

Bellingcat locates July 16 BUK video

Posted on March 7, 2016 by [admin](#) in [Army positions](#) // 50 Comments

by

Taken from the Bellingcat :

On July 16, 2014, the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense's television network aired a clip of Ukrainian Buks and radar systems deployed, with the caption "Servicemen of the Ukrainian Armed Forces patrol the area of the ATO zone." Per a tweet from Nieuwsuur reporter Rudy Bouma, the Ukrainian military reported that the Buks were stationed in Kramatorsk.

We are now able confirm the true location of this Buk: the village of Dovhen'ke, south of Izyum in the Kharkiv Oblast (approximately 130km from the MH17 crash site). We will publish materials that further confirm the location of the video soon.

At March 9 Bellingcat published the full report [here](#).

This maps shows the BUK location according the Russian Ministry of Defense. The red star is Dovhen'ke. The green circles shows the radar reach of BUKs stationed in Eastern Ukraine.

This blog was about the statement of Ukraine that video was taken at Kramatorsk.

by

50 Comments on Bellingcat locates July 16 BUK video

1. Athomas // [March 7, 2016 at 9:57 pm](#) // Reply

Readers of the German newspaper "FAZ" knew this on July 5th, 2014, two weeks before MH17 happened:

"Am Freitag war jedenfalls ein Kolonne mit sechs ukrainischen Flugabwehrraketen des Typs BUK am Hauptquartier der Streitkräfte bei der Stadt Isjum zu sehen. Da die Rebellen keine Luftwaffe besitzen, kann das nur eines bedeuten: Man denkt in Kiew viel an Moskau in diesen Tagen."

http://www.faz.net/aktuell/politik/ausland/europa/ukraine-krise-es-ist-vorueber-die-separatisten-sind-weg-13029665.html?printPagedArticle=true#pageIndex_2

Congratulations, Bellingcat

◦ Andrew // [March 8, 2016 at 2:15 am](#) // Reply

They knew Ukraine had BUK's in Kharkov Oblast. The same were also shown by the AP in pictures on July 4, and were also admitted by Ukraine to be present in this location on July 30, 2014.

Bellingcat deserves credit for locating the actual site of both videos.

The same effort now needs to be made on other Ukrainian units and videos of them, especially the 156th Regiment/1st Battalion.

▪ Deus Abscondis // [March 10, 2016 at 1:07 pm](#) // Reply

Thanks for that late information Andrew.

You and admin suggested that it was important to find the site, that the road through the forest was a sign as was the antenna. How many hours did you spend looking? I can't say how long I

spent, it's a bit embarrassing. I will put it down to a learning exercise. If there's no collaboration amongst people trying to geolocate small areas with few features "brute force looking" is futile. What I have learned is that the appearance of "geolocating" things using Google Earth comes after it is found out where what you are looking for actually is.

It was on March 1st I found a reference to a camp Sth of Izyum in of all places a Jane's Military article! The timing of Bellingcat's 'discovery' was uncanny. However, I don't expect they needed to do much actual searching. It was becoming clear that the political cost to the powers that be that "BUKs in the ATO" wasn't good optics. This was in part to certain people provoking the issue via twitter.

It became clear to me early on that the camp was nowhere near any ATO. Which is not to say other Ukrainian BUKs weren't in a much better position or could have got their quicker. The so called "rebel held" areas of course gets overamplified by people who disbelieve that Ukrainian forces could possibly have had anything to do with MH17 and often saying so as if butter wouldn't melt in their mouths. Of course situation analysis is key 6as is an understanding that surveillance technology has improved. Military history surely is replete with examples of "working behind" so called "enemy lines"?

There are some issues I have trying to fine tune the exact location of the equipment at Dovhen'ke. Some things aren't stacking up. Google Earth has some limitations too and a more professional GIS package may help for areas that have sufficient content where "looking" might work. I expect it to be a rare event.

I think trying to search using Google Earth for the BUKs and radar as indicated by the Russian MoD to be a futile pastime. The "open source citizen investigator" line that Bellingcat runs with is a con to hook people into ideology. The fact that the powers that be can add or remove features at the source is never discussed. For example I found a checkpoint that was blurred out. Perhaps dead bodies were lying around, I have no idea, but to think one might find the elusive, likely Ukrainian BUK responsible for MH17 in Google Earth is fanciful.

There is one thing I recently noticed, a SAM unit of some type behind the logo at 4:45 of the infamous video. I haven't sought to ID it yet, I expect you will know off the top of your head. It has been suggested there is one behind the trailer next to the Tin Shield segment, it's not so clear to me.

Deus Abscondis

- admin // [March 10, 2016 at 1:23 pm](#) // Reply

If this video was the golden bullet showing the BUK which shot down MH17, Ukraine would have deleted it soon after the date of publication.

I did not spent any time searching for it. There are higher priorities.

I agree Google Earth is unlikely to provide the Golden Bullet. Just as other commercial satellite photos available for the public will not reveal anything interesting.

Can you provide locations to the checkpoint which is blurred?

2. Eugene // [March 7, 2016 at 11:02 pm](#) // Reply

That does not mean that there were no Buks in Kramatorsk though. There were. July satellite image of Kramatorsk airfield below shows what looks like two Teller's (#1 and #4) and a Kupol (#3).

#2 is probably a 36D6, judging by the shadow, which is a more powerful than Kupol radar. Andrew would know more.

<http://uploads.ru/00bHa.jpg>

- Andrew // [March 8, 2016 at 2:04 am](#) // Reply

Eugene:

There were no BUK's in Kramatorsk when the videos were made. The 156th Regiment/3rd Battalion reappeared in Kramatorsk on July 18. Their complete timeline uncovered so far:

March 4, 2014 – leave base A-0194 in Lugansk for Kramatorsk airfield under self-propulsion.

March 5, 2014 – 301, 312, 321, 323, 331, 332 seen in Soledar early morning under self-propulsion.

March 6, 2014 – arrive in Kramatorsk

March 16 (311, 323), March 17 (312), March 19 (321, 332) – depart Kramatorsk to base A-1428 in Spartak via H20 Highway and Yasynivuta Traffic Police Post on civilian (311, 323, 312) and military (321, 332) haulers

March 19 (312, 321, 332) – depart Spartak west via Karlovka to Vasylykivka on civilian (312) and military (321, 332) loaders

March 22 (301, 323, 331) – depart Spartak west via Dimitrov to Vasylykivka on military loaders

July 4 – arrive via Izyum in Dovhenke (301, 311, 312, 323, 321, 331, 332) on military loaders

July 18 – arrive Kramatorsk (301, 311, 312, 321)

Remaining units:

300, 313, 322, 333 left at Lugansk on March 4, captured by LNR rebels on June 3 at base A-0194, and confiscated by Russian military on July 17/July 18 and taken to Russia.

- Eugene // [March 8, 2016 at 2:10 am](#) // Reply

Ok, I was not sure what exact date in July that picture was taken on. Apparently google maps still displays that imagery, while saying its date is 2016. Which cannot be true, as there has been no summer in 2016 yet.

- Eugene // [March 8, 2016 at 2:29 am](#) // Reply

Indeed the picture was taken on the 26th of July. Thanks for correcting.

- Andrew // [March 8, 2016 at 2:58 am](#) // Reply

Google Earth shows images for July 23, 27, August 4, 8, and 20, 2014 which show BUK launchers in Kramatorsk. Ground imagery on VK.com is seen through winter. There are no BUK's visible there on July 12, 2014.

- Eugene // [March 8, 2016 at 3:20 am](#) //

Here is the screen grab of the picture for 26th by someone (I have currently no access to Google Earth)

http://storage5.static.itmages.ru/i/15/1029/h_1446106292_1153983_2c739d32c8.jpg

Can it be that your July 27th is someone's July 26th, because of timezone differences?

- Andrew // [March 8, 2016 at 3:31 am](#) //

Typo. July 26 is right.

- alex // [March 10, 2016 at 7:27 pm](#) // Reply

These where the July 15?

https://vk.com/omikhaylo?z=photo100681165_336989261%2Fwall100681165_510

originally

[https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/-YIzB-](https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/-YIzB-sjKfg/VqCgeGWFUFI/AAAAAAAAAUQ/CYgmaAfx5FM/w604-h457-no/3660712.jpg)

[sjKfg/VqCgeGWFUFI/AAAAAAAAAUQ/CYgmaAfx5FM/w604-h457-no/3660712.jpg](https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/-YIzB-sjKfg/VqCgeGWFUFI/AAAAAAAAAUQ/CYgmaAfx5FM/w604-h457-no/3660712.jpg)

[https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/-i6udQsnSv-](https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/-i6udQsnSv-c/VqCgdtrcR0I/AAAAAAAAUk8/E2zwh4uH_kw/w604-h459-no/3660705.jpg)

[c/VqCgdtrcR0I/AAAAAAAAUk8/E2zwh4uH_kw/w604-h459-no/3660705.jpg](https://lh4.googleusercontent.com/-i6udQsnSv-c/VqCgdtrcR0I/AAAAAAAAUk8/E2zwh4uH_kw/w604-h459-no/3660705.jpg)

- Liane Theuer // [March 13, 2016 at 1:28 pm](#) // Reply

July 4 – arrive via Izyum in Dovhenke (301, 311, 312, 323, 321, 331, 332) on military loaders

July 18 – arrive Kramatorsk (301, 311, 312, 321)

Andrew, do you know the whereabouts of the Buks between July 5 and July 18 ?

Because the July 16 video is no prove that the Buks were in Dovhenke at this time. The pictures shown may be shot at July 5 as proven in this video :

3. igor // [March 8, 2016 at 12:47 am](#) // Reply

Plenty of ukrainian buks but no one can find an authentic russian buk in eastern ukraine yet. Just imagine if Bellingcat deceit operatives have chosen the separatists side. By now we had been flooded with stories of how this ukrainian buk made its way further to south within the shooting range of mh17.

- sotilaspassi // [March 8, 2016 at 6:51 am](#) // Reply

So far: There is no evidence of any UA BUK in suitable shooting location vs MH17 damage. Only some “soft” evidence(s) of the RU BUK on separatist’s trailer.

One thing is pretty sure, the guilty TELAR is scrapped by now, it can not be found. Potentially also the guilty personnel is “scrapped”.

Final truth about the guilty persons might not come out until RU (and UA) government(s) have changed.

- igor // [March 8, 2016 at 8:47 pm](#) // Reply

Somehow you seem to forget russian mod presentation concerning mh17. Look carefully and you will find an ukrainian buk capable of shooting down mh17 from Zaroschinskoe.

http://archive.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/ECD62987D4816CA344257D1D00251C76

- sotilaspassi // [March 9, 2016 at 2:05 pm](#) // Reply

Pretty much all the RU MOD provided material has been proven to be fake and lies. Why would that one satellite picture be any different than their other fakes?

My thoughts about it here:

(buk images are hastily copied to the satellite image from somewhere else + no civilian has seen a TELAR or launch from there)

And the Zaroschinskoe direction is 100% impossible because of this:

- admin // [March 9, 2016 at 2:17 pm](#) //

There is a lot of noise added to statements. This is normal human behaviour but disturbs the facts.

I am not aware of any claim/statement by the Russian Federation which says the BUKs near Zaroschinskoe actually launched the BUK missile which destroyed MH17

I believe Russia showed the satellite picture stating two BUKs were observed. The question is

“why the battalion was deployed near to the territory controlled by militants just before the accident?”

- Wind Tunnel Man // [March 9, 2016 at 3:24 pm](#) //

sotilaspasi:

Your third posted image (adapted from Mick West's graphic) provides an “IMO: this match” in an attempt to portray the most likely point of the warhead detonation – actually this is unlikely because it depicts shrapnel penetrating the aircraft's port side lower cockpit window area at approx 90 degrees to the skin surfaces in the horizontal plane. Damage to that skin area on MH17 shows shrapnel penetrations and deflections caused from a much smaller angle relative to the aircraft's longitudinal axis.

Actually your posted image resembles the shrapnel directions which Almaz Antey demonstrated with their “dynamic” live firing experiment simulating a missile approach from the Snizhe direction. Due to the nature of the damage on their target they concluded that a missile approaching MH17 from a Snizhe direction was very unlikely.

- igor // [March 10, 2016 at 5:24 pm](#) //

Murders are committed without eyewitnesses so just because no civilian may have not seen a telar or launch from Zaroschinskoe is not a proof there wasn't a missile fired from there.

Regarding the russian satellite photo from Zaroschinskoe, the best way to prove it as a fake is to compare it with another satellite image from a western country. But alas the West has failed to prove there were no buks in Zaroschinskoe, thus the russian evidence stands.

The Russian Mod specifically said that the image has been deliberately lowered. You should pay more attention to details.

<http://eng.mil.ru/en/analytics.htm>

“The resolution of the Russian satellite image on Slide 5 has been deliberately lowered, which resulted in the outlines the terrain (i.e. field) looking smeared.”

- Andrew // [March 10, 2016 at 9:42 pm](#) //

igor:

“Regarding the russian satellite photo from Zaroschinskoe, the best way to prove it as a fake is to compare it with another satellite image from a western country. But alas the West has failed to prove there were no buks in Zaroschinskoe, thus the russian evidence stands.”

The Digital Globe satellite that took photos of Donetsk and Lugansk on July 17 at midday appears to have also been able to take a picture of Shakhtersk/Zaroshchenske in between.

It is hard to believe that it took pictures of the two cities but not what was in between.

It seems very unlikely that Digital Globe releases all space photos that it captures. Some must obviously be censored for reasons of national security by DG's intelligence agency controllers.

“The Russian Mod specifically said that the image has been deliberately lowered.”

Specifically to hide the capabilities of the modern generation of Russian satellites such as Resurs-P1. It is notable that the images released on July 21 are the first spy satellite images released by Russia in eons. Further, no one disputes these images are genuine at least as far as the base features, because they certainly didn't come from the likes of Digital Globe.

- Deus Abscondis // [March 12, 2016 at 11:54 am](#) //

Andrew: there may be some legs left in the satellite issue. A certain amateur satellite watcher wasn't too pleased when I pointed out an article that showed Persona 2 was likely responsible for some of the images. Less assumption and a simple acknowledgement would have been more appropriate.

There are still some issues in my mind worth verifying/checking out but it is time consuming work for what end? It is unlikely the MH17 matter will be resolved because of hard facts and strong unrefuted evidence.

I don't come with the predefined unrealistic notion that MoD are going to disclose capability and don't attach so much importance to exact dates/times in all cases. There are likely military-military signals being sent that aren't at all obvious. A lot of non experts make assumptions about the visibility of tracks, angles of shadows, error level analysis, the skewed appearance of images etc based on small sample sizes and no established methodology or reference to methodology.

In relation to Digital Globe, I trust them as far as I can throw them. Who had saved Google Earth images (areas based on Digital Globe images) of the relevant areas before the saga started? Did updates of certain edited areas get quietly made to catch out an opponent in a propaganda war? Not inconceivable, very difficult to prove or disprove.

That the powers that be have decided a TV program on the 16th sent the wrong message and those particular BUKs weren't in the ATO after it was stated they were means very little, just another military “stretching of the truth”. Any similar evidence that was unintentionally broadcast will have been reviewed and scrubbed. As is the case with any compromising information on Google Earth.

- Liane Theuer // [March 13, 2016 at 12:54 pm](#) //

Andrew wrote : “It seems very unlikely that Digital Globe releases all space photos that it captures. Some must obviously be censored for reasons of national security by DG's intelligence agency controllers.”

I think this is true not only with Digital Globe but with all public available satellite imagery.

And that tells a lot !

Andrew, did you made a map of the movements of ukrainian Buks with dates and Buk numbers ?

- // [March 8, 2016 at 7:28 pm](#) // Reply

There are tones of evidence proving presence of exclusive Russian equipment on Ukranian soil, including AA. If Putin was crazy enough to send Pantsir-S (exclusive Russian AA unit, capable reaching 15 km altitude targets) or Buratino, then who can prove that he didn't sent Buk there?

- [De Grijze Duif](#) // [March 8, 2016 at 7:44 pm](#) // Reply

Could you please link to this "tones of evidence". I cant wait because NATO, Dutch secretaresse services included, were on the look out for a Russian "gamechanger" like heavy weaponry crossing the border. Up untill mh17 there was a lot of blabla from the Ukrainian side, but none of that turned out to be true. Both SHAPE and CTIVD confirmed this.

So if you have reliable sources that prove otherwise, I really would like to see it...

- // [March 9, 2016 at 12:58 am](#) // Reply

I cant wait because NATO, Dutch secretaresse services included, were on the look out You'd better be checking news instead of waiting. NATO has acknowledged Pantsyr presence in Ukraine.

<http://sputniknews.com/europe/20150219/1018476918.html>

- Eugene // [March 9, 2016 at 1:33 am](#) //

> NATO has acknowledged Pantsyr presence in Ukraine.

And as a poof you present a link that tries to debunk the very evidence by NATO.

- [De Grijze Duif](#) // [March 9, 2016 at 9:18 am](#) //

"You'd better be checking news instead of waiting. NATO has acknowledged Pantsyr presence in Ukraine."

This reply is wrong on so many levels...sigh...

First of all it would be up to Russia to "acknowledge". NATO did nothing more than claim.

A claim that is easily debunked by the link you provide yourself! This is on spot:

"The photos shown there feature a truck-mounted missile complex, reminiscent of the Pantsir SA-22. Finding out just when and where those photos were actually taken proved a mission impossible."

This "mission impossible" doesnt add up to the "claim" by NATO, does it?

Last but not least you imply i do not check the news. Which is incorrect and i have been on this roas several times where people claimed the gamechanger had taken place. But in the end it was not supported by any evidence. So not by far "tones of evidence"!

In that sense i am waiting, for a person to stand up and back up all this anti-Russian propaganda talk. Up untill now they all, just like you, fail in this task.

You want to go another ound to back up you r ridiculous claim?

- sotilaspassi // [March 9, 2016 at 2:18 pm](#) // Reply

RU was running in more stealth mode until NovoR started to loose ground heavily. Before MH17 was shot down I have not seen any half modern or modern russian gear on UA soil. It is very hard to tell if a T64 is captured UA device, from Russia military reserve or from captured Crimea.

At the end of July & Early August the heavy flow of modern weapons (y2013 Russian models of tanks, cluster ammunitions etc.) started + train loads of ammunition.

- H.L. // [March 9, 2016 at 6:45 pm](#) //

> At the end of July & early August the heavy flow of modern weapons ... started.

There have also been lots of "russian volunteers" reported supporting the separatists after MH-17 was shot down.

I think this was a russian reaction on the shoot-down of MH-17 with an ukrainian fighter jet. With this false flag attack the west has apparently crossed the "red line" for the Russians and they decided to react.

- Denis Cashcov // [March 8, 2016 at 10:06 pm](#) // Reply

It's up to you and Bellingcat to prove they did have a buk, not for anyone lease to prove they did not

- sotilaspassi // [March 9, 2016 at 2:34 pm](#) // Reply

DSB + others have proven (without any professional doubt) that there was a BUK launcher near the MH17 flight path.

What is left is to pinpoint the exact location, device & personnel.

- admin // [March 9, 2016 at 3:29 pm](#) //

The question is how professional the investigation was done. to start with not all cockpit roof parts were part of the investigation. It looks like someone deliberately delayed the recovery of wreckage.

4. Eugene // [March 8, 2016 at 1:37 am](#) // Reply

Almost unrelated but interesting find about the following BBC video.

http://www.bbc.com/russian/blogs/2014/07/140725_blog_editors_bbc_story_republished

After publishing the video, BBC quickly removed it. But someone had saved it and the news about the removal broke out. So BBC decided to republish the report.

Recently, while trying to geolocate the video, people found that it was actually mirrored by BBC. Yes, BBC for some reason mirrored the video!

Source of the find: <http://mh17.webtalk.ru/viewtopic.php?id=70&p=19#p42824>

- Eugene // [March 8, 2016 at 1:40 am](#) // Reply

BTW, in case you don't know, the eyewitnesses on the video talk about seeing Ukraine military warplanes at the crash site.

- Remko // [March 8, 2016 at 7:10 am](#) // Reply

Eh, did you read your own link?

Maybe read this too <https://whathappenedtoflightmh17.com/conspiracy-theory-debunked/>

- [De Grijze Duif](#) // [March 8, 2016 at 9:45 pm](#) // Reply

Het Remko,

This what is stated in your link:

“BBC Russia later removed the video of two eye-witnesses because the video was not according their quality standards. The Dutch Safety Board published in their preliminary report an overview of the local weather. It was cloudy that day at the crash site. Video proves it was raining. Eye witnesses could most likely not have seen any aircraft flying at FL330.”

Did the 2 witnesses claim they saw 2 fighterjets “at FL330”?

And perhaps a silly question, but what video proved the rain?

- Remko // [March 8, 2016 at 11:08 pm](#) // Reply

Eugene claimed a few things, that are refuted in the BBC link in his message.

Don’t know if the translation is correct, but one female in the BBC video said she saw a military plane beside MH17.

Don’t know which “Video proves it was raining”.

- Eugene // [March 9, 2016 at 12:07 am](#) //

One doesn’t have to believe any reason for withdrawing the video that BBC gives. It is perfectly possible that they initially withdrew it because they did not want to give much air to witnesses talking about Ukrainian warplanes at the crash site. I don’t think anyone would be so naive to expect BBC to plainly name that be the reason.

It is also perfectly possible that BBC put the report back because the withdrawal was turning into a big news.

Why they mirrored (a portion of) the video is beyond me. Mirroring should not be in the active vocabulary of tools in use by video editors for a news channel.

I guess they can always say that they mirrored it by mistake. But to me it would look almost as improbable as if the Paris Match editors photoshopped a Buk into a picture “by mistake”.

- [De Grijze Duif](#) // [March 9, 2016 at 8:53 am](#) //

“Don’t know if the translation is correct, but one female in the BBC video said she saw a military plane beside MH17.”

Exactly my point.

So “Eye witnesses could most likely not have seen any aircraft flying at FL330”, the “at FL330” is unfair, and the complete argument should be scrapped.

“Don’t know which “Video proves it was raining”.”

Same here. So i think its fair to scrap that as well for the time being...

This part: “The Dutch Safety Board published in their preliminary report an overview of the local weather. It was cloudy that day at the crash site.”, without a conclusion is useless in itself in the debunk, so should be scrapped as well...

That leaves “BBC Russia later removed the video of two eye-witnesses because the video was not according their quality standards.”

Besides the point if the BBC claim about quality is correct, in itself it says nothing about the content of the 2 eye-witnesses.

So there is actually no debunk at all about this subject. At least for the time being. For now they are just 2 eye-witnesses, completely ignored by media and politicians. That IS a conclusion you can make out of this.

Up until now i did read articles from this website but did not interact. So i do not have the link at hand. But i believe there is an article that sums up the list of eye-witnesses. The plural part of witnesses being ignored by media and politicians is troubling to me. This ignoring part does not contribute to the objectivity of the quest for truth...

- H.L. // [March 9, 2016 at 6:33 pm](#) //

This is the article about eyewitnesses reporting seeing military aircraft:

<https://whathappenedtoflightmh17.com/overview-of-eyewitness-reporting-seeing-military-aircraft/>

- Remko // [March 9, 2016 at 7:09 pm](#) //

As I said, Eugene presented his speculation as fact.

Like “BBC decided to republish the report, because the news about the removal broke out.”

“The eyewitnesses on the video talk about seeing ‘Ukraine’ military warplanes.”

Things that are refuted in the BBC link in his message, or by watching the video.

I thought the whathappenedtoflightmh17.com link I provided explained that too, guess I was wrong about that.

And I must confess also that I misread the part where Eugene says a part of the video is flipped. I read it as mirroring it, as in provide a copy, on youtube or something.

- Eugene // [March 13, 2016 at 10:42 pm](#) //

Remko,

Firstly, we need to remember the obvious bias of BBC towards a pro-Ukraine PoV. For example, BBC made a lot of fuss about a couple of bruised protesters on Maidan, but completely failed to report on Luhansk city centre bombing by Ukraine Su-25, which killed only civilians. The bombing was away from areas of military engagement, so had no military justification. For the Odessa massacre report BBC chose to show pictures of girls with Ukraine flags (bit.ly/1UqYnrL) to highlight the patriotic impulse, but chose not to show the pictures of those girls filling Molotov cocktails (bit.ly/1V4GmQD). (If Prosto Tak was still around he’d say that those Molotov cocktails had nothing to do with the fire. Fortunately, he’s no longer with us.)

Secondly, the debunking of the witnesses as the reason for withdrawal can be put to question itself.

-The dense clouds on the weather satview are never used to question the sunny photos by Aleynikov (bit.ly/1WjjHyd) or of Torez (bit.ly/1nHtan4), for some reason. Don't you find?

-Witnesses did not say that the warplanes were at the 777's altitude. In fact, a lady specifically said that a warplane was lower than 777.

-“Video proves it was raining”. I don't know where this came from. There was no rain mentioned or shown in the video.

So, I think what likely happened was the following. BBC Russia issued the report. Then the London headoffice figured that it does not really fit their agenda because it gives too much air time to people talking about Ukraine warplanes. So the video got removed. After a backlash apparently started growing BBC re-added the video. They had to come up with a plausible and innocent reason for the removal. So they said that standards were not maintained. What sort of standards, of course, they did not specify. And as far as I can see the original report was of a reasonably high standard.

■ Eugene // [March 15, 2016 at 1:03 pm](#) //

Remko, my reply have again been stuck in the spam filter (I presume because of the bit.ly links). Here it is in an image form: <http://uploads.ru/pOt2n.png>

5. sotilaspasi // [March 8, 2016 at 7:08 am](#) // Reply

Just to check: Paris Match has not yet shared the original video of the BUK transport?

They do not have it?

- doctored photo to help some magazine sales?
- data is stored in same place as the RU radar data? (wastebin?)
- the “videographer” has disappeared?
- JIT investigators have captured the originals?

○ sotilaspasi // [March 8, 2016 at 7:10 am](#) // Reply

my mistake: I think PM photo discussion should be here, if continued:

<https://whathappenedtoflightmh17.com/are-the-paris-match-photos-of-the-buk-fake-here-are-the-indications/>

6. Rob // [March 10, 2016 at 10:27 pm](#) // Reply

We know now the place, what about the time? , a similar item in the program from 15-7.

○ Liane Theuer // [March 14, 2016 at 5:56 pm](#) // Reply

Rob, look at your linked video now – not a single Buk is to be seen.
Somebody changed the images.

You find the Buks (until now) in this video :

7. Rob // [March 14, 2016 at 10:07 pm](#) // Reply

Liane, what I meant was the item from 15-7 might have been the first part and the item from 16-7 the second part of the same video. There were no Buks in the item from 15-7, but it has the same title.

8. Liane Theuer // [March 17, 2016 at 10:30 am](#) // Reply

I think this are important details about the Dovhen'ke Base :

„Units from the Ukrainian Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA) and Security Service (SBU) have been spearheading the first phase of an operation against armed pro-Russian paramilitary groups in the restive east of the country.

According to MIA advisor Stanislav Rechynsky the assault force was made up of the MIA's Omega spetsnaz (special forces) battalion and the Alpha Group of the SBU.

It has emerged that the operation in eastern Ukraine is under the personnel command of General Vasily Krutov, first deputy head of the SBU, after he flew in the first wave of helicopters to secure Kramatorsk airbase.

The operation got underway when a column of BTR armoured personnel carriers moved to an improvised forward operating base just south of the city of Izjum.

A convoy of Buk-M1 mobile surface-to-air missile systems was also photographed leaving the barracks of the 156th Anti-Aircraft Regiment on the northern outskirts of Donetsk on 15 April, heading into the countryside.“

<http://www.janes.com/article/36783/ukrainian-internal-security-units-lead-response-to-pro-russian-paramilitaries>

(The link doesn't work anymore)