the report has more information and is better structured than many of the source links at the bottom of the page. Saying that the report is not quite relevant is ridiculous - I believe the only explanation is biased opinion based on sticking to official US government version, while the report considers several options. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 46.39.247.53 (talk) 19:31, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

UPD Unfortunately, not all text was translated by google. My bad. Sorry for misunderstanding. — Preceding unsigned comment added by 46.39.247.53 (talk) 19:35, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

I think this is what we call original research so is not really relevant to this article. MilborneOne (talk) 19:54, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

Totally agree. Quite fascinating. But classic OR. Martinevans123 (talk) 20:03, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

I'm not sure I agree. For the opinion of the Russian Union of Engineers it isn't OR. I would prefer to find the document at the REU page, but their page does mention their taking part in this conference. Geogene (talk) 15:46, 28 August 2014 (UTC)

Even if it isn't OR, it's WP:PRIMARY. If there are reliable secondary sources which discuss the report then maybe we can say something about it. Volunteer Marek (talk) 15:53, 28 August 2014 (UTC)

There are the following sources: <http://news.rambler.ru/26622925/> , <http://www.bfm.ru/news/270419> Saharaza (talk) 21:18, 3 September 2014 (UTC)

But are these reliable. Rambler.ru appears to be a portal and as such probably not more reliable than e.g. Yahoo in this context. I could not even find any description of BFM quickly. Arnouf (talk) 18:41, 4 September 2014 (UTC)

There are many others, e.g. <http://expert.ru/2014/08/23/ekspertyi-soyuza-inzhenerov-malazijskij-boing-skorej-vsego-sbit-s-samoleta/?n=171> Saharaza (talk) 21:42, 4 September 2014 (UTC)

This report is not OR and should be included. It is a very thorough and neutral investigation. It presents all its evidence in a nice concise manner. 121.45.26.144 (talk) 11:59, 12 September 2014 (UTC)

Here is another secondary source, the International Business Times: <http://au.ibtimes.com/articles/566834/20140919/russian-union-engineers-point-ukraine-airforce-responsible.htm#.VByfTKLUc4z> --PM3 (talk) 21:30, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

I think that's probably the only secondary source for this out there (at least when I put "Russian Engineers Union" into Google News). IBT Australia's coverage is odd, they've also used Global Research as a source in their previous coverage of MH17. I'd say that makes them non-RS. Geogene (talk) 22:13, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

So it's published (written?) by these guys: Russian Union of Engineers? Martinevans123 (talk) 22:17, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Yes, and now available in English: [5] (<http://российский-союз-инженеров.pdf/en.pdf>). Geogene (talk) 22:28, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Interesting that "The situation was also analyzed with the help of the Su-25 aircraft flight simulator." Martinevans123 (talk) 22:43, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

There are several other secondary sources in Russia: [6] (https://www.google.de/?gws_rd=ssl#q=%22%D0%A0%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%81%D0%B8%D0%B9%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9+%D1%81%D0%BE%D1%8E%D0%B7+%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B5%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B2%22+malaysia) Of course, this paper is - among other - based on some obviously forged material published by the Russian military, so I don't trust it. It is just useful to prove that air-to-air-strike theories are circulating, especially - but not only - in Russia (I mentioned another one above). --PM3 (talk) 23:07, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

I think that'd be okay, as long as there are some good Russian sources. I have no idea whether this particular organization is very notable over there. Usually the test for notability is their having a Wikipedia page, which they do, on both EN and RU. But the page history of both the EN and RU articles show a lot of weirdness in this case. Seems to have been unnoticed at EN but associated with blocks at RU. Geogene (talk) 23:24, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

PM3: if it's covered in Russian media, there's already a mention of air-to-air in the "Russian media coverage" section. Stickee (talk) 23:32, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

In "Russian media coverage" no air-to-air shootdown theory is mentioned. In "Cause" one is mentioned - that's the basic theory published on 21 July by the Russian military. There are other theories which have other arguments and are partially based on other sources, one of which is the Russian Engineers Union theory.

@Geogene: This source (http://tvzvezda.ru/news/vstrane_i_mire/content/201408251120-25nx.htm) also has RU and EN wp articles *Zvezda* (TV channel) and *ru:Звезда (телеканал)*. A state-controlled nationwide Russian TV network. --PM3 (talk) 23:52, 19 September 2014 (UTC)

Okay, that satisfies my notability concern as an example of the media coverage in Russia.
Geogene (talk) 00:04, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

Do you have any evidence that the material published by the Russian military is forged? I am unaware of Western governments commenting on that material, much less claiming that it was forged. And why do you say it is *obviously* forged? That is not obvious to me at all. – Herzen (talk) 00:24, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

@Herzen: For example this graphics (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BrhEzecCdTI&feature=youtu.be&t=230s>) is obviously forged: It claims that MH17 flew in northeastern direction along Donezk, before making a sharp turn to the southeast. This contradicts both, the radar images shown later in the same source, and the flight route as recorded by Flightradar24 (compare it to the map!)

The same video also claims that the radar echo appearing near MH17 at 21:00 is a fighter jet. This has been questioned by the Russian general and former air force commander Peter Deynekin, who said that radar just showed multiple fragments of the B777 [7] (<http://ria.ru/mh17/20140910/1023539819.html>).

Also, the comment made at 28:00 in the same video is a lie. There are publicly available webcam and streetview-like pictures which show that the still picture shown there was made at exactly this street crossing (<https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@48.5450947,39.2643991,16z>) in Luhansk, not in Krasnodon as claimed in the video. I have spent a whole night comparing all those pictures, they match perfectly to the Luhansk site.

(Disclaimer: This is mostly OR by me, not to be included in the article.) --PM3 (talk) 02:28, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

I don't know what to make of that Russian general's remarks. He says that there was no Mig-29 or Su-27 near MH17 when it was downed. How does he know that? The briefing by the Russian defense ministry suggested that a Su-25 might have been near MH17. But it could as well have been a Mig-29, since the latter appears the same on radar as a Su-25. Also, according to eyewitness accounts, one or two fighter jets were near MH17 when it exploded.

Finally, since you work on German Wikipedia, I direct your attention to this Spiegel article, in case you don't know about it: Bundesregierung zu Flug MH17: Keine "gesicherten Erkenntnisse" über Abschuss (<http://www.spiegel.de/panorama/flug-mh17-regierung-hat-keine-sicheren-erkenntnisse-ueber-abschuss-a-990288.html>):

Zur Frage, was die Bundesregierung über Aktivitäten von Raketenstellungen am Tag des Absturzes weiß, heißt es darin, aus den vorliegenden Informationen ließen sich "keine gesicherten Erkenntnisse auf etwaige Einsätze von Flugabwehrenflugkörpern gegen das Luftfahrzeug (MH17) ableiten".

This means that the hypothesis that MH17 was shot down by a surface to air missile is highly speculative. This WP article should reflect that. The response of the German foreign ministry to the Left Party's questions about MH17 is available here (<http://www.jungewelt.de/downloads/mh17.pdf>) as a PDF file. That document indicates that NATO AWACS detected anti-aircraft radar being activated, which the Russian defense ministry also mentioned in its briefing, but AWACS did not detect a SAM being launched. – Herzen (talk) 03:23, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

He says that there was no Mig-29 or Su-27 near MH17 when it was downed. How does he know that? – By looking at the radar recordings of the Russian military? The press conference only presented civil radar data, I would expect that the military has the best capabilities to detect fighter jets, and that Mr. Deynekin has full access to that data.

With the rest, you are going offtopic, this section is not about the rocket shutdown scenario. --PM3 (talk) 16:12, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

Of course military radar would give better information about whether there were fighter jets in the area, but Mr. Deynekin having "full access to that data" is pure speculation on your part. He retired in 2002. From the MH17 press conference given by the Russian ministry of defense, and from the US/NATO not offering any evidence to counter what was said at that press briefing, the only reasonable conclusion is that military radar did indeed indicate that there was at least one fighter jet in the area. And that document from the German foreign ministry *is* relevant, because it does not deny that there were military jets in the area. That document is consistent with the Russian Engineers Union theory. – Herzen (talk) 17:30, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

As an example of "media coverage in Russia" it may or may not satisfy notability. But then we get into WP:UNDUE. If there was an article - as some have proposed - on conspiracies and theories about MAF 17 it could go in there. Here's it's undue, even for "media coverage in Russia". At this point. Volunteer Marek 01:21, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

The latest Ukrainian account of who downed MH17 is a rather implausible conspiracy theory. According to that account, the Novorossian military conspired with the Russian military in order to shoot down a Russian jetliner, so that Russia would have a pretext for invading the Ukraine. According to this theory, the Novorossians/Russians shot down MH17 by mistake; they wanted to shoot down a Russian plane. If that's not a conspiracy theory, I don't know what is. – Herzen (talk) 03:23, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

Is this theory in the article? No? Then what's your point? You seem to be saying that "because pro-Ukrainian conspiracy theories exist, even though they're not included in this article, we MUST include pro-Russian conspiracy theories in the article, presumably for balance". How does that make any sense? [Volunteer Marek](#) 20:41, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

This theory *is* in the article: "The SBU later concluded that rebels intended to shoot down a Russian airliner in a false flag operation to give Russia a pretext to invade Ukraine, but shot down MH17 by mistake." And this conspiracy theory is put forth by the head of the SBU. So yes, this whole Wikipedia article is nothing more than advocacy of a Ukrainian conspiracy theory. And this new conspiracy theory, by the way, *which is the official position of the Ukrainian government, falsifies a lot of material in the article*, such as the original Ukrainian claim that the rebels intended to shoot down a Ukrainian military plane. – [Herzen](#) (talk) 19:30, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

The report must be covered in the article and the info must go into the "Cause" section. (I'm not going to respond to random links to policies. Cause the Western media coverage is already being given an WP:UNDUE weight and everyone can see it.) --[Moscow Connection](#) (talk)

Why must this report be mentioned. This is made by people who are neither involved in the official investigation, nor have had any access to the crash site or any official materials. [Arnouf](#) (talk) 18:05, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

This report must be mentioned because the Dutch Safety Board preliminary report itself calls out for the consideration of the theory that the Russian Engineers Union report develops, because the DSB report is so vague. The word "missile" does not appear in the DSB report. That a surface to air missile downed MH17 is pure speculation at this point. There is no evidence for that conspiracy theory. The only "evidence" that has been put forward is from social media and hearsay. To quote *Time* magazine (<http://time.com/3310287/mh17-report-dutch-malaysia-airlines/>):

the wording of the 34-page report ... **was also vague enough to leave room for one of the more common theories among the rebel fighters** in eastern Ukraine. Russian President Vladimir Putin blamed the disaster on the Ukrainian government on the night of the crash; and in the days that followed, some of the separatists claimed in interviews with *TIME* that a Ukrainian fighter jet had, for some reason, intercepted the airliner and sprayed it with chain-gun fire. As evidence, they pointed to the many small holes in the fuselage, suggesting that **these looked like the work of a machine gun shooting another type of high-energy object — bullets.**

There you have a reliable American source saying that the theory that MH17 was downed by fire from a fighter jet must be considered along with the theory that it was downed by a SAM. Since both scenarios are nothing more than speculation at this point, NPOV requires that WP gives the two theories equal weight. The theory of the Russian Engineer Union report is the prevailing theory in Russia. That the West prefers a rival theory should not influence WP in the least. That just leads to clear systemic bias:

The Wikipedia project strives for a neutral point of view in its coverage of subjects, but it is inhibited by systemic bias that **perpetuates a bias against underrepresented cultures** and topics. The **systemic bias is created by the shared social and cultural characteristics of most editors**, and it results in an imbalanced coverage of subjects on Wikipedia.

[Herzen](#) (talk) 19:32, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

No there you have a source stating that the cause is not determined yet. Not that the cause is a fighter plane. But in any case, even if the fighter hypothesis would be relevant, the report by the REU may not be as they have no more access to the crash site than you or me. Also, that a lot of Western speculation is present (I just now moved it to a speculation subsection) is problematic, but adding Russian speculation does not make that right. [Arnouf](#) (talk) 19:46, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

As I said, not including the Russian speculation is a clear case of systemic bias. That you did not respond to that point suggestss that you have no counterargument to my claim. The relevant section is called "Speculations about cause and responsibility": *speculations*, plural. Thu Russian theory is clearly notable, because a reliable secondary source, *Time* magazine pointed out that the DSB preliminary report is neutral between the SAM and the jet fighter theories. DONTLIKE is not a valid reason to not to mention the Russian. – [Herzen](#) (talk) 20:53, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

Yep. We still include the bullshit from Tony Abbott, who with no evidence at all, and after only hours had passed after the crash, blamed the Russians. Our article is very biased. [HiLo48](#) (talk) 22:34, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

What's Tony Abbott got to do with this? His views are mentioned in the reactions section. [Stickee](#) (talk) 22:52, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

So you're happy for propaganda based bullshit to be in one section of the article but will tackle anything you don't want in the Causes section with a fine toothed comb? No. It's one article. Same standards should apply throughout. Our article is very biased. [HiLo48](#) (talk) 23:00, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

So reactions shouldn't be included in the reactions section because you think they're propaganda-based? Sorry, but the media is reporting on them. [Stickee](#) (talk) 23:07, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

What we report about Abbott is a lot more than a simple reaction, like saying how sad it is, and other nonsense like that. We say "*Tony Abbott said in an address to parliament that the aircraft was downed by a missile which seems to have been launched by Russian-backed rebels.*" That's obviously a statement about the cause. Why isn't it in the Cause section? [HiLo48](#) (talk) 23:19, 20 September 2014 (UTC)

Because Abbott is a politician with an agenda, not an expert.

Consider my addition of discussion of a memo produced by the German government about what it knows about the downing of MH17 which I made with this edit (https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17&diff=626399294&oldid=626392078). I put it in the "Cause" section, but Stickeee moved it to the "Reactions" section. What I did then was move the discussion of the official German government statements about what it knows about the downing of MH17 back to the "Cause" section, but kept the response by a German politician to those statements in the "Reactions" section. – [Herzen](#) (talk) 01:46, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

I totally agree that Abbott is a politician with an agenda. Why do we help him promote that agenda so much? [HiLo48](#) (talk) 01:56, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Here is a blog post about the report: [Reconstruction MH17 Crash by Russian Union of Engineers](http://deepresourc.wordpress.com/category/countries/ukraine/) (<http://deepresourc.wordpress.com/category/countries/ukraine/>). I am giving it not because I think that it can be used as another secondary source, but because it gives a good summary of the report, which I have not read myself. It also has a photo of a contrail left by a Buk. – [Herzen](#) (talk) 20:11, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Consistent

For unknown reasons I can't edit the article, but I would like to point out that the source for this line was not written by an expert on the subject, and the line is highly speculative:

The Dutch Safety Board preliminary report is consistent both with a missile and with machine gun fire from a fighter jet having downed MH17.[164]

It must be regarded as the opinion of a journalist. The direction of the blast from above with shrapnel entering through the roof and leaving through the floor of the cockpit, and the instant decompression and breakup of the aircraft (as seen from the black box log of the cabin pressure altitude) are both inconsistent with a fighter jet shooting it down. It is inconsistent with an air-to-air missile as well, since air-to-air missiles are heat seeking and will hit an engine. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [81.191.86.132](#) (talk) 18:45, 21 September 2014 (UTC)

Actually, that's not even in the source. It's not *even* an opinion of a journalist. Just whoever wrote that sentence in Wikipedia. Removed as synthesis and original research. [Volunteer Marek](#) 03:56, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

@IP82: Yes, User:Ymblanter expressed similar concerns about that sentence in this comment (<https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=&diff=prev&oldid=626525821>) 2 sections above. [Stickeee](#) (talk) 03:59, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Here is what the [\[http://time.com/3310287/mh17-report-dutch-malaysia-airlines/source\]](http://time.com/3310287/mh17-report-dutch-malaysia-airlines/source) says:

the wording of the 34-page report ... was also vague enough to **leave room for** one of the more common theories among the rebel fighters in eastern Ukraine. ... some of the separatists claimed in interviews with TIME that a Ukrainian fighter jet had, for some reason, intercepted the airliner and sprayed it with chain-gun fire. As evidence, they pointed to the many small holes in the fuselage, suggesting that these looked like the work of a machine gun shooting another type of high-energy object — bullets.

"Leave room for" is just a different way of saying "is consistent with". I don't see how anyone can deny that.

Also, since when do we decline to use an impeccably reliable source just because the writer is a journalist, not an expert??? I thought that expertise was a property of primary, not secondary sources. What matters about secondary sources, which this Time article is, is *reliability*. Finally, when an actual expert's view is cited, you don't like that, either, because since what he says threatens your worldview, he must be a "conspiracy wing nut". It is undeniable that your guiding criterion for not including something in an article related to the Ukraine is [DONTLIKE](#).

Your obstruction by means of [lawyering](#) and constant deployment of specious arguments is making it impossible for editors to bring a minimal level of [NPOV](#) to this article. – [Herzen](#) (talk) 19:08, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Euhm, if the report is really that vague, and if leaving room should really be considered as being consistent with we could also consider the report as being consistent with an alien attack. [Arnouf](#) (talk) 19:43, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Do aliens normally use high-energy projectiles? –[82.198.102.128](#) (talk) 19:51, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

They might. It may also be a disintegrated meteor strike. Just to make the point that we really, really, really should not overinterpret the reports. [Arnouf](#) (talk) 19:53, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Look, Time magazine, German Wikipedia, and French Wikipedia all consider the possibility that Kiev shot down MH17. But some editors of English Wikipedia are doing everything in their power to keep English Wikipedia from doing that, by employing [civil POV pushing](#). – [Herzen](#) (talk) 19:59, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

The Time quote you gave wasn't a ringing endorsement. As for other Wikipedias, they can use the sources they have and follow their own guidelines. The guidelines here are that we use the POV of the bulk of reliable sources--which in this case is that it was probably the separatists shot it down. Any departure from this is a POV push. [Geogene](#) (talk) 20:18, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

As stated earlier by others. The media is asked for conclusions, and they provide them. However, the media in this are not reporting the conclusions from the investigation as these are inconclusive. So the media are depending on a range of non-official experts, rumours, hearsay and self proclaimed witnesses. The reliability of all these sources is less than perfect (among others because none of these experts have had access to the crash site, none of the witnesses are experts, and many of the sources may have vested interest in presenting one side of the story). That is why we should not overinterpret their reports. Arnoutf (talk) 20:26, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Air traffic control data

There is lots of contradicting information on the recordings of communication between MH17 pilots and the Air traffic controllers:

- Media reported on 17 July that they were confiscated by the SBU, referring to a "source in Kiev". [8] (<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-28360784>)
- The Ukrainian ambassador to Malaysia denied on August 8 that the recordings were confiscated [9] (<http://www.nst.com.my/node/21260>).
- DSB announced on August 11 that *cockpit voice recorder and the flight data recorder (the black boxes), air traffic control data, radar and satellite images ... is currently being compared* [10] (<https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/en/onderzoek/2049/investigation-crash-mh17-17-july-2014/onderzoek/1555/investigation-into-cause-of-mh17-plane-crash-continues-in-the-hague-the-netherlands#fasen>).
- The Russian ambassador to the UN demanded today: *They [Ukraine] have to provide records of conversations between their air-traffic controllers [and pilots] ...* [11] (<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/churkin-ukraine-should-give-investigators-access-to-mh17-audio-files/505346.html>)

Is there any additional information which clarifies this issue? When DSB says "air traffic control data", could this mean anything else than the ATC conversation with pilots? It can't mean radar data, as this is mentioned separately. --PM3 (talk) 19:59, 19 August 2014 (UTC)

Ukrainian ATC tapes: the turd that will not flush! Strange how the "bad" guys handed over the flight-data and voice recorders that would prove their guilt whereas the "good" guys held back the ATC data that would prove their innocence. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 20:25, 21 August 2014 (UTC)

82-The talk page is not a place to talk about the topic of the article, the Ukrainian-Russian situation generally, or your views on such things. It is a place to discuss how to *improve* the article. Frankly, there are a lot of possible reasons why the investigators have not made the information on the data recorders public at this time (but this isn't the place to discuss them). You seem to be interested in the topic, I hope you will help us all improve the article further. Best Regards--64.253.142.26 (talk) 00:15, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

See <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2728660/Ukrainian-air-traffic-control-sent-doomed-flight-MH17-conflict-zone-Donetsk-region-says-Russia.html> (as an example): "*Russian envoy to UN demands Kiev release communications with MH17*". The story being suppressed on this article is not that the investigators haven't made things public it is that **the authorities in Kiev seized ATC recordings and have still NOT handed this over to the investigators**. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 08:44, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

Find a collection of reliable sources that discuss the issue, and we can examine the sources WhisperToMe (talk) 10:25, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

As if **western** mainstream media would cover this: it's not in line with the official (US State Dept) narrative. --87.117.204.133 (talk) 10:56, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

There are plenty of sources from other countries, Malaysia included. WhisperToMe (talk) 14:44, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

<http://www.kyivpost.com/content/ukraine-abroad/the-moscow-times-churkin-says-ukraine-should-give-investigators-access-to-mh17-audio-files-361175.html>

quoting: <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/churkin-ukraine-should-give-investigators-access-to-mh17-audio-files/505346.html>

<http://au.ibtimes.com/articles/563210/20140820/russia-ukraine-air-traffic-control-malaysia-airlines.htm>

<http://www.nation.lk/edition/breaking-news/item/32450-kiev-must-publish-record-of-mh17-communication-with-traffic-control-russia.html>

<http://rt.com/news/181300-mh17-flight-record-public/>

<http://en.itar-tass.com/world/745999> --82.198.102.128 (talk) 15:15, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

Thank you! The RT source (re-posted at Sri Lanka) identifies the Russian envoy as Vitaly Churkin. Would it be fair to state his demands within the article? RT and the *International Business Times* both mentioned this demand, so it may make sense to state this in the article. I am aware that the DSB has not mentioned the ATC data anymore. WhisperToMe (talk) 15:35, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

Personally, I would have thought that a statement by Russia's Permanent Representative to the United Nations since 2006 would be worth mentioning (notable in Wikipedian?) Even the BBC reported off-hand in their timeline that in the immediate hours after the crash the Ukrainian regime intelligence services confiscated the air traffic control records in Kiev. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 16:01, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

Is the statement relevant? Is Churkin speaking for the DSB now? [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 18:43, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

No he's speaking as Russia's Permanent Representative to the United Nations. Is the UN not relevant?

--[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 18:56, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

Ambassador Churkin doesn't speak for the UN, either. But that is beside the point. Do you think that this comment of his is of lasting relevance? And don't you think that if the ATC recordings are not available to the DSB, and are needed in the investigation, that the DSB would comment on this on their own behalf? [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 19:38, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

What I think doesn't matter. After all - its not a forum. Surely it's the secondary sources that count:

- [Malaysia wants the 'missing' Ukrainian ATC tapes \(http://www.nst.com.my/node/21260\)](#) New Straits Times [82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 08:50, 23 August 2014 (UTC)
- [Russia Wants Regular, Transparent Reports on Boeing 777 Crash Probe \(http://en.ria.ru/world/20140823/192273535/Russia-Wants-Regular-Transparent-Reports-on-Boeing-777-Crash.html\)](#) - RIA - [82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 11:03, 23 August 2014 (UTC)

I think that if the Malaysians are also wanting the tapes, it's a strong indication that this is something that should be addressed in the article. [WhisperToMe \(talk\)](#) 11:55, 23 August 2014 (UTC)

Examining the quotes themselves, we have "*Attorney-General Tan Sri Abdul Gani Patail said Malaysia would make a formal request for the ATC recordings. However, he did not commit to a definite timeline.*" and "*the Ukrainians have yet to receive any formal request for the tapes [from the DSB official investigation]*". So it seems no-one has actually requested them (officially) yet anyway. [Stickee \(talk\)](#) 12:03, 23 August 2014 (UTC)

Adding on to what's been said earlier: the DSB has previously said they have the ATC data [12] (<https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/en/onderzoek/2049/investigation-crash-mh17-17-july-2014/onderzoek/1555/investigation-into-cause-of-mh17-plane-crash-continues-in-the-hague-the-netherlands#fasen>), as has been repeated by other sources (IB Times (<http://www.ibtimes.com/mh17-safety-report-will-be-released-september-dutch-safety-board-says-1658504>)). In regards to new FAQ not mentioning ATC, the list wasn't exhaustive: "...information from various sources, such as the...". The "*such as*" means they have other data, which would likely mean the ATC as well. Some more sources saying the DSB has the recordings: RIA/Reuters (<http://en.ria.ru/world/20140814/191989219/Dutch-Investigators-to-Release-First-MH17-Crash-Report-in.html>), China Central (<http://english.cntv.cn/2014/08/12/ARTI1407800105959860.shtml>), Indo-Asian News/The Hindu (<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/world/mh17-crash-investigation-continues-in-netherlands/article6307921.ece>) NBC News (<http://www.nbcnews.com/storyline/ukraine-plane-crash/dutch-investigators-leave-malaysia-airlines-mh17-crash-site-n178291>).

Also, just found this interview in which a DSB spokesman says they have ATC information: "*This team has collected a lot of information ... For example ... radar information from air traffic controllers*" RT (<https://rt.com/news/177420-dutch-investigators-mh17-crash/>). [Stickee \(talk\)](#) 12:45, 23 August 2014 (UTC)

None of these sources say where the *radar information from air traffic controllers* came from. Russia has very publicly made their recordings available, so they would obviously be a source. If Ukraine is saying that they "... have yet to receive any formal request for the tapes [from the DSB official investigation]" then how can they be a source of info for the DSB? --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 13:17, 23 August 2014 (UTC)

The day after my posting, DSB released an FAQ (Dutch original (<https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/nl/onderzoek/2048/onderzoek-crash-mh17-17-juli-2014/onderzoek/1558/vragen-en-antwoorden-over-het-onderzoek-naar-het-needstorten-van-vlucht-mh17#fasen>), English translation (<https://www.onderzoeksraad.nl/en/onderzoek/2049/investigation-crash-mh17-17-july-2014/onderzoek/1559/questions-and-answers-concerning-the-investigation-into-flight-mh17#fasen>)) which differs in one point from the August 11 statement: While flight recorders, satellite and radar images are still mentioned, ATC data is no longer mentioned. I have also directly asked the DSB about the ATC data, but I got a "we won't tell" reply. So no helpful information from that side so far. --[PM3 \(talk\)](#) 02:53, 22 August 2014 (UTC)

@[PM3](#): , regarding your comments, the conclusion of the english-language Wikipedia editors appears to be:

- Yes the BBC did report that "*Ukraine's SBU security service has confiscated recordings of conversations between Ukrainian air traffic control officers and the crew of the doomed airliner, a source in Kiev has told Interfax news agency.*"
- The Ukrainian ambassador to Malaysia actually said: "*There is no proof or any evidence that the tapes were confiscated by the SBU*". This is not strictly a **denial** that that the recordings were confiscated. I doubt most native-english speakers would spot the subtle difference, so there's no need to feel bad about interpreting these words as a *denial*.
- DSB does not say exactly whose "*air traffic control and radar data*" is being compared".
- Yes, basically, the Russian ambassador to the UN did demand that: They [Ukraine] have to provide records of conversations between their air-traffic controllers [and pilots].

So the apparent contradictions could actually be reconciled - if somebody really wanted to. But the thing is: *so what?* This subject is not mentioned in the english-language article anyway.

PS: the german-language version has a much more neutral tone to it. Well done. --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 08:24, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

It is normal to impound the ATC recordings after an incident or accident most if not all the relevant discussion is also on the aircraft voice recorder, so I am not sure what all the fuss is about it doesnt actually appear to be relevant. [MilborneOne \(talk\)](#) 08:47, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

Aye, I was thinking the same thing. The cockpit voice recorder would have all the ATC-Aircraft conversations on it, and the DSB confirms they have the CVR [13] (<https://www.onderzoekraad.nl/en/onderzoek/2049/investigation-crash-mh17-17-july-2014/onderzoek/1559/questions-and-answers-concerning-the-investigation-into-flight-mh17#fasen>). There's also the fact that the DSB hasn't requested the tapes yet anyway, according to the NST [14] (<http://www.nst.com.my/node/21260>). **Stickee** (talk) 08:52, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

Not strictly true - 1) The CVR will only reveal what ATC said to MH17, not conversations with other aircraft in the area (or show that there weren't any). Ukrainian radar data will also show what (if any) other aircraft were in the area. 2) Humennyi said that "*if a formal request was made by Malaysia or the international investigation team, Ukraine would extend its cooperation*". The international investigation team is not the same thing as the DSB. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 09:13, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

(1) Slight error the VCR will record all transmissions from atc to all aircraft on the frequency in use by the aircraft it has no way of knowing the air traffic are talking to somebody else. **MilborneOne** (talk) 09:45, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

Yes: "*on the frequency in use by the aircraft*" - not traffic using a different frequency --82.198.102.128 (talk) 09:55, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

If it is on a different frequency it is not under the control of the FIR sector so not really relevant. **MilborneOne** (talk) 11:42, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

I think you'll find that **all** aviation frequencies are under the control of the FIR sector - not just the ones in regular use. See here (<https://ivao.aero/db/ss/freqs.asp?ld=UA>) for some common civvy ones in Ukraine or here (<http://www.milscan.nl/frequency.php>) (and search for Kiev) to find 22 military ones. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 12:20, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

True but none are relevant to the incident or investigation as MH17 was probably only using one frequency plus guard at the time, if MH17 talked on other channels it will be in the voice recorded data, suspect we are in the realms of original research so perhaps just need to wait for the preliminary report and then we can judge if any of this is actually relevant. **MilborneOne** (talk) 12:53, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

That's just it - an accident investigation HAS to consider ALL possibilities - including what OTHER aircraft were in the area. Only ATC data can help with that - VCR won't. -82.198.102.128 (talk) 12:58, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

re: "It is normal to impound the ATC recordings." Normal, yes, if not obligatory, but it would normally be done by those authorised/certified to do so (in this case authorised/certified by the EASA, probably). What's not normal is confiscation by security services. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 10:09, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

- It seems clear to me that no editor is going to include this subject in the main article, so why don't we just call it quits here and let it disappear down the memory-hole into the archive? I think that @PM3: - the OP - has enough info here to make his mind up for the german-language version. --82.198.102.128 (talk) 12:52, 24 August 2014 (UTC)

My thinking on notability is this: what is the most damning thing that could possibly be on that ATC tape? That a Ukrainian controller sent the aircraft, along with many others, down a corridor that international agencies considered safe? It suddenly became unsafe when *somebody* gave the guerrillas a launcher that could reach airliner cruise altitude, and that happened with no warning. The Churkin remark is a Soundbite of the Week for the domestic media consumption, and at most a foot in the door for Russia to try to discredit the Dutch investigation in a few weeks (note that they're laying the groundwork for that now). But I won't come behind you and remove it. **Geogene** (talk) 16:03, 25 August 2014 (UTC)

This is related to the request for the ATC records: [15] (<http://www.news.com.au/travel/travel-updates/russia-claims-malaysian-airlines-flight-mh17-crash-investigation-stalled/story-fnizu68q-1227036669088>). Getting ready to reject the report's findings. **Geogene** (talk) 20:09, 25 August 2014 (UTC)

re: "*what is the most damning thing that could possibly be on that ATC tape?*" - that military aircraft were operating close by the civilian aircraft - directed by Ukrainian ATC. Why do you bother trying to trivialise the issue - as a way of dropping it - when it has already been effectively dropped anyway through being ignored? — Preceding **unsigned** comment added by 87.117.204.133 (talk) 07:47, 27 August 2014 (UTC)

As no-one seems prepared to cover the subject - or offer convincing reasons why not - I have made it the subject of an edit request, --87.117.204.133 (talk) 13:14, 30 August 2014 (UTC)

Stickee reckons this is still under discussion so: I would like to request that the following being included in the article:

- On 17 July the BBC reported that "*Ukraine's SBU security service has confiscated recordings of conversations between Ukrainian air traffic control officers and the crew of the doomed airliner, a source in Kiev has told Interfax news agency.*" **BBC** (<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-28360784>)
- The Ukrainian ambassador to Malaysia said: "*There is no proof or any evidence that the tapes were confiscated by the SBU*". **NST** (<http://www.nst.com.my/node/21260>)
- The Russian envoy to the UN Security Council has demanded Kiev release all records of its air-traffic controllers' communications with the plane. **Daily Mail** (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2728660/Ukrainian-air-traffic-control-sent-doomed-flight-MH17-conflict-zone-Donetsk-region-says-Russia.html>)

--87.117.204.133 (talk) 12:48, 1 September 2014 (UTC)

As I said above, there's not going to be anything damning on those audiotapes the Kremlin is asking for except for Ukrainian ATC routing the flight down a corridor that was believed to be safe. Any communications between the ATC and

MH17 would have taken place over standard VHF frequencies that would have been monitored by every other commercial aircraft in the area and would probably have been recorded on the CVR (along with, "Why is that Su-25 shooting at us?") Further, the DSB would probably just ask for whatever it doesn't have that it needs. But by making allegations about "missing" data, certain parties can make it look like something nefarious is going on that isn't. It's food for conspiracy theories that we normally wouldn't include in the article. [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 18:15, 2 September 2014 (UTC)

So basically, after researching the topic yourself, the conclusion is that these three sources were wrong to have reported it. --[87.117.204.133 \(talk\)](#) 19:44, 2 September 2014 (UTC)

You seem to be misinterpreting the prohibition on OR (which is a ban on putting OR in article content) to say that we are forbidden from using research/argumentation to debate notability on talk pages and noticeboards (which happens daily). [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 20:01, 2 September 2014 (UTC)

Anyway, what are you proposing to add? Something like...*Russia asked Ukraine to publish its air traffic control records?* [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 20:10, 2 September 2014 (UTC)

I am only proposing to add details from what the sources reported, such as:

- On 17 July the BBC reported that "*Ukraine's SBU security service has confiscated recordings of conversations between Ukrainian air traffic control officers and the crew of the doomed airliner, a source in Kiev has told Interfax news agency.*" [BBC \(https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-28360784\)](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-28360784)
- The Ukrainian ambassador to Malaysia said: "*There is no proof or any evidence that the tapes were confiscated by the SBU.*" [NST \(http://www.nst.com.my/node/21260\)](http://www.nst.com.my/node/21260)
- The Russian envoy to the UN Security Council has demanded Kiev release all records of its air-traffic controllers' communications with the plane. *Daily Mail* (<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2728660/Ukrainian-air-traffic-control-sent-doomed-flight-MH17-c-onflict-zone-Donetsk-region-says-Russia.html>)

Please feel free to add any further info from these sources (or indeed any other RS that covered the subject). --[87.117.204.133 \(talk\)](#) 21:35, 2 September 2014 (UTC)

I added a sentence from Reuters about Russia demanding that the CVR and ATC audio be published. I think that meets the notability criteria because it's being repeated and was picked up by Reuters (whether it will be lasting is another matter). This stuff about seizing ATC data doesn't seem to have resonance in the sources. In my opinion, a passing remark from the BBC on it isn't enough. [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 22:24, 2 September 2014 (UTC)

For anyone with a genuine interest in the possible relevance of the missing ATC data, [this \(https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17/Russia%27s_questions_to_Ukraine#Data_requests\)](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17/Russia%27s_questions_to_Ukraine#Data_requests) covers quite a lot. — Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 17:22, 7 September 2014 (UTC)

The DSB Preliminary Report says that The data obtained was the following:

- Primary surveillance radar recorded by Russian surveillance aids --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 16:44, 9 September 2014 (UTC)

This issue has been resolved by the DSB preliminary report:

- "UkSATSE provided the recording and transcript of the radio (RAD) and telephone communications regarding flight MH17."

That's the data which allegedly was seized and which Russia demanded to be released. There is a transcript of it in the DSB report on page 15, at least the communication from 13:20:00 on which is not from the cockpit voice recorder. --[PM3 \(talk\)](#) 13:43, 15 September 2014 (UTC)

The data requested by Russia, specifically Russia's Air Transport Agency, was much more than what was supplied to the DSB, see [HERE \(https://rt.com/politics/official-word/175584-russia-agency-questions-mh17/\)](https://rt.com/politics/official-word/175584-russia-agency-questions-mh17/) (prepared by the Federal Air Transport Agency) --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 22:37, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Semi-protected edit request on 22 September 2014 - Lead paragraph in Cause section.



This edit request to [Malaysia Airlines Flight 17](#) has been answered. Set the `|answered=` or `|ans=` parameter to **no** to reactivate your request.

The Cause section has now grown to be so long and complex that it may benefit the reader (college-kid standard?) to include a summary (in the lead paragraph?). Having looked through the article and checked the quoted sources, my summary would be as follows:

According to reliable sources, a Russian BUK launcher had made its way to Donetsk - undetected by US and Ukrainian intelligence assets or by the local population. It then spent four or five hours driving around on a civilian low-loader past several areas with Kiev military activity (including an enemy BUK system) before settling down south of Torez/Snizhne to do the deed. It fired (accidentally) at MH17 under clear blue skies and by the time MH17 hit the ground the weather has almost completely clouded over. Ten minutes later, a rebel-leader's conversation was intercepted saying that MH17 had been downed from near Chernukhino (over 40km away from Snizhne) and that it had fallen outside Enakievo (over 30km from the MH17 crash-site). Although the perpetrators had been only 30km from the nearest Russian border checkpoint, in Marynivki, they decided not to head that way in their 24-ton tracked and armoured vehicle (top speed 65km/h)BUK specs (<http://www.ausairpower.net/APA-9K37-Buk.html#mozTocId239351>). Instead, they opted to make their escape on the civilian low-loader. About 12 hours after loading up, and after having travelled during the

night, they were spotted in Luhansk (100km from the launch site). At dawn, they had turned off the motorway into the suburbs and were apparently on their way to the Kiev-controlled customs-post and Russian border, still some 60km away (assuming they got straight back on the motorway after the SBU photo-op).

Though, obviously, I would expect that more experienced contributors would be able to improve on this. [82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 19:05, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

No the cause section has grown so large that it needs serious trimming. This seems however to be impossible since everyone wants their own speculation about the cause in there. [Arnouf \(talk\)](#) 20:21, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

But it won't get trimmed - so why make the readers struggle? --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 20:28, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Can we trim some of the journalist-reported Buk sightings? That part seems to take a lot of space. [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 20:39, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Give it up. [WP:NOTAFORUM](#). [Volunteer Marek](#) 20:30, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Is it a bad thing to suggest something that might improve the article? [82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 20:39, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

the cause - the 53rd buk brigade, based in Kursk [16] (<https://bellingcat.com/news/uk-and-europe/2014/09/08/images-show-the-buk-that-downed-flight-mh17-inside-russia-controlled-by-russian-troops/>) - 7 words, what else is there really ? [Sayerslle \(talk\)](#) 21:07, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

That's an even better solution - like it! --[82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 21:36, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

The Cause section should contain nothing more than what's in the current official report. All else is propaganda and speculation. I've never seen an article breach fundamental NPOV guidelines so much as this. [HiLo48 \(talk\)](#) 22:01, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

Closing this "request". Looks like [WP:POINT](#). [Geogene \(talk\)](#) 22:14, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

"This page in a nutshell: When you have a point to make, use direct discussion only." What point, specifically? [82.198.102.128 \(talk\)](#) 22:25, 22 September 2014 (UTC)

ⓘ Not done: please establish a consensus for this alteration before using the `{{edit semi-protected}}` template. Clearly out of scope for an edit request, continue to work on building consensus on this talk page as you have been doing. [Cannolis \(talk\)](#) 03:01, 23 September 2014 (UTC)

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Talk:Malaysia_Airlines_Flight_17/Archive_16&oldid=1136983476"

▪