

From	Jutta Rabe	e - mail
fax	+49 - 331-740 49 41	
phone	+49 - 331-740 49 40	
to	Margus Kurm	
fax	00372 – 613 94 02	
date	October 31 st /2006	
ref:	Comments to the JAIC answer concerning the questions state prosecutor Margus Kurm had asked	

Introduction

Belonging to the group which the former chairman of the JAIC Mr. Uno Laur has decided to give the title 'dissidents' I want to express my astonishment to the 7 pages answer the former JAIC members gave.

Firstly I'm astonished that people get discriminated who have more then 12 years spend their private time, money, and energy to find out truthfully what really caused the sinking of the M/V ESTONIA.

This efforts of civil people from all levels within the European and even world-wide society should be appreciated, but not discriminated especially in the light that more then 850 innocent people lost their lives.

Secondly I'm astonished how much wrong information the JAIC is even giving out today and how much this so called 'EXPERTS' have NOT done their job.

Thirdly I'm astonished that JAIC members as well as some politicians again and again write: "nothing new was reported...."

Since everything is NEW that was reported after the Final Report of the JAIC was published in December 1997, this can only mean that the JAIC members are either ignorant, can't hear, see and read, or – and that makes me thinking – they know already !

But now to the facts:

1. Non of the members of the JAIC has or had any particular track record on investigations concerning the influence of explosions on metal.
This very special knowledge only a few very specialised and selected institutes world-wide have.
Burning traces at the respective places are of course one indication.
But either the JAIC members have never looked at the evidence they had (the visor) or they ignored those burning marks which clearly could be seen at the visor. But unfortunately all this metal of the visor around the locking devices were cut out by this 'EXPERTS' almost instantly the visor was brought to land and nothing of that metal was ever given to any explosion analyses.

Further they claim there was made an analyses of the paint from some places of the visor.

That is correct, but the results could only be null and nothing, because even a 'NON-EXPERT' knows that paint which was exposed to almost 7 weeks saltwater can't contain any marks of explosives anymore.

The JAIC members are claiming that they have listened to many explosion theories even it took lot of their valuable time – and probably was in their eyes anyway rubbish.

But what they totally failed to explain are the holes in the starboard front bulkhead of ESTONIA, which are according to the most prominent real experts in this fields, namely military experts who have really a track record and loads of experience with explosions on ships, are belonging to an explosion.

The JAIC members are writing '*extensive investigations were conducted*' to look into the matter that on one of the underwater videos there showed a package that looks similar to a non exploded load of plastique.

Here should be allowed the question 'what kind of extensive investigations'?
Extensive looking at the only existing video? Divings to find this package?
Consulting with explosions and military experts?
If so where are the reports about this extensive investigations?
In fact: non of this was done, just assuming, guessing and again endless nonsense talking among the so called JAIC 'EXPERTS'.

Then coming to the analyses of metal samples which were taken during the diving expedition in August 2000 which Gregg Bemis and I initiated.

Two very experienced German labs and one very experienced US lab as well as an underwater explosion military expert of the British Marine as well as the senior professor of the leading institute for military analyses in this field - all came to the conclusion that the metal samples had been exposed to explosions.

Only one institute in Germany, which had not analysed the same samples as the other labs, came to the result that they can't find any marks of explosions.
This one institute – and that has to be pointed out has besides everything else very good and tied links to the VTT in Finland, the home of the so called 'EXPERTS' of the JAIC on Finnish side.
So this analyses of this one lab came to the JAIC more then welcome.

And finally now coming to the mentioned surveillance recordings by Finnish Maritime and the Helsinki University Seismology Institute.
The place where the hole is situated in the starboard front bulkhead of ESTONIA is clearly over the waterline. So an explosion during the voyage of the ship could have only been an over waterline explosion probably partly covered by pounding waves. But this means that the seismological instruments would not have recorded the impact, because they are installed on the seabed.
But as well there is the option that the visor was days after the sinking detached by an explosion initiated by whomever.

All this options were never ever properly investigated, but ruled out before they were even spoken out.

2. The wreckage was not properly videofilmed.
Firstly there was not taken care of that Rockwater would use a video technique up to date. Back in 1994 Betacam would have been a normal option or at least the quality of a bit older technique called U-matic should have been standard for such expensive diving operations. This would have produced at least clear pictures and not the blurry amateur video quality which the JAIC presented to everybody later.

The Meyer Werft has given all the available videotapes to an UK based video company to analyse all kinds of odd edits, clocks running backwards and other mysteries on the videos taken by Rockwater. Out came a huge list of manipulations which was discussed intensively with the JAIC member Kari Lehtola and the Finnish Criminal Police and they had to admit that these manipulations are existing on the video tapes.

Whoever made them should be of great interest for the JAIC, but they never cared.

On top there are 3 videotapes missing. Johan Franson from Swedish Sjöfartswerket is insisting that his list is complete, but on his list there are not existing the tapes numbered D 013, D 014 and D021.

Surprisingly enough the Finnish part of the JAIC has these tapes obviously in their possession, because they have listed these tapes, but they again can't show them, because Dr. Nuorteva, member of the Finnish JAIC, has these tapes since years in his private video archive.

Then coming to the statement that: *the Rabe/Bemis diving did not show any relevant in the hull either, if it had, it would have been mentioned in the press conferences of the operation...(for example)... in Tallinn.*

Firstly there was never a press conference in connection with the Rabe/Bemis diving operation held in Tallinn, but more important is: there was a hole in the starboard side hull (bulkhead) shown on clear video pictures and the JAIC calls this nothing relevant?

3. The witness statements are contradictory. The JAIC would have noticed that even with the statements they had, if they would have allowed somebody reading them in a sense making way.

The psychologist Mr. Bengt Schager was withdrawing from the JAIC, because he did not want any longer to be involved in an investigation where the witnesses would not be heard. That is a fact. Nobody ever evaluated the witness statements like real 'EXPERTS' are used to do it.

The JAIC did not want to listen to eyewitnesses. They called them in the same ignorant and discriminating way: "*witnesses are amateurs and what can they provide?*"

There are statements made by 12 key witnesses who are totally contradicting the JAIC sinking and time scenario, but they were never heard by the JAIC, they were even pushed away when they wanted to make statements.

The JAIC time and sequence of events scenario is only based on the statement of the witness Silver Linde, who changed his statement 7 (!) times and according to

an interview Linde gave to me and to a judge under oath, he did this changes always according to pressure and even life-threats to him and his family by the secret police of Estonia in order of the JAIC.

4. The visor fell and collided with the bulb.
This is the most spectacular statement I have ever read.
It feels like in the fairytale 'the emperors new cloths'.
The JAIC must have a massive imagination if they assume that the damages which can be seen on the visor until today are stemming from the bulb.
Nothing fits together, not even slightly with the best fantasy.

To all following points can be noticed that they are partly already treated in the points before, but there are some facts which are missing at all:

Why has the Swedish chief of the Rockwater investigation Mr. Börje Stenström thrown away one of the main evidence parts, the bolt of the Atlantic lock?

Why was the falsificated document of the port control, exercised at the night in Tallinn by Swedish inspectors just before leaving the harbour - in which it shows that the ESTONIA should have been detained in Tallinn- taken into the JAIC report and not the correct document?

Why has the JAIC never investigated how the decision was made by high Swedish officials of the Sjöfartswerket, that ESTONIA should sail even with this mal-report of the inspectors?

Why did the JAIC ignore the as well falsificated cargo loading list of Estline.
Easy to see if one is comparing with the customs list of Tallinn customs with the Estline cargo list.
The customs list shows one truck more which is not registered on the Estline list.

Berlin, October 31st/2006
Jutta Rabe