From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 8, 1997 1:51:55 PM PDT
To: R.Wagenaar@inter.NL.net
Subject: flying safe

Though I will check the newspapers if I can get some addresses of people which are busy with this.

Thanks.

If I compare the crash data it seems that the DC10 is safer than the 747 or?

I don't know. Probably about the same. The main thing is to fly in newer planes, in good weather, into good airports with a good airline. The type of plane is not that important compared to weather and pilot skill.

Sincerely,

Barry Smith

From: Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com
Date: October 16, 1997 11:36:32 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Interesting web site...

Barry,

I was just wandering the web when I discovered your pages.
Very
interesting reading, although I must admit that I have barely
scratched the surface of it. I also have done some research on
aircraft accidents, albeit certainly not as much as you have.
The
night of Flight 800’s demise I watched in horror with my wife.
Within
hours, based on the witness testimony I began to suspect a
catastrophic MECHANICAL failure. Nothing that came out in the
days and
weeks following changed my mind on that. It is fairly certain that
your description of the mechanism of breakup is correct, however I
disagree somewhat with your conclusion that the cargo door is
primarily responsible.

In PAN AM 103 and TWA 800, there are parallels that I found
irresistable to the damage on UAL 811. I believe, however that the
failures had three distinct separate causes. The PAN AM 103
was some
form of explosion which may have been muffled or directed by the cargo
surrounding it. Whether it was plastique or some lesser explosive I do
not have the information to judge. (at this time, I’m not sure such
evidence has survived). In the case of TWA 800, there was again a low
order explosion (I believe) which corresponds to the PAN AM 103 in
that (I believe) the overpressure forced open the inadequate
latches
on the cargo door. In UAL 811, the latch failure is not defined.
I can
not even speculate as to the reason for the failure.

Ever since the Comet crashes, pressurized aircraft have been punctured
time and again with relatively predictable results... If the hole appears at a point in the design where a separating fragment can grab
the structure and tear past a few reinforcements the plane will tear
apart. If the hole does not propagate past a certain percentage of the
structure AND the damaged area of the airframe is not under significant torque stress, the aircraft will land o.k.

Unfortunatly, the cargo door, by its design, is a good airbrake, and
well attatched at the hinges. This leads to a cargo door separation
impacting large stresses on the structure near the hinges, which tears
the 'header' (the nearest term I know from house design) out of the
fuselage and tears the skin significantly. Perhaps, in addition to a
better latch design, the aircraft should be designed with a section of
'tear-away' skin which would halt the tear at a preset location, before damaging the structure....

Anyway, ranting and raving aside... The real reason I wrote
you is to
  congratulate you on your survival from the RA-5 ejection. I'm sorry to
  hear that the pilot didn't make it. Unfortunatly, low altitude
  ejections are always risky.

I'm the writer/webmaster for 'The Ejection Site' which is a web
  page
  devoted to egress systems, the maintainers, and of course the users. I
  would like to either link to some of the ejection material you have on
  your site, or preferably copy some of it over to my site and edit it
  slightly, of course with your prior approval. I would also provide a
  link back to your site and an email link if you desire. Please let me
  know if this interests you... Thanks!

  Kevin
  http://www.bestweb.net/~kcoyne/eject.htm
  kcoyne@bestweb.net

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 16, 1997 8:05:57 PM PDT
To: Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com
Subject: Re: Interesting web site...

Within
  hours, based on the witness testimony I began to suspect a
catastrophic MECHANICAL failure.
Me too, and we are both right.

I believe, however that the failures had three distinct separate causes.

For crashes and could be four causes, 103 182 811 and 800 all had door pop and why door popped could be four reasons.

the overpressure forced open the inadequate latches on the cargo door. In UAL 811, the latch failure is not defined.

Yes it is, chafing wires shorted on fuselage and turned motor on which overrode safety locks and unlatched door which popped. Could be same reason for the other three.

Ever since the Comet crashes, pressurized aircraft have been punctured time and again with relatively predictable results...

New boss same as the old boss.

Perhaps, in addition to a better latch design, the aircraft should be designed with a section of 'tear-away' skin which would halt the tear at a preset location, before damaging the structure....
Good idea.

would like to either link to some of the ejection material you have on your site, or preferably copy some of it over to my site and edit it slightly, of course with your prior approval. I would also provide a link back to your site and an email link if you desire. Please let me know if this interests you... Thanks!

Great, use all of it you want, copy or whatever and links are fine. The ejection is the motive for my cargo door effort, it is to repay Mr. Butler for saving my life 30 years ago. I owe 30 years to him.

Did you read the Navy accident report? and my narrative? The Navy report has good stuff on landing location of the items. I flew across the Atlantic and after landing noticed someone had safety wired the knee restraints to the seat so I could not have separated from the seat had I ejected. And I once flew and while orbiting the ship looked down and say I had forgotten to remove the pins so the ejections handles would not have worked had I used them. Got away with the two problems but scary after. They have dummy ejection seat fam seats at Navy air bases. You can get a free ride possibly by just asking. It is a real kick.

Nice web site.

Cheers,
Barry Smith

From: gordonh <gordonh@tpgi.com.au>
Date: October 17, 1997 8:28:13 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Crv
Reply-To: gordonh@tpgi.com.au

Hi,
    I was wondering if you could tell me where i could get any CRV recordings of crashes if you could tell me it would be greatly appreciated :)

Regards DAL

DAL_NET@hotmail.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 18, 1997 10:54:52 AM PDT
To: gordonh@tpgi.com.au
Subject: Re: Crv

Hi,
    I was wondering if you could tell me where i could get any CRV recordings of crashes if you could tell me it would be greatly appreciated :)

Regards DAL
DAL_NET@hotmail.com

http://web.inter.NL.net/users/H.Ranter/

Has some, it's a good site with good links too. Good luck,
Sincerely,
John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 18, 1997 11:14:15 AM PDT
To: minnie@digysis.net
Subject: cargo door

Hello, saw your post on Discovery forum. Check out www.corazon.com for more cargo door stuff. You were right.
Sincerely, John Barry Smith

From: "Gary Spewak" <gspewak@co.camden.nj.us>
Date: October 18, 1997 4:20:41 PM PDT
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Boeing 747

Dear Barry:

My eight year old son LOVES jet aircraft and wishes to become a pilot. He wants to fly a 747, in general. A 747-600X or 747-700X, in particular. He owns Microsoft Flight Simulator and seems a capable pilot for his age.
Please help me. He brought home a book from school with pictures of both a Boeing 747-600X and a 747-700X. I cannot find any information on the internet relating to those particular models. Boeing 747-400 seems to be the most popular and a 747-200 is mentioned. Do you know of any web sites that we can visit? I've about worn out my search engines looking.

Thank you much.

From: Bjaminash@aol.com
Date: October 20, 1997 7:25:30 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: 747 crashes

what were the causes of these wrecks, pilot error or maintense error or equiptment failure?

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 20, 1997 9:53:34 AM PDT
To: Bjaminash@aol.com
Subject: Re: 747 crashes

what were the causes of these wrecks, pilot error or maintense error or equiptment failure?
Don't know why the cargo door opened in flight.

Sincerely, John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 20, 1997 9:56:01 AM PDT
To: "Gary Spewak" <gspewak@co.camden.nj.us>
Subject: Re: Boeing 747

Dear Barry:

My eight year old son LOVES jet aircraft and wishes to become a pilot. He wants to fly a 747, in general. A 747-600X or 747-700X, in particular. He owns Microsoft Flight Simulator and seems a capable pilot for his age.

Please help me. He brought home a book from school with pictures of both a Boeing 747-600X and a 747-700X. I cannot find any information on the internet relating to those particular models. Boeing 747-400 seems to be the most popular and a 747-200 is mentioned. Do you know of any web sites that we can visit? I've about worn out my search engines looking.

Thank you much.

http://www.corazon.com/747historycontents.html
but nothing on the 600 or 700X, sorry.

Sincerely,
John Barry Smith

From: Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com
Date: October 24, 1997 11:36:30 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: CVRs and FDRs

Barry,

I hope you saw that I linked your article off the main page of my site. I actually will add a line or two more to mention your short seat stories, when I get the chance.

A month or so ago I sent the attached email to Aviation Week. They just called to verify that I exist and told me that it will be published in the next few weeks!

Kevin

Thanks again!
For Correspondence column:

I have studied the reports on many air crashes and have a suggestion.
One of the primary problems faced by the crash review boards such as
the NTSB is the damage to the Flight Data Recorder and Cockpit Voice
Recorder from the crash and possible fire. What comes to mind in
studying the reports is that the actual impact is less critical than
the incident that causes it. By this I mean that once the aircraft has
left controlled flight, or experienced certain definable circumstances, the FDR and CVR likely contain the information that is
necessary to determine why the event occurred.

Therefore, it would make some sense to define a set of circumstances
that are outside the normal flight envelope of an airliner. These limits could be adjusted for each aircraft type. At a preset limit,
there could be an audible/visual alert in the cockpit to alert the crew that the aircraft is approaching the limit. When the system
detects that the higher 'critical' limit has been reached, the system
could jettison a set of FDR/CVRs that would be equipped with a small parachute, floatation device, and locator beacons. This set of FDR/CVRs should be an adjunct to the original FDR and CVR which would remain with the aircraft until impact.

This would provide several benefits. First, this set of FDR/CVR should escape impact and fire damage. Second, as the set would descend away from the wreckage, it should be easier to detect than the set that is buried in the wreckage of a large aircraft. Third, since it would be equipped with a ELT beacon, activated on jettison, the crash location and time would be more likely to be pinpointed than in the normal case where the plane merely disappears from the scope. Fourth, the floatation device would enable a crash over water to be located more quickly, and provide for rapid retrieval of the data.

Unfortunately, the only benefit to the passenger and crews of an airliner so equipped would be the quicker location of the crash, albeit it is possible for an aircraft to travel some distance from the jettisoning of the FDR/CVR package. If the ELT was encoded with a different tone to indicate that it was a remote beacon, this should
not mislead rescuers. The main benefit of this system would be to increase understanding of how the flight got out of control, and thus educate other aviators to the possible dangers.

It is true that in some crashes, such as Korea Air 801, this concept would provide no information not available from the normal FDR and CVR, but in the case of say TWA flight 800, some of the information from the CVR and FDR would have been available to the NTSB within hours of the crash. This may not have provided the clues needed to understand what occurred, but it is possible that in some crash, some day it could.

Kevin M. Coyne
31 Devon Ave.
Croton-on-Hudson, NY 10520
(718)-260-4250 (days)
kcoyne@bestweb.net
http://www.bestweb.net/~kcoyne/eject.htm

Please withhold street and phone #
Subject: Re: CVRs and FDRs

Dear Kevin, yes, saw link and read story. Wonderful. The seat saved my life pure and simple. Ejection for FDR and CVR. Sure, and first make it a video recorder and about a hundred other inputs too. The whole FDR and CVR package should be a test plane mode recorder, have everything. They don't want to admit planes crash and won't prepare fully for it.

Below earlier email was sent and returned, don't know if you got it.

Cheers, Barry

I hope you saw that I linked your article off the main page of my site. I actually will add a line or two more to mention your short seat stories, when I get the chance.
The original message was received at Thu, 16 Oct 1997 20:09:00 -0700
from mail.redshift.com [165.227.94.16]

----- The following addresses had transient non-fatal errors -----
<Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com>

----- Transcript of session follows ----- 
451 <Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com>... reply: read error from bmt.tdc.com. 
<Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com>... Deferred: Connection reset by bmt.tdc.com. 
Warning: message still undelivered after 4 hours 
Will keep trying until message is 5 days old

Reporting-MTA: dns; smtp.redshift.net 
Arrival-Date: Thu, 16 Oct 1997 20:09:00 -0700

Final-Recipient: RFC822; Kevin_Coyne@tdc.com 
Action: delayed 
Status: 4.4.2
Remote-MTA: dns; bmt.tdc.com 
Last-Attempt-Date: Fri, 17 Oct 1997 00:21:16 -0700
Will-Retry-Until: Tue, 21 Oct 1997 20:09:00 -0700

Return-Path: barry@corazon.com 
Received: from mail.redshift.com (mail.redshift.com
Within hours, based on the witness testimony I began to suspect a catastrophic MECHANICAL failure.

Me too, and we are both right.

I believe, however that the failures had three distinct separate causes.

For crashes and could be four causes, 103 182 811 and 800 all had door pop and why door popped could be four reasons.

the overpressure forced open the inadequate latches on the cargo door. In UAL 811, the latch failure is not defined.
Yes it is, chafing wires shorted on fuselage and turned motor on which overrode safety locks and unlatched door which popped. Could be same reason for the other three.

Ever since the Comet crashes, pressurized aircraft have been punctured time and again with relatively predictable results...

New boss same as the old boss.

Perhaps, in addition to a better latch design, the aircraft should be designed with a section of 'tear-away' skin which would halt the tear at a preset location, before damaging the structure....

Good idea.

would like to either link to some of the ejection material you have on your site, or preferably copy some of it over to my site and edit it slightly, of course with your prior approval. I would also provide a link back to your site and an email link if you desire. Please let
me
know if this interests you... Thanks!

Great, use all of it you want, copy or whatever and links are fine. The
ejection is the motive for my cargo door effort, it is to repay Mr. Butler
for saving my life 30 years ago. I owe 30 years to him. Did you read the Navy accident report? and my narrative? The Navy report
has good stuff on landing location of the items. I flew across the Atlantic
and after landing noticed someone had safety wired the knee restraints to
the seat so I could not have separated from the seat had I ejected. And I
once flew and while orbiting the ship looked down and say I had forgotten
to remove the pins so the ejections handles would not have worked had I
used them. Got away with the two problems but scary after. They have dummy
ejection seat fam seats at Navy air bases. You can get a free ride possibly
by just asking. It is a real kick.

Nice web site.

Cheers,

Barry Smith
Barry,

I hope you saw that I linked your article off the main page of my site. I actually will add a line or two more to mention your short seat stories, when I get the chance.

A month or so ago I sent the attached email to Aviation Week. They just called to verify that I exist and told me that it will be published in the next few weeks!

Kevin

Thanks again!

For Correspondence column:

I have studied the reports on many air crashes and have a
suggestion.

One of the primary problems faced by the crash review boards such as the NTSB is the damage to the Flight Data Recorder and Cockpit Voice Recorder from the crash and possible fire. What comes to mind in studying the reports is that the actual impact is less critical than the incident that causes it. By this I mean that once the aircraft has left controlled flight, or experienced certain definable circumstances, the FDR and CVR likely contain the information that is necessary to determine why the event occurred.

From: "George Richardson" <Gulfairs@ihug.co.nz>
Date: October 28, 1997 11:09:17 AM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: b747 breakups.

<html><html><head></head><BODY bgcolor="#FFFFFF"><p><font size=2 color="#FF0000" face="Arial">Barry I am an ex B747-200 jockey,<br>how does the station 43 (or what ever number it is) failure stack up against an inadvertant door latch failure.<br>I have always maintained that the Air India and TWA were straight unadulterated inflight structural failures,( hushed up by Boeing)<br>which is a good reason for not even having an "Ah shit" on the cvr.<br>Regards,<br>George Richardson.</font></p></BODY></html>
From: "George Richardson" <Gulfairs@ihug.co.nz>  
Date: October 28, 1997 11:09:17 AM PST  
To: <barry@corazon.com>  
Subject: b747 breakups.

<html><html><head></head><BODY bgcolor="#FFFFFF"><p><font size=2 color="#FF0000" face="Arial">Barry I am an ex B747-200 jockey,<br>how does the station 43 (or what ever number it is) failure stack up against an inadvertant door latch failure.<br>I have always maintained that the Air India and TWA were straight unadulterated inflight structural failures,( hushed up by Boeing)<br>which is a good reason for not even having an &quot;Ah shit&quot; on the cvr.<br>Regards,<br>George Richardson.</font></p></BODY></html>

From: Wayty@aol.com  
Date: October 28, 1997 2:18:17 PM PST  
To: barry@corazon.com  
Subject: Your B747 pages

Hello Barry,  
I just want to say I was most impressed at the way you have put together these accounts of B747 accidents.  
I currently fly the B737-400 and have been in aviation ( MIL and CIV ) for 37 years (25,000 hrs) so I know a little of the subject !  
I have not read all your accounts and references, but what I have read is
creditable.
Should you need a contact such as I, you need only email me.
I shall watch out for more of your work - well done Sir.

Best regards,

Bryn Wayt
Captain
British Airways

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 28, 1997 6:16:10 PM PST
To: Wayty@aol.com
Subject: Encouragement

Well, thank you sir. I am heartened, really. The educated and experienced, such as yourself, agree generally with the line of thought. The uneducated and unexperienced, which I see a lot, violently disagree.

Should you need a contact such as I, you need only email me.

Thank you, I welcome a pilot with an open mind. PA 103 is the one that is the hot button. If you take the time to peruse the AAIB I would be glad to go through the evidence with you. Bomb is weak, door is strong. And the report says improvised explosive device, not bomb, and the cargo door, is in fact, an improvised explosive device. So the British precision in language is effective.

If you know anyone in safety authority or pilot union who is
willing to talk about 103 from an evidence point of view, lead him to me.

The goal of course is to prevent death by preventing crashes by preventing mechanical fault by preventing inadvertent opening of cargo doors in flight. It seems the goal of others involved is not that but money or power.

By the way, I was born in Birkenhead in 1944 and my parents emigrated in 1946. I still have a British passport and my relatives are still in England.

103 distresses me much because the AAIB error prone report washes away the precedent Comet investigation which was find out what happened. And of course, the new boss is the same as the old boss, rupture of pressurized hull at weak spot after repeated pressurizations.

Thanks for encouragement.

Cheers,
Barry

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 29, 1997 10:02:22 AM PST
To: "George Richardson" <Gulfairs@ihug.co.nz>
Subject: Press kit
Below links show in NTSB pictures and text show TWA 800 fuselage blowout at cargo door area. Other aircraft accidents are matched also. Your experience will enable you to identify the cargo door area. Note round rupture circle.

http://www.corazon.com/crashcontentspagelinks.html

Click on 'Newest page'. http://www.corazon.com/presskit.html

http://www.corazon.com/800foreafthorreconweb.html

http://www.corazon.com/doorpixweb.html

http://www.corazon.com/reasoning.html

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

From: "George Richardson" <Gulfairs@ihug.co.nz>
Date: October 29, 1997 9:55:16 PM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: b747 breakup.

<html><html><head></head><BODY bgcolor="#FFFFFF"><p><font size=2 color="#FF0000" face="Arial">Barry,\nI was discussing your web site at a large FBO in NZ yesterday, and one of the the FBO managements acquaintances is associated with aircraft insurance ( heavy aircraft)\nHe advised me that TWA have yet to file a claim for TWA 800.\nIs this true??\nIf so what in the hell is going on in Uncle Sams brain waves.\nRegards,\ngeorge.\nPS I retired from
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: October 29, 1997 10:09:16 PM PST
To: "George Richardson" <Gulfairs@ihug.co.nz>
Subject: Re: b747 breakup.

Barry, I was discussing your web site at a large FBO in NZ yesterday, and one of the the FBO managements acquaintances is associated with aircraft insurance( heavy aircraft)He advised me that TWA have yet to file a claim for TWA 800. Is this true?? If so what in the hell is going on in Uncle Sams brain waves.Regards, george. PS I retired from ANZ in 1985 having flown -200 series.

I don't know about insurance claims. The whole thing stinks because the first thing they think about is blame and money and not fixing the problem. 1985, Air India 182 was in June it was a -237 and it was cargo door popping, the first. But the Indians didn't like the Singhs so they were the terrorists who planted a bomb. The AI 182 Indian and Canadian report on on web site. Very interesting reading. Essentially they said a bomb blew out cargo door. The same insurance company that had PA 103 had TWA 800, US aviation underwriters. They are still paying out claims on 103, eight years later. The previous CEO of US Aviation is in jail for fraud over another plane crash. The whole thing stinks. The lawyer Lee Kriendler who got 500 million from insurance on PA 103 being a bomb has the theory of streak being leaking fuel for TWA 800 and months later the NTSB believes him and now agrees. Can you believe it, a streak as leaking fuel
on fire. Ever see flame from a plane going 300 knots? I have. It's straight behind the plane and it goes out without a constant ignition source. We did in with afterburners on RA-5C dumping fuel. Not a streak.

Door, so obvious, so simple, so boring, so historically accurate, so documented, so ignored.

Cheers,
Barry

From: GBTZ00B@prodigy.com (MR THOMAS J KELLY JR)
Date: October 30, 1997 1:03:07 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: TWA 800

AFTER READING THIS MIS-INFORMATION I FIND IT VERY HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW ANYBODY CAN MAKE STATEMENTS LIKE YOU DID WITH NO SOLID INFORMATION ONLY PURE SPECULATION. CARGO DOOR ????? GET REAL, READ THE FACTS AND CLEAN UP THIS PAGE.

From: gi6x@p1zplm.net
Date: October 31, 1997 9:45:16 AM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: #1 Aviation Database on the Net
Reply-To: user122@ybecker.net

Check out the #1 Aviation Database on the Net! Inventory listing
My name is Erik C. Huey, from Chicago. I found out about your site from David Evans at Phillips Business International, who passed on to me a copy of an e-mail of URL's about your site and your cargo door theory regarding TW #800. Your site is very full of information, pertinent information that makes sense. I spent about 2-3 hours on your site and printed out info. on this theory and am wondering why this theory has not been talked about in the mainstream media nor among NTSB investigators at all? Your research and conclusions make sense, and the findings from similar crashes/incidents seem to lead in this direction also.

It will be interesting to see if this or any other new theories come to light at the NTSB hearings in early December.
Sincerely,

Erik C. Huey
Free-lance Aviation Journalist
Chicago, IL.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 1, 1997 6:47:05 PM PST
To: gerihuey@bgu.edu
Subject: Re: Your web site and cargo door theory

My name is Erik C. Huey, from Chicago.

Hi Erik. I'm Barry.

Your site is very full of information, pertinent information that makes sense.

Yeah, that's important, makes sense. Not entertaining, even boring, but makes sense.

I am wondering why this theory has not been talked about in the mainstream media nor among NTSB investigators at all?

Ask them please. I believe it's because they saw latched latches and ruled out door failure. Too bad. My current position is
fuselage rupture at cargo door area as supported by attached NTSB photo with my annotations. Why door ruptured has always been open to debate, I postulated unlatched latches as one of many possibilities.

I've included below a letter to FAA I just sent.

As a aviation writer, I will say you are sitting on the story of a lifetime. This 800 cargo door is small compared to implications for AI 182 and PA 103. It is literally billions of dollars shifting hands and power moving back and forth among nations.

Cheers, and say Hi to David for me.

Barry Smith

Bob Brenerman,
Aerospace Engineer,
Federal Aviation Administration
Transport Airplane Directorate, ANM-100
1601 Lind Ave. S.W.
Renton, WA 98055-4056
(206) 227-2100
Ron Wojnar, Manager
Darrell Pederson, Assistant Manager

Dear Mr. Brenerman,
Thank you for your telephone call on Thursday, 30 Oct 1997. You told me that a letter had been sent to me from FAA about my concerns about the forward cargo door area in Boeing 747s rupturing in flight.

We were able to chat for a few minutes about the crash of TWA 800 and others. You were able to tell me that:
1. The bottom sill of the forward cargo door is intact and attached to fuselage skin but in several pieces.
2. The bottom latches are latched around the locking pins.
3. AD 88-12-04 was implemented in TWA 800 including all other ADs.
4. The nose hit the water on the right side and caused inward hydraulic impact damage in door area.
5. The door did not open in flight.
6. The door was found with nose debris and did not come off first.
7. Admiral who said door was found first was wrong because metal piece was misidentified underwater.
8. Nose came off at station 741.
9. You didn't scrutinize the paint smears on TWA 800 reconstruction photo.
10. PA 103 and AI 182 were inflight breakups and would show similar evidence but were proven to be bombs.
11. NTSB has tagged each piece of metal of wreckage and it's plotted.
12. You referred my photos to NTSB for reply.
13. A letter is coming to me from FAA explaining the above.

Well, sir, that was a lot and thank you again for chatting with me. For the first time in a year and a quarter I was able to hold a scientific conversation about TWA 800 with a government authority. As an engineer and commercial pilot we respect
science. I contend fuselage rupture at cargo door area is all science which means it is reproducible and explainable.

Your statement of inward damage to the cargo door area from impact with water took me aback as I have not heard that before. I have had time to digest that information and wish to reply in this letter. I invite you to have a scientific discussion with me about metal and wreckage and air pressure. I'm not an engineer but a pilot with aerodynamic background.

I understand your sequence of events. Essentially it is center tank explosion of unknown origin, nose comes off at station 741, plane falls and later fireball and destruction. The nose falls intact and alone on right side into water which hydraulic impact pushes metal skin into and past the stringers and bulkheads in cargo door area while leaving port side smooth and intact. Forward cargo door is in pieces from this impact and is in debris field of nose. The lower part of door has latches which are latched and attached to bottom sill of frame indicating door did not open in flight.

Do you understand my sequence? Did you go to my extensive web site which documents my explanation? To present such a complex sequence concisely is difficult but I will try.

Fuselage ruptures at forward cargo door area for unknown reason. Nose comes off at station 741, plane falls and later fireball and destruction. The nose falls intact and alone on right side onto water which gives hydraulic impact damage to nose gear doors which drives them inward. When fuselage ruptures at 13700 feet the skin is burst outward and the red painted metal on door is slammed against white painted area between windows above the door and red paint is transferred leaving red smears only above rupture area. Fireball is ignited by flaming foddered engine number three at 7500 feet. Sudden loud sound is explosive decompression when fuselage ruptures. Streak is shiny metal piece of door spinning away reflecting evening sunlight to ground observers. Missing bodies were ingested into number
three engine. Abrupt power cut when cargo hold floor is severely disrupted. Nose comes off when huge hole appears in side of nose and 300 knot wind tears it off.
I offer that the fuselage rupture explanation explains all the evidence of streak, sudden loud sound, abrupt power cut, debris pattern, and many other observed events. I will be glad to go over them one by one with you. Center tank explosion as initial event leaves too many contradictory conclusions such as autopsies with no burns, abrupt singed areas on fuselage skin, soundless explosion, no ignition source, etc.
As an engineer and pilot we understand the enormous internal forces of 4 pounds per square inch on a nine foot by ten foot outward opening door and the incredible power of 300 knots of slipstream on a weakened airframe. I trust you respect reality which means things you can see, touch, hear, and feel. In that regard, let me attempt to rebut the inward impact damage at cargo door area conclusion with the following reality which can be checked out:
If we look closely at NTSB TWA 800 reconstruction photograph there are red paint smears on the white paint between windows alongside the fuselage. These red paint smears are only above and slightly aft of the forward door. The cargo door normally has red paint on it. The space between the windows normally had white paint. The between window spaces now have red paint smears on them in the reconstruction. This indicates the red colored metal below expanded upward and struck the white painted area and transferred the red to the white. If the damage had been caused by inward action of water impact there would be no red paint smears on the white paint between the windows. But there are many smears and that is consistent with rupture outward, not inward.
Let us assume that the forward cargo door was latched and rode nose down to the water. That rules out FBI innocently altering
latches searching for explosive residue in their lab, or a mistaken identity with the identical aft cargo door, and confusion with any other of the twelve doors on the 747. Because the door was latched does not mean there was not a fuselage rupture at the cargo door area. In fact, I believe the picture shows such a rupture in the shattered right side forward of the wing. I don't have three dimensions but it appears to be a round outward rupture hole at lower left of cargo door. Doors can open at places other than where they are supposed to. The damage on the right side is consistent with an outward opening rupture. It does not look like impact damage because it is located only around the cargo door and not far above it or aft. Of course the entire nose is not reconstructed nor is the NTSB photo complete with part of the extreme forward part missing so it is difficult to make definite conclusions based on observations of pictures, as you said in your call. Hands on examination is needed and you have that opportunity.

I am very familiar with AI 182 and PA 103 and 'they' did not 'prove' a bomb was the cause. On the contrary the evidence is very flimsy and could have gone either way of structural failure or bomb. AI 182 had structural failure as cause but said it was bomb that blew out the forward cargo hold on the right side without naming the door. AI 182 door description on the bottom of the ocean matches TWA 800 door area NTSB photo. PA 103 reconstruction drawing matches UAL 811 after landing with huge hole in side.

The importance of including other similar accidents is to group them and then draw conclusions based upon deductions. I did not choose the flight numbers; they were included only because of the evidence of sudden loud sound on CVR, inflight damage, abrupt power cut, and many more significant similarities. If you know of any more high time Boeing 747s that have a fatal accident centered near the forward cargo hold that left a sudden
loud sound, an abrupt power cut, foded engines, missing bodies, and forward door in pieces, and I'll include them in the group. So far it's only AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800. As an aerospace engineer do you not welcome a possible scientific explanation for an aviation event rather than shadowy conspiracy Sikh terrorists or evil foreign secret agents?

But to talk of AI 182 and PA 103 is fraught with emotion and difficult without the reports to point to specific items. But let us at least agree that AI 182 and PA 103 and UAL 811 and TWA 800 all had inflight structural problem starting forward of the leading edge of the wing, with three of them pinpointing to forward cargo hold.

I checked TWA 800 station 741 nose separation point on PA 103 and it matches too. Both noses came off at same point on fuselage give or take a few inches.

To be specific about TWA 800 cargo door:
1. Is it confirmed it is forward and not aft or other latches?
2. Are all latches accounted for? There are eight below and one on each side for total of ten.
3. Are all latches latched around locking pins? If only one unlatches that may be sufficient for internal pressure to bulge out door into slipstream when ultimate destructive force of 300 knots tears door away and nose off.
4. Mid span latches are particularly critical as rupture appears to be in middle of door.
5. Where are the missing pieces of the door? Only about 20 percent of the door is in reconstruction. The missing portions may be the pieces that fell first and closest to event site and still unfound.

To say forward cargo door was latched is not sufficient to rule out rupture at cargo door area as initial event for TWA 800 because:
1. Not all latches are accounted for.
2. Most of door still missing.
3. Rupture can occur with a latched door but failure at corners or middle.
4. Description of TWA 800 door area matches AI 182 door area which had door attached to fuselage skin which was explained as fuselage rupture at forward cargo hold (caused by bomb). TWA 800 was thought to be bomb also based upon early evidence which NTSB computer simulation showed baggage spewed forth from forward cargo hold as first event.

I understand the problem NTSB has with that unilateral damage on right side because a center tank explosion should give bilateral damage and doesn't. So the water impact explanation is offered. If damage at cargo door area is inward then no rupture and if latches latched then no door opening.

What can be done to persuade you that rupture occurred? What evidence is there to examine? Can you confirm the direction of the metal in the forward cargo door area of TWA 800? Is that scientifically possible? If it is outward will you reconsider your conclusion of not door failure? I point to the red paint smears as evidence to warrant such an effort at confirmation of metal direction, in or out.

If you should find that the right side damage is outward and not inward, or not all of the latches or pieces of door are accounted for, please reconsider your conclusion that the door area did not fail in flight and rupture.

Please establish a dialogue with me. My email is barry@corazon.com and I can send and receive high resolution color photographs via email. My web site has accident reports from DC-10 to B747 and others to support cargo door fuselage rupture. I've attached some of the web page analysis for your consideration.

I apologize for any name misspellings; my hearing is shot from thousands of hours in recips and jets and I may have heard names
wrong on the phone. I may have heard other statements wrong too and that is why I prefer writing to talking such as this letter and email. Please correct any misstatements I may have made.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

From: ALLEN John  <jallen@gcc.DHL.COM>
Date: November 3, 1997 7:22:21 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: 747 Crash List

Barry,

Is there some reason for which you have excluded the 1974 crash of a Pan Am 747 on Bali, Indonesia, from your list?

Regards,

John
jallen@gcc.dhl.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 3, 1997 9:15:52 AM PST
To: ALLEN John  <jallen@gcc.DHL.COM>
Subject: Re: 747 Crash List

Barry,
Is there some reason for which you have excluded the 1974 crash of a Pan Am 747 on Bali, Indonesia, from your list?

What Bali crash? My records don't show it. Closest to Bali is below.
Cheers, Barry

# 19) 19.02.89 (06.36) Boeing 747-249F N807FT (21828/408) Flying Tiger Line
4 fatalities / 4 occupants +
Location: Kuala Lumpur; 7.5 mls (Malaysia) Nature: Freight
Phase: Final Approach from:
to: Kuala Lumpur-Subang IAP Flightnr.: FT66
The Boeing crashed into a wooded hillside, while on an NDB approach to Runway 33. The aircraft had descended 1800ft below minimum altitude and collided with a hill at 600ft MSL.
PROBABLE CAUSE: Non-standard phraseology was used by Kuala Lumpur ATC, causign the the crew to misinterpret the instructions.
Source: ICAO Adrep Summary;
AW&ST 27.02.89 (24); FI 17- 12.01.90 (44)

# 2) 23.07.73 () Boeing 747-246B JA-8109 (20503/180) Japan Air Lines - JAL
0 fatalities / 0 occupants +
Location: Benghazi-Benina
(Libya) Nature: Scheduled Passenger
Phase: Ground from:
Amsterdam-Schiphol APT to: Anchorage IAP Flightnr.: JA404
Flight 404 was hijacked by 4 men and a woman, shortly after leaving Amsterdam. The woman hijacker got killed in an accidental explosion of the explosive device she was carrying. The aircraft landed at Dubai and later took off for Damascus and Benghazi. All passengers and crew were released and the aircraft blown up.

Source:

# 3) 20.11.74 (ca. 07:50) Boeing 747-130 D-ABYB (19747/29)
Lufthansa
59 fatalities / 157 occupants
+

Location: Nairobi-Wilson APT (Kenya) Nature: Scheduled Passenger
Phase: Take-off from:
Nairobi-Wilson APT to: Johannesburg-Jan Smuts APT Flightnr.: LH540

Boeing 747 D-ABYB was taking off for the last leg of the Frankfurt-Nairobi- Johannesburg flight when the crew felt vibration or buffeting following lift off. The captain, suspecting wheel imbalance, raised the gear. A lack of acceleration forced the crew to lower the nose in order to maintain airspeed. The Boeing continued to descend however and contacted the ground 1120m past the end of Runway 24 and struck an elevated road 114m further on. The
aircraft broke up and caught fire before coming to rest 454m past the initial point of impact.

PROBABLE CAUSE: "The accident was caused by the crew initiating a take-off with the leading edge flaps retracted because the pneumatic system which operates them had not been switched on. This resulted in the aircraft becoming airborne in a partially stalled condition which the pilots did not identify in the short time available to them for recovery. Major contributory factors were the lack of warning of a critical condition of leading edge flap position and the failure of the crew to complete satisfactorily their checklist items."

Source:

# 4) 12.06.75 () Boeing 747-128 N28888 (20542/201) Air France
0 fatalities / 394 occupants + Location: Bombay (India)
Nature: Scheduled Passenger Phase: Take-off from:
Bombay to: Flightnr.: During a 180° turn at the beginning of Runway 27 the No.11 tire (on the right hand maingear) failed. During take-off the no.12 tire also failed. Wheels and braking assembly then started rubbing the runway, causing a fire. The take-off was aborted. Initial delay in shutting down the engines and an improper deployment of fire services caused the fire to spread.
Barry,

Re:
Is there some reason for which you have excluded the 1974 crash of a Pan Am 747 on Bali, Indonesia, from your list?

What Bali crash? My records don't show it. Closest to Bali is below.
Cheers, Barry

Thanks for all of the details, but none are of the flight I am referring to.

I regret that I do not know the flight number, but if I find it, I will send it to you. It has been a long time, but I remember it as having been the first fatal accident in the 747: prior to that time, no accident had taken so many lives. Your list made me question that memory.
It was a Pan Am flight, landing on the Indonesian Island of Bali, April 22, 1974. The plane crashed into the mountain-side, and all aboard were killed. There is a monument to the accident on the Island now.

There were no investigative results generally made available to the families of the victims, though I have heard from a flight attendant who was with PA at the time, that the airline blamed weather conditions and pilot error.

You seem to be quite an expert; what do you make of this?

Regards,

John

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 4, 1997 9:19:14 AM PST
To: ALLEN John <jallen@gcc.DHL.COM>
Subject: Re: 747 Crash List

Barry,
Re:
Is there some reason for which you have excluded the 1974 crash of
a Pan Am 747 on Bali, Indonesia, from your list?

What Bali crash? My records don't show it. Closest to Bali is below.
Cheers, Barry

Thanks for all of the details, but none are of the flight I am referring to.

I regret that I do not know the flight number, but if I find it, I will send it to you. It has been a long time, but I remember it as having been the first fatal accident in the 747: prior to that time, no accident had taken so many lives. Your list made me question that memory.

It was a Pan Am flight, landing on the Indonesian Island of Bali, 22 April, 1974. The plane crashed into the mountain-side, and all aboard were killed. There is a monument to the accident on the Island now.

There were no investigative results generally made available to the families of the victims, though I have heard from a flight attendant who was with PA at the time, that the airline blamed weather conditions and pilot error.
You seem to be quite an expert; what do you make of this?

Regards,

John

I think it was a 707.

http://web.inter.NL.net/users/H.Ranter/

Pago Pago

# 17) 30.01.74 (23.41 AST) Boeing 707-321B

American World Airways

N454PA (19376/661) Pan

occupants: 10 crew + 91

passengers = 101.

fatalities: 10 crew + 87

passengers = 97.

location: Pago Pago (USA)

nature: Scheduled Passenger

phase: Final Approach

flight PA806 - Pago Pago-

PROBABLE CAUSE: "The flightcrew's late recognition, and failure to correct in a timely manner, an excessive descent rate which developed as a result of the aircraft's penetration through destabilizing wind changes. The winds consisted
of horizontal and vertical components produced by a heavy rainstorm and influenced by uneven terrain close to the aircraft's approach path. The captain's recognition was hampered by restricted visibility, the illusory effects of a "blackhole" approach, inadequate monitoring of flight instruments, and the failure of the crew to call out descent rate during the last 15 seconds of flight."

(NTSB-AAR-77-7)

Source:

or April 74
# 38) 22.04.74 (15.30 GMT) Boeing 707-321B N446PA (19268/544) Pan American World Airways occupants: 11 crew + 96 passengers = 107. fatalities: 11 crew + 96 passengers = 107. location: Denpasar; 42mls NW (Indonesia) nature: Scheduled Passenger phase: Initial Approa flight PA812 Hon Kong-Kai Tak APT - Denpasar-Ngurah Rai APT The aircraft crashed into a mountain while preparing for a Runway 09 approach to Denpasar after a 4h20m flight from Hong Kong.

PROBABLE CAUSE: "The premature execution of a right-hand
turn to join the 263 degrees outbound track which was based on the indication given by only one of the ADFs while the other one was still in steady condition"

Source:

or first crash of 747
# 104) 20.11.74 (ca. 07:50) Boeing 747-130 D-ABYB (19747/29) Lufthansa
Boeing 747 D-ABYB was taking off for the last leg of the Frankfurt-Nairobi- Johannesburg flight when the crew felt vibration or buffeting following lift off. The captain, suspecting wheel imbalance, raised the gear.

A lack of acceleration forced the crew to lower the nose in order to maintain airspeed. The Boeing continued to descend however and contacted the ground 1120m past the end of Runway 24 and struck an
elevated road 114m further on. The aircraft broke up and caught fire before coming to rest 454m past the initial point of impact.

PROBABLE CAUSE: "The accident was caused by the crew initiating a take-off with the leading edge flaps retracted because the pneumatic system which operates them had not been switched on. This resulted in the aircraft becoming airborne in a partially stalled condition which the pilots did not identify in the short time available to them for recovery. Major contributory factors were the lack of warning of a critical condition of leading edge flap position and the failure of the crew to complete satisfactorily their checklist items."

Source:

or Indonesia
flight PA812 Hon Kong-Kai
Tak APT - Denpasar-Ngurah Rai APT
The aircraft crashed into a
mountain while preparing for a Runway 09 approach to Denpasar
after a
4h20m flight from Hong Kong.
PROBABLE CAUSE: "The premature execution of a right-hand
turn to
join the 263 degrees outbound
track which was based on the indication given by only one of the
ADFs
while the other one was still in
steady condition"
Source:

So, John, above is in Indonesia, it is in 1974, it is Pan Am and it
is Boeing and did crash into mountain. What do you think?

Cheers, Barry

From: ALLEN John <jallen@gcc.DHL.COM>
Date: November 4, 1997 10:08:54 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: 747 Crash List

Barry,

I certainly appreciate your examination, and the exhaustive
details.
I can see that I was mistaken about the type of aircraft.
Thank you very much indeed,

John

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 10, 1997 7:23:21 AM PST
To: anzu@twics.com
Subject: Re: Pan Am 103

Particularly there are the reports the South African Foreign Minister Pik Botha was warned to stay off the flight, and actually changed his plans (though one UN diplomat apparently was not). Do you know if there are true reports or not?

Dear Jens Wilkinson,

Nope. You'll have to talk the conspiracy boys about that.

Also, the issue of the "Toshiba radio." From your page it appears that this was not in the official report, but newspapers speak of it as if it were fact. Do you know where the reference is to the radio?

None in AAIB. They never say bomb either. You'll have to talk to the conspiracy boys about that.

The closest I can find to bomb is the 'rather large shotgun' description of blast damage by investigator. Shotgun is directed,
bomb is spherical. 25 inches from fuselage giving 25 inch
diameter hole is also described by the person who looked at
reconstructed damage. That short directed blast with small result
will not bring down a 747. 'Relatively mild blast' is also quote
from report and I conclude it happened after very large explosive
decompression went off in forward cargo hold where 'rather large
shotgun' might have been, or flares, or diplomatic pouches or
whatever, but no bomb in cassette radio. Also semtex does not
leave soot and they found soot on piece of frame.

Bomb is flimsy. Cargo door is strong. The AAIB report lays out
facts which are accurate, it's the conclusions which don't hold up.
And that's because of hindsight, internet, and similar subsequent
Crashes.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith
of hindsight, internet, and similar subsequent crashes.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

Thanks for the help. I'll have to see what I can find out about the "conspiracy boys," I guess. It seems odd that newspapers keep printing stuff about semtex as if were fact rather than hypothesis. I suppose that few journalists have actually gone through the trouble of reading reports.

Best,
Jens Wilkinson

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 16, 1997 4:33:02 PM PST
To: Melkywey@aol.com
Subject: Meteor guy

Dear Mr. Mielke,

Below is Meteor guy, email him for more data, he's very well organized.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
Greetings Barry:

Got it, Richard Spalding for methane gas.
Yup. Biomass generation under the sea, "burping" out and creating a pillar of gases. Flamefront travels along the path and creates a "streak". He has a little credibility since he works at Sandia. I am aware that the NTSB actually sent someone to interview him.

If the meteor hit TWA 800, where did it hit?

After the meteor ended in an explosive bolide event, the plane flies into a hail of meteorites.

"The fragment strikes the right side of the fuselage above the window beltline at a downward angle of 27 degrees and a horizontal angle of 135 degrees to the right of the aircraft's centerline. The initial impact penetrates the outer fuselage, enters the main cabin at row 27 and punctures the floor of the cabin at row 24. "

There may well have been other strikes - excising a chunk off the far end of one wing, and another striking the front wheel hydraulic actuator.

The quote above is from the abstract of my paper, attached below along with the text I sent to Congressman Traficant's office. They have contacted me to request a copy of the full paper. I also am taking the liberty of sending you three gifs which detail one possible scenario. (mucho bandwidth, please excuse my enthusiasm :)

I should mention in passing that I do enjoy your posts to the Flight 800 group. I admire your energy; I gave up debating with the conspiracists long ago. I agree that ignorance and personal agendas are operational in the investigation, not a cover-up. I continue to be amazed at their ability to run up blind alleys and retreat to yet another.

Best wishes,
- Michael

-------------

Greetings Congressman Traficant:

Regarding the recent press......

"The abrupt, short noise at the end of the Flight 800
cockpit voice recorder remains unidentified and does not match any previously identified sounds from other accidents and incidents, including bomb explosions."

Perhaps it is something NO ONE THOUGHT OF (or cares to deal with)!

"... despite different angles, offered near-identical reports: a red streak across the horizon, followed by a small red-orange explosion, a bright white ball and a large ball of fire."

'red streak across the horizon' is what I read into many reports, but it is not commonly accepted that it could be anything except "straight up".

" Extensive tests in which various missile warheads were exploded near an aircraft fuselage produced damage patterns 'significantly different from those found in the wreckage of the plan, the NTSB wrote in its letter to lawmakers."

But, there are impact/puncture damage patterns on the aircraft! Has anyone considered small, dense, machete 4+ projectiles from a meteor bolivar?

--------
I am a private individual who has been actively promoting a scientific review of the possibility that the July, 17, 1997 crash of TWA Flight 800 was directly caused by a meteorite. Several areas of research
have been identified which may indicate that a significant bolivar event occurred over the Atlantic that evening. A bolide is characterized by a streak (meteor) in the sky terminating in a bright flash, often generating a "fireworks" spray of smaller objects and smoke.

I have taken the liberty of attaching below a brief overview of my work, along with a gif of the proposed trajectory. Please excuse the bandwith use. If you are interested, I would be happy to supply you with the full paper.

I am very aware that in each area I have explored, the real data is still in the hands of the investigators, and is being held close due to the criminal probe by the FBI. My goal is to enlighten the official investigators as to what to look for in the remote case it had been a meteorite which hit the aircraft. Additionally, I have been attempting to engage scientists in various disciplines to comment on my work with the hope that they would be motivated to contact the NTSB and suggest further review of the evidence with this possibility in mind.

Although the NTSB is now investigating the "High-Speed
Particle Penetration Theory" (their phrase), I have no indication they are looking beyond the physical penetrations. I continue to lobby them to look at the DSP, VLF, sonic boom and infrasonic avenues.

Best wishes

_ Michael Davias
(203) 783-9854
146 High Street #304
Milford, CT 06460

=================================================================
Abstract of the Flight 800 Meteorite Interface Hypothesis
An Interdisciplinary Approach to Solving the TWA Flight 800 Paradox
Draft 8.5 August 29, 1997
By Michael E. Davias mike@cintos.com

"On the evening of Wednesday, July 17, 1996, TWA Flight 800, carrying 212 passengers and 17 crew members, exploded and crashed into the Atlantic Ocean off the coast of Long Island shortly after taking off from New York City's John F. Kennedy International Airport en route to Paris. There were no survivors, and at this time the cause of the crash has not been determined."

--- Federal Bureau of Investigation, July 1996
HYPOTHESIS
This paper proposes that a natural celestial event created a monumental human tragedy: A small asteroid entered the earth's atmosphere, creating a visible meteor event over the Atlantic Ocean, south of Long Island, NY. The meteor was disrupted in a bolide explosion several kilometers above TWA Flight 800, showering the airliner's flight path with a fall of meteorites. The interface between one of these meteorites and TWA Flight 800 caused a catastrophic break-up of the aircraft.

MOTIVATION
At the time of this draft (8/29/97) the investigation into the cause of the TWA Flight 800 accident has been underway for more than a year. During this time enormous sums of money have been expended and many lives put at risk in what seems to be a futile task. Evidence has been collected and evaluated and yet the possible causes being actively investigated continue to be diverse: mechanical failure, a bomb or a missile.

FBI Director Louis Freeh suggested on 5/4/97 that the criminal investigation into the crash of TWA Flight 800 is drawing to a close, because "...the evidence is certainly not moving in the direction of a
terrorist attack. It is in fact moving in the other direction."

The common extrapolation of Mr. Freeh's statement is that the crash must have been due to a catastrophic mechanical failure. But one finds no consensus there, either. Indeed, negating evidence abounds for each of the "official" theories, suggesting that the investigation needs to consider other, less probable, solutions. The extraordinary circumstances surrounding the presentation of available evidence creates a number of paradoxes. The author shall attempt to show that this hypothesis uniquely provides solutions to the paradoxes confronting the investigation.

AUDIENCE
The intended audience for this paper includes the team of official investigators. The NTSB has recently stated publicly that they are reviewing all alternatives, including the meteorite theory.

The author asks that the reader keep an open mind - think "out of the box" - as he reviews the confusing paradoxes which have provided grist for a mill of rumors and accusations. Should the reader consider this presentation to be of merit, it is respectfully requested that the reader contact Mr. Thomas Haueter of the NTSB and request that the meteorite theory be considered.
The NTSB, the FBI and various federal legislative agencies have been provided copies of the author's hypothesis throughout its development. The author has had no personal contact with the investigators, nor has he been the recipient of support from the official investigation team. The author maintains that the meteorite theory has not yet had the considered attention it deserves. The goal of this paper is to encourage that attention.

THE PARADOX LIST
Paradox #1 - A STREAK IN THE SK:
A common proposal suggests that the bright flare seen streaking over the Atlantic moments prior to the crash represents the signature of a missile approaching the aircraft. Yet, it is unlikely that an anti-aircraft missile could have generated a brilliant steak visible in daylight at the distances reported, nor is it likely that it could have traversed such a vast expanse of sky in several seconds.

The hypothesis suggests that the "missile" was actually an exceptionally large "fireball" meteor, providing for a streak in the sky brilliant enough to be visible for 50 kilometers. Traveling at a velocity of many kilometers per second, a meteor could cover the distance
required by the
sightings.

Paradox #2 - MULTIPLE SONIC BOOMS:
Observers along the Atlantic coastline report that they heard and felt
multiple sonic booms at their locations 8 to 12 miles away from the
unfolding event. It is highly unlikely that the fuel conflagration
or the impacts on the ocean's surface would have generated such
forceful blasts over these distances.

The reported series of sonic blasts is consistent with the hypothesized
meteorite fall, those sounds being a well-know signature of a meteorite-producing fireball meteor.

Paradox #3 - TIMING OF "THUNDERCLAPS":
Observers along the Atlantic coastline report that they heard sonic booms
accompanying the visible transit of the aircraft across the sky. Yet,
these observers were located 8 to 12 miles away, a considerable
distance from the unfolding event. It is known that 43 seconds elapsed from the
initial event until the aircraft struck the Atlantic. Any sound created at the initial event would have taken a minimum of 40 seconds to reach the shoreline, arriving just as the aircraft impacted the water.
The hypothesis suggests that the meteorite fall's trajectory brought shock-wave generating objects towards the witnesses at supersonic velocity, allowing the booms to reach them while visual events were still unfolding.

Paradox #4 - PUNCTURES BY HIGH VELOCITY MASSES: The FBI is continuing its investigation into the possible causes of approximately 200 holes found in the Calverton reconstruction. These have been described as holes which do not exhibit "metal bent outward". Forensic examination of these holes has not led to any evidence of a nearby chemical explosion, yet "cookie cutter" holes are most likely to be caused by very high speed projectiles.

The hypothesis predicts that penetration holes from high velocity meteorites would be found in the wreckage. These holes would be the result of either direct impacts along the trajectory, or secondary impacts as a meteorite fragmented upon impact with various structures.

Paradox #5 - CENTRAL WING TANK EXPLOSION: The prevailing official explanations for the crash focus on the Central Wing Tank (CWT). Debris recovered during the investigation suggests that the initiating event was an explosion within this CWT structure.
Yet, despite a massive investigation, no source of ignition has been identified.

The hypothesis suggests that a significant amount of kinetic energy was injected into the CWT by the passage of the meteorite through it, buckling and fracturing the structure, resulting in the conflagration of the CWT's fuel.

Paradox #6 - ASYMMETRIC DAMAGE TO CWT: The common proposal holds that the CWT's 50 lbs of aviation fuel ignited, which damaged the CWT and the fuselage in a catastrophic explosion. Debris recovered during the investigation suggests that this explosion began near the center of the CWT and grew in destructive power as it proceeded asymmetrically along a narrow path of damage, as defined by tank components ejected early in the crash sequence. Yet, it would seem that a vapor explosion should proceed outward in all directions, not along a focused singular path.

On its proposed trajectory, the meteorite struck near the upper center of the CWT and proceeded out the lower left front of the tank. The
evidenced
damage pattern is created as the meteorite punches through the structure at
supersonic velocity. The compromised structural elements became the path
of least resistance as the CWT's fuel burned, overpressurizing the structure.

Paradox #7 - COCKPIT VOICE RECORDER:
The cockpit voice recorder (CVR) has yielded a 120 millisecond burst of
noise at the start of the crash sequence. The official investigators have
stated that an analysis of this "unusual" sound has shown it to be indicative of an explosion moving through the airframe at over 600 meters per second (2,000 ft./sec). Yet, they admit this rate of progression is inconsistent with a fuel explosion, which would not exhibit such high velocity.

The hypothesized meteorite traversing the airframe at a supersonic velocity would generate sounds consistent with those reported.

Paradox #8 - SATELLITE SENSOR READINGS:
The Department of Defense reported that a space-based surveillance system recorded events during the crash of Flight 800. The public explanation is that this was indicative of the fuel conflagration. Yet, the specific satellite system has been tuned to ignore low intensity burning
petrochemicals, suggesting that a high intensity event was detected instead.

These same satellite systems have been excited on numerous previous occasions by fireball meteors and bolide events.

Paradox #9 - NATURE OF THE INVESTIGATION:
Attempts by the NTSB and the FBI to put forward a working theory for the cause of this disaster have repeatedly led to dead ends, as supportive evidence in one area of the investigation was mitigated by contradicting evidence elsewhere. Although currently there are today three official working theories (mechanical, bomb, and missile), the FBI has been suggesting for six months that they are close to ruling out a criminal act as causal. The paradoxical nature is without precedent.

The hypothesis provides a solution which can be correlated with many of the official cause du jour

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED SCENARIO

At approximately 8:30:30 PM EDT on July 17, 1996 (00:30:30 UT on 18 July) a meteoroid begins to enter the earth's atmosphere above the Atlantic and
heading north north-easterly. The object's angle of incidence (27 degrees), its mass (4,000 kg) and its relatively slow velocity (12 to 14 Km/sec) offers it an excellent chance of surviving the fiery passage. See Figure 1: Proposed Trajectory for Scenario.

During the final seconds of the fireball meteor event, viewers on Long Island witness a "streak" in the sky, first white, then tending toward deep red. Elsewhere in the electro-magnetic spectrum, the transit of the fireball generates Very Low Frequency (VLF) radio waves as the Earth's magnetic field is perturbed; this registers on VLF/lightning research instruments. At an altitude of 10 to 14 Km, the meteor is disrupted by an explosion, showering TWA Flight 800's air corridor with a spray of meteorites. The explosion, called a bolide, produces a high intensity flash of light seen from the Long Island shoreline and recorded by DOD satellite sensors. The resulting fall of high velocity objects leave little but "noise" on local radar.

Multiple sonic shock waves are generated by the meteorites as they traverse the lower atmosphere at supersonic speeds. These booms will shortly be heard and felt on Long Island. At 8:31:10, several seconds after
the
bolide event, one meteorite (out of the many produced) strikes
the 747 at
4.4 Km altitude. The proposed meteorite is traveling at a velocity
1 to 2
Km per second and weighs 25 to 250 kg.

The fragment strikes the right side of the fuselage above the
window
beltline at a downward angle of 27 degrees and a horizontal
angle of 135
degrees to the right of the aircraft's centerline. The initial impact
penetrates the outer fuselage, enters the main cabin at row 27 and
punctures the floor of the cabin at row 24. Entering the Center
Wing Tank
(CWT) below the main cabin floor, the meteorite crushes
Spanwise Beam #2
downward. The meteorite then shatters its way through the left
side of
Spanwise Beam #3 - the forward wall of the CWT.

While traversing the rigid CWT, the meteorite's powerful
shockwave is
enhanced by the ignition of fuel vapors within the CWT. The
surrounding
airframe buckles under the overpresurization, bending the tank
floor
downward and fracturing the aircraft's box keel beam
immediately below.
Spanwise Beam #3 tilts forward and down from the blow. The
resulting
flexing of the airframe drives off components below the CWT, including an
air-conditioning unit mounted there. These components will fall into the western most debris field, closest to JFK. After crossing the Dry Bay ahead of the CWT, the meteorite passes through the Front Wing Spar and then into the lower cabin/cargo hold on the left side of the aircraft. Cutting through the aircraft's belly just ahead of the wings, the meteorite exits the aircraft.

Following behind the impacting object are a number of components shattered in the interface event, including structural elements from Spanwise Beams #2 and #3. The structure of the lower cabin/cargo area was compromised by the exit wound. As a result, sections of belly skin immediately ahead of the wing are blown outward by the shock wave. This debris will float with the prevailing wind south to Debris Field #3, along with other CWT components ejected.

Now vented, the fuel from the CWT produces a growing plume of fire. A ribbon of orange-red flame and resulting black smoke pouring from the central fuselage is seen by witness on the distant shoreline.

After 10 seconds, during which time more outer skin is peeled away, the
fuselage structure snaps apart ahead of the wings. The forward section is driven away by the airstream, creating Debris Field #2. The main section of the aircraft, with the wings still intact, continues to fly.

Now severely tail-heavy, the 747 begins to transition into a tail-down attitude. At 8,500 ft., with the increasing aerodynamic pressures on the wings, the structural box supporting the wing roots fractures, and the wings separate as the airplane suffers a major breakup. The right main wing tank is compromised and a massive conflagration ensues as the debris falls for another 15 seconds to the Atlantic.
From: magnetix@ix.netcom.com (Peter Rooney)
Date: November 16, 1997 8:15:23 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: TWA 800

You must be gratified that the FBI is getting off the case, saying there is no evidence of a criminal act, and a mechanical failure is likely. I'm still amazed that your open-door theory has not received any media attention to speak of. It's as if there were a conspiracy to suggest everything but. But to say "conspiracy" is to invite the reply "crackpot".

Be that as it may...
1) when have you last updated your website and pages?
2) what about trying to organize the website? at least, make a chronology or diary.
3) what is your latest (or last) word?
4) HAVE THEY FIXED THE DOOR?

Hope you keep battling!
It's as if there were a conspiracy to suggest everything but. But to say "conspiracy" is to invite the reply "crackpot".

And not true, there is no conspiracy to hide door problem.

Be that as it may...
1) when have you last updated your website and pages?

5 Nov 97

2) what about trying to organize the website? at least, make a chronology or diary.

Yeah, to me it's organized, but to others, well,

3) what is your latest (or last) word?

See below:

Bob Brenerman,
Dear Mr. Brenerman,

5 Nov 97

Thank you for your 29 Oct 97 letter reference 97-120S-699. It was signed by Mr. Pederson for Mr. Wojnar but I'm assuming you wrote it and you are the "FAA structural engineer who assisted the NTSB at the hangar in Calverton, New York..."

I would prefer to discuss with you, an airplane person with the hands on experience of TWA 800, the details of your letter. First, the politics...why is the Northwest Region of the FAA given the task by Mr. McSweeney through my congressman to 'investigate Mr. Smith's concerns'? Would not the Office of Accident Investigation of the FAA be more appropriate? Especially since the Northwest Region of the FAA is the only FAA authority to go on record as supporting the center tank as initial event with its own ignition theory?

"Worn Wiring May Have Had Role In TWA Disaster
Chafing in Fuel Tank Conduits Found in Study of Early 747s
By Don
A theory, developed by the FAA's Northwest Region in Seattle, involves an unlikely chain of events in which an electrical problem causes a fire to burn outward from the wing tank to the wing tip through a vent tube that is designed to allow vapors to escape from the wing tip, the flame front then reverses direction and travels back down another vent tube into the center tank.

The NTSB, conducting the TWA 800 investigation, played down the theory as only one of many."

So, you see, Mr. Brenerman, my cargo door explanation was sent for evaluation to a group who already have their own contrary
explanation for TWA 800, not exactly an open mind to an impartial forum for investigation. It's like asking someone to prove they're wrong. Few will attempt to overcome that set bias. I hope you can.

By the way, we are as one on chafed wiring as a problem. NTSB AAR 92/02 for UAL 811 had chafed wiring which shorted to turn on door motor which unlatched door. This explanation of why door ruptured/opened may well explain why fuselage ruptured at cargo door area for AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800 also.

One last thing on politics: We are the good guys, we seek to prevent airplane crashes, we are open, we discuss the possibilities relying of real evidence that we can see, touch, and hear. If my style 'chafes' when I rebut or attempt to refute your line of thinking, please don't take it personally. We are not indifferent; we care. We are on the same side with the same goal, as you state in your letter to me, "...the first priority of the ... (FAA) is ensuring the continued operational safety of aircraft."

In that regard let me dissect your letter of 29 Oct 97 very carefully and reply to each observation and conclusion you have made about TWA 800 and others.

Assumptions:
1. You are a FAA structural engineer and understand the Boeing 747 airframe.
2. I am a FAA licensed commercial pilot, instrument rated and previous FAA Part 135 certificate holder.
3. NTSB published documents such as AAR 92/02 shall be assumed to be correct unless otherwise noted.
4. UK AAIB and Canadian/Indian published government aircraft
accident reports shall be assumed to be correct unless otherwise noted.

5. You have had hands on experience with TWA 800 and can confirm or refute deductions based upon personal experience lacking a published NTSB AAR for referral.

6. The color photograph of the reconstruction of TWA 800 is complete and accurate. (Photo included in letter and at www.corazon.com/800foreaflhorreconweb.html.)

7. You may soon have internet access and can examine my website at www.corazon.com which has scanned text of accident reports for referral. Email is available to you and you can correspond to me at barry@corazon.com

8. Hindsight is great and everybody makes mistakes once in a while.

29 Oct 97 letter to me from you:
Paragraph four, sentence two:
"However, when the wreckage of the nose section was recovered it became evident that the forward cargo door had not opened in flight or separated from the nose section prior to impact with water."

Well, sir, let's be picky. A door means a door and not pieces or segments or sections. The forward cargo door of TWA 800 is in tatters, it's shattered, it's in pieces; it's everything but a 'door'. It is so shattered that only 20% is recovered and reconstructed. What is the weight of a normal door? What is the weight of the recovered pieces? For the purposes of discussion I use 20%. If wrong, provide a more accurate number please. To base the conclusion, "...forward cargo door had not opened in flight or separated from the nose section..." based upon only 20% of the evidence is not valid.
Especially since I have pinpointed the location of door failure/rupture to the aft midspan latch of the forward cargo door and that latch is not connected to the frame, as seen in reconstruction photo. The identification of the aft midspan latch as the point of failure is deduced by a. observing the large round hole in reconstruction photo of TWA 800, b. reading descriptive text about the AI 182 door rupture, and c. viewing the recovered door of UAL 811. The UAL 811 door shows a small door rupture at aft midspan latch area. The forward midspan latch pin was not damaged while the aft latch pin was. The UAL 811 door had a rupture hole straight through the door. That was an opening in the door. The door opened inside the door itself as well as at the latches.

(http://www.corazon.com/811page35analydoor.html
http://www.corazon.com/811doorhalves.html and
182pixtext1web.html gives text about forward cargo door area of
AI 182.)

UAL 811 is the model for the three other accidents, AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800. It always comes back to NTSB AAR 92/02. (Not the first UAL 811 NTSB AAR which was NTSB/AAR-90/01 and then superseded by NTSB AAR 92/02, written after door was recovered and conclusions changed. Everybody makes mistakes once in a while.)

The TWA 800 reconstruction photo shows other similarities to UAL 811 which will be discussed as we go along.

Paragraph five, sentence one:
"The FAA structural engineer who assisted the NTSB at the
hangar in Calverton, New York, verified that the forward cargo door was recovered at the same location as the rest of the nose section."

Well sir, again, not door recovered but pieces were. Let us assume the bottom 5% of the door pieces with the bottom eight latches was found with the nose section and attached to the sill and fuselage of TWA 800 as seen in NTSB photo. (That matches the description of AI 182 from video film 6700 feet underwater also, corazon.com/182pixtext1web.html.) Because 5% of the door of TWA 800 was found with the nose does not rule out door rupture at aft mid span latch. It does not rule out fuselage rupture caused by door failure. What it does do is say that bottom piece of door stayed with nose until water impact. Rupture at midspan latch still possible.

Paragraph five, sentence two:
"A further examination of the recovered wreckage showed that the upper hinge was still attached to the both the fuselage and the door."

Exactly! That is what the model shows too! UAL 811 had the door tear away with the top piece taking upper flange of the door and all the hinge and attachment bolts with it. The hinges of UAL 811 were in the same condition and attached to the door as TWA 800. (corazon.com/811page35analydoor.html) NTSB AAR 92/02 page 35 and 41: "The hinge pins and all hinge sections from N4713U's forward cargo door were intact; all hinge sections rotated relatively easily. All attach bolts from the hinge sections of the door remained attached..." The TWA 800 reconstruction photo shows a piece of fuselage skin attached to hinge. The fuselage skin that left with the door of UAL 811 was not recovered from ocean floor for examination.
Paragraph five, sentence four and five:
"In addition, the door latches at the bottom of the door were still attached to the fuselage lower sill structure. This indicates that the door was in the 'latched and locked' position at the time of impact with the water."

Well, sir, there are two latches unaccounted for out of ten, the mid span latches. The door may have been in the almost all latched and locked position when it hit the water but not totally. And it is in that area, specifically, the aft midspan latch area, where the evidence points to rupture.

It was an understandable conclusion to make that door did not rupture/open in flight when bottom latches were found latched and attached. It is an understandable conclusion to make that the door did not rupture/detach when the hinge stayed stayed attached to the door. However, both conclusions can be adjusted by viewing more of the door and relying on past precedent.

The answer to refute aft midspan latch rupture is to locate and identify the aft mid span latch and confirm it is latched around its pin, an impossibility when looking at the TWA 800 reconstruction photo with sharp, clean line at door frame where aft mid span latch is supposed to be latched and isn't.

Paragraph six, sentence one:
"The nose section of the airplane impacted the water on the right side, causing severe hydraulic damage with the result that the door structure did not remain completely intact."

Well, sir, is this an explanation of why the starboard side cargo door area is so shattered and the port side of fuselage is so
smooth? You mentioned in our phone call that the skin appeared to be pushed inwards also. On page 41 of AAR 92/02 for UAL 811 it reads, "Examination of the outer skin contour of the upper door piece revealed that it had been crushed inward." So the cargo door of UAL 811 does give an appearance of inward crush on the door when top piece struck fuselage on its way up after explosive decompression. You may have noticed the same effect on the TWA 800 top piece of door. Regarding the rest of the nose having inward crushing, the TWA 800 reconstruction shows otherwise with large pieces of skin clearly showing an outward force with the skin peeled outwards. Regarding the many pieces of the cargo door area, that is to be expected when the fuselage ruptured in flight and the weakened nose tore off subjecting that now exposed and jagged area to 300 knots of slipstream.

Paragraph six, sentence two:
"However, wreckage for the entire door was recovered at the same location as the nose section and had the same impact damage as the surrounding fuselage structure on the right side."

Well, sir, I have to contest the use of the adjective, "entire." My online dictionary states; entire \in-"tr\ adj : complete, whole synonym: sound, perfect, intact, undamaged ~ entirely adv

No way was that entire door recovered period, anywhere, according to that TWA 800 reconstruction photo. I estimate 20% recovered and let us assume that was in the nose section debris field. That leaves most of door missing and in particular the accused aft midspan latch section of the door. In addition, the 20% recovered pieces shown in the reconstruction have all types of damage revealed; inward, outward, crushed, twisted, crumpled, torn, and frayed, which is dissimilar to damage only ten feet above cargo door area of the nose. (I am unable to
comment on the forward part of the cargo door or the area forward as the only released photograph by NTSB is cropped short of the entire reconstruction.)

The many pieces of the door would explain the discrepancy in the newspapers, a computer simulation, and a Coast Guard Rear Admiral stating on the record that the forward cargo door was found closest to the event site, yet contradicted by your above statement. All may be correct, it depends upon which piece is talked about. The categorical statement by the officer in charge of recovery that the door was found closest to Kennedy Airport is probably true and implies that the critical midspan latches may in the piece of the door he is referring to. The statement by you that the door was found with nose section is true because you are referring to the pieces that stayed with the nose.

Please reconsider your appraisal of 'entire' and 'same impact damage' based upon close analysis of TWA 800 reconstruction photo.

Paragraph six, sentence three:
"This is additional verification that the forward cargo door had not opened in flight or separated from the airplane."

Well, sir, my explanation of TWA 800 is rupture in forward cargo door at aft mid span latch. A door can open at places other than the latches, some parts can separate and some can stay attached and yet door can still be said to have 'opened.' But 'open' implies turning doorknob and door opens. That's why I changed 'inadvertently opened' to 'ruptured'.

Now to paint smears. The red paint smears are real, there are a lot of them, and solid conclusions can be reached by that very
real evidence. Their location is important, only above and slightly aft of the forward cargo door. Using NTSB AAR 92/02 as a model again, page, 41, "There were also many areas on the outer skin where blue and red paint transfer marks could be seen." The paint transfers for UAL 811 were from fuselage to door using blue and red paint of United Airlines. TWA 800 was the red of TWA from the door to the fuselage above. This indicates an outward expansion of the area below forcing the red colored door to slam upwards against the fuselage transferring red paint onto the white painted areas between the passenger windows. NTSB AAR 92/02 again, page, 41, "The forward cargo door can rotate open 143 degrees before the hinge would deform, permitting the door to contact the fuselage above."

The splotchy red painted skin above the door matches the splotchy red painted smears between windows, indicating the top of the door slammed up, transferred paint and tore away. The red paint smears above cargo door indicated outward force not inward. The peeled open skin indicates outward movement. The outward means the unilateral starboard damage is not water impact. Not water impact means that center tank explosion is not viable as initial event since that would give bilateral damage and didn't. Outward unilateral damage strengthens rupture at cargo door area explanation as that is what would happen and did.

Paragraph seven, sentence two and three: "There is even more compelling evidence resulting from the TWA flight 800 accident investigation that indicates that the forward cargo door did not cause the accident. However, it is up to the NTSB to share this information with you."

Well, sir, that hurts. NTSB sharing information with me? I think not. Secret information that cargo door didn't burst? I think not
Paragraph eight, sentence two and three:
"However, the accidents to which your refer, in particular the Pan Am flight 103 and the Air India flight 182 accidents, each had strong evidence of an internal explosion caused by high explosive materials (terrorist bomb). In each case there has been no evidence that the forward cargo door opened in flight causing the accident."

Well, sir, let me polite in disagreement. Not 'strong' evidence of bomb. Very weak is what the evidence shows and I have reviewed the evidence as described in UK, Canadian, and India accident reports over and over again. AI 182 and PA 103 as cargo door rupture is quite clear once the premise is made of fuselage rupture in flight in cargo door area. AI 182 said the fuselage ruptured in flight at cargo door area and for want of a better explanation, said bomb did it. PA 103 also had fuselage rupture on left side of forward cargo hold while wreckage evidence shows much more damage and sooner on starboard side, at cargo door area. The evidence is in the reports and they are on web site www.corazon.com under the flight numbers.

Briefly, AI 182 summation leading to cargo door rupture is on web page http://www.corazon.com/AI182essentials.html. I will quote from only two of twenty statements about AI 182 here: "As described earlier, the sudden nature of the occurrence indicates the possibility of a massive airframe structural failure or the detonation of an explosive device." Page 49. And then: "The AIB report concluded that the analysis of the CVR and ATC recordings showed no evidence of a high-explosive device having been detonated on AI 182. It further states there is strong evidence to suggest a sudden explosive decompression of
undetermined origin occurred." Page 24.
So, Mr. Brenerman, the official report actually gives 'strong
evidence' to cargo door rupture and 'no evidence' to bomb.

PA 103 is similar; rupture at cargo door area is supported by
factual evidence including the reconstruction of PA 103 on
starboard side which matches the photograph of UAL 811 after
landing. The essentials for cargo door for PA 103 are on page
http://www.corazon.com/PA103essentials.html. The premise of
bomb is based upon evidence which shows that a '...rather large
shotgun had been fired at the inner surface of the fuselage at
close range.' Pages 19 and 20 of AAIB report. The resulting hole
was about 15 inches in diameter, not a bomb hole and not big
enough to bring down a 747. There was a blast in PA 103 but
after the rupture at cargo door, just as center tank explosion was
after cargo door rupture for TWA 800. One last thing on PA 103,
the AAIB report never said bomb, only 'improvised explosive
device.' The British are precise with language and they are right
to be so. A door rupturing in flight becomes a device which
wasn't meant to be but became an explosive causing agent, an
explosive decompression. And residue that could be high
explosive is now shown to be possibly benign with TWA 800 and
the dog sniffing test. Bomb explanation for PA 103 is tenuous at
best and will not stand up to scrutiny. I would love to go over
every point of AI 182 and PA 103 with you but first become very
familiar with the government accident reports as I have, they
give the evidence. I encourage you to do so.

The bomb conclusions were political. As an engineer and pilot
let us leave shadowy Sikh terrorists and secret Libyan agents
putting bombs aboard planes to the politicians and let us examine
evidence such as CVR, FDR, FOD, bodies, metal, and statistics.
I full well know the immense claim of PA 103 not being a bomb.
It is a myth airplane like the ship Titanic, the airship Hindenberg,
and the ship Maine, all three of which had original accident causes modified over time, brittle steel, flammable skin, and coal dust.

Four high time Boeing 747s took off at night running late and suffered a fuselage rupture at forward cargo hold which left similar evidence of sudden loud sound on CVR, similar abrupt power cut to the FDR, similar Fodded engines, similar paint smears, similar wreckage pattern, similar in flight damage, similar destruction sequence, similar missing never recovered bodies, similar reconstruction patterns, and similar red herring of bomb.

All four, Mr. Brenerman, all four; and only those four of all 747 accidents. Only one came back to reveal the cause, inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight, rupture at aft midspan latch area, UAL 811 as described in text and pictures in NTSB AAR 92/02.

Paragraph nine, sentence two:
"A repetition of the events that caused the UAL flight 811 forward cargo door to open in flight is not likely to occur again because of modifications required by Airworthiness Directive (AD) T89-04-54."

Well sir, the cargo door was not supposed to open:
1. after certification.
2. After the first AD when lower sill damage was noticed.
3. After the second AD after door opened on PA 125.
4. After the third AD after UAL 811 cargo door opened.
5. After the fourth AD after the UAL preflight uncommanded opening.
6. After the fifth AD you mention.

And they are still opening, leaking and malfunctioning. Here's
just one of ten non fatal openings, leakings and loss of pressurizations over the past three years. SDR: 27 November 1994 Discrepancy/Corrective Action: On rotation, aft cargo door opened. Replaced spring on lock pin and adj per MM52-34-12.

The cargo door is known to be dangerous, has failed in the past, is still failing, and I'm saying it's failed/ruptured on three previously undetected events, AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800.

The modification you refer to is to replace the aluminium locking sectors with steel to prevent the lower eight latching cams from being back driven past the soft metal and un latch the door. It's like making the barn door stronger against a horse when it may be a bull inside trying to get out.

And more important, the midspan latches have no locking sectors at all so the modification does not apply to them at all. Is it not strange that the risk of latch cams becoming unlatched, and they have several times, is so great as to warrant locking sectors yet the two side midspan latches have none? And each of them holds in more door sill than the lower latches. That is an astonishing discovery: no locking sectors on all Boeing 747 forward cargo door latches which have rupture evidence at that midspan latch as shown on UAL 811 recovered door.

The absence of locking sectors for the midspan latches and the AD to strengthen the eight locking sectors for the lower eight latch cams explains much.

It probably solves how the forward cargo door of AI 182 and TWA 800 ruptured at aft midspan latch while the bottom latches remained latched in place: that is the locking sectors did their job on those two doors and prevented the eight lower latch cams
from being driven into the unlatched position when chafed wires shorted and turned door motor on. Unfortunately the midspan latches had no such protection and were driven into the unlatched position enough for the internal pressure to rupture at that now weakened area leaving similar shattered door pieces and bottom latches still attached to lower sill for AI 182 and TWA 800.

For UAL 811 and Pan Am 103, the soft, pre-AD, locking sectors were overridden by door motor and all ten latches were driven into the unlatched position allowing the door to open completely and slam upward, breaking in two and tearing away, leaving the identical pattern of torn away fuselage skin and door broken in half longitudinally at midspan latches for each door.

Four aircraft, four door motors to unlocked position, two locking sectors held and two didn't; two partial openings/ruptures and two total openings as reflected in the reconstructions and photographs of wreckage. AI 182 and TWA 800 had locking sectors hold so ruptures. PA 103 and UAL 811 had locking sectors overridden so entire door opened and came off.

Paragraph ten, sentence one:
"I hope that this information assures you that the tragedy of TWA flight 800 was not caused by the in-flight opening of the forward cargo door and that the FAA has taken measures to ensure that another occurrence similar to that of UAL flight 811 will not be repeated."

Well, sir, I am not assured that the tragedy of TWA 800 was not caused by the inflight opening of the forward cargo door and I am not assured that the actions of the FAA ensures another UAL 811 will not be repeated. On the contrary, I strongly believe that the tragedy of TWA 800 was caused by the inflight rupture of the
fuselage at the forward cargo door at the aft midspan latch area and the actions of the FAA will not prevent such a reoccurrence.

Now, what to do about it. Eventually Boeing will have to fix the door again.

But first, FAA and NTSB are doing what they can prior to TWA 800 based upon the best evidence at the time. If the real cause of a failure is unknown, then the fault can't be fixed. If foreign governments insist on saying a bomb caused a crash, then it is a security matter, not a structural engineers' or accident investigators'.

Second, if the cause of a national aviation tragedy is unclear and ambiguous, then it is understandable for politicians to turn the cause to advantage, even if later proved wrong. Third, accident investigating teams only had precedent to rely on up to their crash. Hindsight and the subsequent similar crashes were not available to them for their analysis. They are for mine and now they are for yours. We are all doing the best we can with what we have.

Fourth, the internet with its research and communication abilities have sped up the citizen analysis of national accidents.

Fifth, I am the one to have discovered the cargo door cause because of circumstances:
1. Aircraft modeler.
2. Aircraft owner doing routine maintenance. Mooney M20C
3. Commercial pilot, instrument rated.
4. FAA Part 135 certificate holder, single pilot, single aircraft.
5. Enlisted aircrewman in SP-2E with 2000 hours in patrol aircraft maintaining and operating all electronic anti-submarine equipment with specialty of radar.
6. Officer as reconnaissance attack navigator in RA-5C going supersonic in combat during wartime flying off carriers.
7. Retired military officer with time, money, and motivation to devote to research into cargo door of Boeing 747s.

I am qualified to give worthy explanation into other sudden, night, fatal, fiery jet airplane crashes, AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800: inadvertent opening/rupture of forward cargo door in flight at aft midspan latch area on high time Boeing 747s.

What I'm personally doing to prevent a reoccurrence of those accidents is mailing my analysis to you, talking on the telephone, emailing government officials and media, and being open and sharing all information I find that is relevant as soon as I can. Only through fast, open, and accurate communications can we stop these fuselages of high time Boeing 747s rupturing in flight at forward cargo door.

What you can do, Mr. Brenerman, is up to you, as you see fit based upon the evidence that you have seen with your own eyes at Calverton, my analysis, NTSB and other government accident reports, and your own conscience. You have contacts with Boeing, NTSB, and FAA aircraft accident related groups. I encourage you to pass along my concerns and analysis for discussion and possible rebuttal. Please give me scientific rebuttal to this letter today, I'm sure there must be some inaccuracies, everybody makes mistakes once in a while.

And everybody gets it right once in a while, too.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith
4) HAVE THEY FIXED THE DOOR?

No.

Hope you keep battling!

Oh yeah,...

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

From: "Michael C. Spencer" <fourdm@aloha.net>
Date: November 18, 1997 12:44:40 PM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: New E-mail Address

I can now be reached at:

spencerm001@hawaii.rr.com
Hello all...

I work at SunSpot, the web site for The Baltimore Sun. We are currently putting together plans for web coverage of the upcoming hearings in Baltimore.

Among the possible elements we are considering are live chats with proponents of various theories about the TWA 800 accident.

We're not looking to dismiss these theories, and we're not looking to accept them on face value either. We're planning to provide an open forum where these differing ideas can be discussed and probed. This will be a live and unedited segment, allowing for the free exchange of thoughts and opinion.

The format of our coverage -- and the actual timing -- is still up in the air, but it will likely begin a week before the hearings -- December 1 -- and continue through to the end.
We're looking for members of this list -- or others you may know -- to participate in some of these live chats.

If you have an area of special expertise, and would be willing to be a guest during one of the chats, please contact me at windsor@sunspot.net (my work address).

Thanks... and sorry for the brief interruption.

Again, if you do reply, please respond to windsor@sunspot.net

Tim Windsor

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 18, 1997 3:59:43 PM PST
To: windsor@sunspot.net
Subject: Cargo door guy here.

Dear Mr. Windsor, I am a discoverer of the aft midspan latch rupture in forward cargo door in flight leading to fatal accidents in hour high time Boeing 747s, including TWA 800. Documentation on web site, www.corazon.com
I have special expertise and would be willing to be a guest during one of the chats.

Holiday Inn Express Baltimore
1401 Bloomfield Avenue
Baltimore
MD 21227
MARYLAND
UNITED STATES

OK, 6 Dec 97, drive to SFO from home, American Airlines
Depart SFO to DFW in Boeing 757 on Flight 1834 in seat 27C at 11:13 AM local and arrive DFW at 4:32 PM.
Depart DFW for BWI in Boeing 757 on Flight 1782 in seat 14C at 5:16 PM and arrive BWI at 9:06 PM.

14 Dec 97
Depart BWI to DFW in Super MD 80 on Flight 1653 in seat 8D at 7:20 AM and arrive DFW at 9:55 AM.
Depart DFW to SFO in Boeing 757 on Flight 1027 in seat 16C at 10:55 AM and arrive SFO at 12:48 PM.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 21, 1997 5:54:53 PM PST
To: seabee@bigfoot.com
Subject: Request info please on 28 June 97 event

UK media reports on June 28th 1997 describe a transatlantic
flight to New York having to return to Heathrow 45 minutes after takeoff due to a
cargo door problem. During its unscheduled rerouting the aircraft received a lightning strike.

Hi, my name is John Barry Smith and I am very interested in cargo door problems in airliners. Can you tell me where to go to get more info on the 28 June 97 event described above in you web site?

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: Dan Thomas Nelson <dtn@e-z.net>
Date: November 22, 1997 1:31:55 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Air India Report
Reply-To: dtn@e-z.net

Thank you for placing the report on the Web. I appreciate your efforts.

Dan Thomas Nelson,
Vancouver, WA, USA

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 22, 1997 8:20:55 AM PST
To: dtn@e-z.net
Subject: Re: Air India Report

Thank you for placing the report on the Web. I appreciate your
efforts.

Dan Thomas Nelson,
Vancouver, WA, USA

You're welcome.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 23, 1997 7:33:28 AM PST
To: Grayaera51@aol.com
Subject: Re: pumps

am doing research on flight 800. am trying to find out about fuel system. would you know where to obtain drawings of fuel pumps and related wiring. how many pumps does a 747 have. would appreciate any help you could give me
thank you.....
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From: Grayaera51@aol.com
Date: November 23, 1997 7:02:16 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: pumps

am doing research on flight 800.am trying to find out about fule system.whould you know where to obtain drawings of fule pumps and related
wireing digs. how many pumps dose a 747 have. would appericate any help you could give me thank you.....

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 24, 1997 4:04:19 PM PST
To: Brian Corbett <bcorbett@andover.co.uk>
Subject: links/doors

With your permission I will add a link to your site next time I update.

By all means, thanks.

I've done some research on doors since I read your article, amazing, they open all the time.

I'm going to Baltimore for 8 Dec NTSB hearing on TWA 800, should be interesting

Cheers, Barry Smith

Difficulty Date : 10/31/97 0:00:00
Operator Type : Air Carrier
ATA Code : 5230
Part Name : LATCH
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Group : 747
Aircraft Model : 747251B
Part/Defect Location : CARGO DOOR
Part Condition : OUT OF ADJUST
Submitter Code : Carrier
Operator Desig. : NWAA
Precautionary Procedure : UNSCHED LANDING
Nature : WARNING INDICATION
Stage of Flight : CLIMB
District Office Region : Great Lakes office #01
A/C N Number : 613US
Part Total Time : 0
Part Time since Overhaul: 0
Aircraft Serial No. : 20358

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

DURING CLIMB, THE AFT CARGO DOOR ILLUMINATED AND AIRCRAFT FAILED TO PRESSURIZE. FLIGHT RETURNED TO BKK AFTER DUMPING 5000 LBS OF FUEL AND LANDED WITHOUT FURTHER INCIDENT. MAINTENANCE FOUND THE AFT CARGO DOOR HANDLE OUT OF POSITION. ADJUSTED LATCH AND LOCK. OPERATIONAL CHECK OK. Difficulty Date

ATA Code : 5230
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Model : 747123
Aircraft Serial No. : 20323
Difficulty Date : 23 April 1993
Operator Desig. : IPXA
A/C N Number : 671UP
Precautionary Procedure : Unsched. Landing
Nature : Other
Stage of Flight : Climb

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

THE SIDE CARGO LIGHT ILLUMINATED SHORTLY AFTER DEPARTURE FROM ONT. THE AIRCRAFT COULD NOT BE PRESSURIZED. THE CREW DUMPED FUEL DOWN TO MAX LANDING WEIGHT AND RETURNED TO ONT. MAINTENANCE FOUND THE MAIN CARGO DOOR SHEAR PIN SHEARED AND REPLACED PIN. OPS CHECK WAS NORMAL.

Part Name : SHEAR PIN
Manufacture Part Number : 69B156232
Part Condition : BROKEN
Part/Defect Loc. : MAIN CARGO DR
Overhaul : X
Submitter Code : Carrier
District Office : Southern US office #01
Aircraft Type : 12501 lbs. and over weight class
               Monoplane Low Wing
               Powered with 4 Engines

ATA Code : 5230
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Model : 747451
Aircraft Serial No. : 24223
Difficulty Date : 16 September 1993
Operator Desig. : NWAA
A/C N Number : 668US
Precautionary Procedure : None
Nature : Other
Stage of Flight : Insp/Maint

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

DURING PERIODIC INSPECTION, CORROSION WAS FOUND ON THE FORWARD CARGO DOOR FORWARD MIDSPAN LATCH TORQUE TUBE. REPLACED TORQUE TUBE AND LATCH ASSEMBLY.

Part Name : TUBE
Manufacture Part Number : 65B073396
Part Condition : CORROSION
Part/Defect Loc. : FWD CARGO DOOR
Overhaul : X
Submitter Code : Carrier
District Office : Great Lakes office #01
Aircraft Type : 12501 lbs. and over weight class
Monoplane Low Wing
Powered with 4 Engines

ATA Code : 5230
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Model : 747238B
Aircraft Serial No. : 20535
Difficulty Date : 10 November 1993
Operator Desig. : CALA
A/C N Number : 17025
Precautionary Procedure : Unsched. Landing
Nature : Other
Stage of Flight : Climb

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

EWR - FLT 0028 - AIRCRAFT CABIN PRESSURE COULD NOT BE MAINTAINED ABOVE 17,000 FEET. ALL PACKS AND DUCT PRESSURE WERE NORMAL AND THERE WERE NO SYSTEM FAIL LIGHTS OR DOOR WARNING LIGHTS. THE AIRCRAFT WAS RETURNED TO EWR. MAINTENANCE FOUND THE AFT CARGO DOOR FORWARD PRESSURE RELIEF DOOR SHROUD CRACKED AND THE DOOR SEAL WAS MISSING. THE DOOR SHROUD AND SEAL WERE REPLACED. THE AIRCRAFT WAS PRESSURIZED AND NO LEAKS WERE NOTED. (W)

Part Name : SHROUD
Part Condition : CRACKED
Part/Defect Loc. : AFT CARGO DOOR
Overhaul : X
Submitter Code : Carrier
District Office : Southwestern US office #09
Aircraft Type : 12501 lbs. and over weight class
Monoplane Low Wing
Powered with 4 Engines

ATA Code : 5230
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Model : 747132
Aircraft Serial No. : 19896
Difficulty Date : 06 September 1994
Operator Desig. : EIAA
Operator Type : Air Carrier
A/C N Number : 481EV
Precautionary Procedure : Unsched. Landing
  : Dump Fuel
Nature : Warning Indication
Stage of Flight : Climb

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

JFK - ON TAKEOFF AFT CARGO DOOR LT ILLUMINATED. UNABLE TO PRESSURIZE, DUMPED 50,000 POUNDS, LANDED JFK. UPON ARRIVING AT JFK, FOUND AFT CARGO VENT DOORS OPENED AND DOOR HANDLE UNLOCKED. CHECKED OPERATION OF DOOR AND HANDLE PER MM 52-34-12 AND MM 52-34-00. OPS CHECKED OK. ADJUST LATCH PIN PER MM 52-34-12 PAGE 234 AND PRESSURIZED OK. PER MM 21-31-00. OPS CHECKED OK AND INDICATION OK. (W)

Part Name : DOOR
Part Condition : NOT LATCHED
Part/Defect Loc. : CARGO COMPT
Name : EVERGREEN INTERNATIONAL AIRLINES IN
Submitter Code : Carrier
District Office : Northwest Mountain office #09
ATA Code : 5230
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Model : 747251F
Aircraft Serial No. : 23887
A/C Total Time : 29362
A/C Total Cycles : 6796
Difficulty Date : 20 October 1994
Operator Desig. : NWAA
Operator Type : Air Carrier
A/C N Number : 639US
Precautionary Procedure : Unsched. Landing
                      : Dump Fuel
Nature : Warning Indication
Stage of Flight : Take Off
Station : VHHH
Flight # : 0904

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

AFTER TAKEOFF, AFT CARGO DOOR LIGHT ILLUMINATED. CREW FOLLOWED COCKPIT OPERATING PROCEDURE, DUMPED 75,000 LBS OF FUEL, AND RETURNED TO HKG. FOUND HOOK ACTUATOR DEACTIVATED. REPLACED HOOK ACTUATOR PER MM 52-71-00 AND DOOR WARNING SWITCH (S3) PER MM 52-71-00. PERFORMED CHECK AND UNITS TESTED NORMAL. AIRCRAFT RETURNED TO SERVICE.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part Name</th>
<th>SWITCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture Part Number</td>
<td>C210251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Condition</td>
<td>FAILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part/Defect Loc.</td>
<td>AFT CARGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NORTHWEST AIRLINES INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter Code</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office</td>
<td>Great Lakes office #01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ATA Code            | 5230                    |
| Aircraft Manufacturer | BOEING                 |
| Aircraft Model      | 747245F                 |
| Aircraft Serial No. | 20826                   |
| Difficulty Date     | 27 November 1994        |
| Operator Desig.     | FDEA                    |
| Operator Type       | Air Carrier             |
| A/C N Number        | 640FE                   |
| Precautionary Procedure | Unsched. Landing     |
| Nature              | Warning Indication      |
| Stage of Flight     | Take Off                |
| Station             | ORD                     |
| Flight #            | 77                      |

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

ON ROTATION, AFT CARGO DOOR OPENED. REPLACED SPRING ON LOCK PIN AND ADJ PER MM 52-34-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part Name</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture Part Number</td>
<td>MS245851290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Condition</td>
<td>FAILED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part/Defect Loc.</td>
<td>AFT CARGO DOOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>FEDERAL EXPRESS CORP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter Code</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

AT 37000 FEET UNABLE TO MAINTAIN CABIN PRESSURE. MADE EMERGENCY DESCENT. REPLACED MISSING SEAL ON AFT CARGO DOOR.

Part Name : SEAL
Manufacture Part Number : 60B1000010
Part Condition : MISSING
Part/Defect Loc. : CARGO DOOR
Name : UNITED AIRLINES INC.
Submitter Code : Carrier
ATA Code : 5230
Aircraft Manufacturer : BOEING
Aircraft Model : 747132
Aircraft Serial No. : 19896
Difficulty Date : 14 May 1995
Operator Desig. : EIAA
Operator Type : Air Carrier
A/C N Number : 481EV
Precautionary Procedure : Unsched. Landing
Nature : Warning Indication
Stage of Flight : Climb

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

JFK - LOG PAGE A3752 - AFT CARGO LIGHT ILLUMINATED ON TAKEOFF ROLL ALONG WITH CARGO DOOR ANNUNCIATOR LIGHT ON PILOTS CLEAR SHIELDS. ABNORMAL CHECKLIST COMPLETED AND LANDING WAS UNEVENTUAL. FOUND LOWER AFT CARGO DOOR VENT DOOR RELEASE HANDLE OPEN. RESECURED HANDLE AND OPERATED HANDLE NUMEROUS TIMES. LIGHT OPERATED NORMALLY IAW MM 52-34-0. OPERATION OF AFT CARGO DOOR VENT DOOR HANDLE AND TRIGGER ASSY AND INDICATION SYSTEM ALL CHECKED OK. (X)

Part Name : VENT DOOR HANDLE
Part Condition : NOT SECURED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part/Defect Loc.</th>
<th>CARGO DOOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>EVERGREEN INTERNATIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitter Code</td>
<td>Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Office</td>
<td>Northwest Mountain office #09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATA Code</td>
<td>5230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Manufacturer</td>
<td>BOEING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Model</td>
<td>747251B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Serial No.</td>
<td>23111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/C Total Time</td>
<td>45787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/C Total Cycles</td>
<td>7155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty Date</td>
<td>03 March 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Desig.</td>
<td>NWAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator Type</td>
<td>Air Carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/C N Number</td>
<td>631US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautionary Procedure</td>
<td>Unsched. Landing : Emer. Descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>Warning Indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of Flight</td>
<td>Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station</td>
<td>RPMM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight #</td>
<td>0007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discrepancy/Corrective Action:

DURING CRUISE, PRESSURIZATION AUTO FAIL LIGHT ILLUMINATED ACCOMPANIED BY A LOSS OF PRESSURIZATION, AIRCRAFT DIVERTED TO MNL AND LANDED WITHOUT INCIDENT. REPLACED AIR/GROUND RELAY R229, RIGHT OUTFLOW VALVE ACTUATOR AND AUTO PRESSURE CONTROLLER. REPAIRED DENT IN FORWARD CARGO DOOR
DEPRESSOR SEAL AND
OPERATIONAL CHECK GOOD.

Part Name : SEAL
Part Condition : DAMAGED
Part/Defect Loc. : CARGO DOOR
Name : NORTHWEST AIRLINES INC
Submitter Code : Carrier
District Office : Great Lakes office #01

From: Brian Corbett <bcorbett@andover.co.uk>
Date: November 24, 1997 11:28:05 PM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: Request info please on 28 June 97 event

At 17:54 21/11/97 -0800, you wrote:
UK media reports on June 28th 1997

Thats all the technical info that was shown in the national newspapers. I have not seen any CAA report yet. I am due to visit the county reference library later this week, and will see if any more info is available.

With your permission I will add a link to your site next time I update.

Cheers. BC

From: Grayaera51@aol.com
Barry,
Thank you very much

All of a sudden, he can spell...and very informal, and knows I go by my middle name.

cheers, Barry

Barry,
Thank you very much

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 25, 1997 8:40:27 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: pumps

Barry,
Thank you very much

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 25, 1997 12:55:56 PM PST
To: Chrisname
Subject: improved grammar

All of a sudden, he can spell...and very informal, and knows I go by my middle name.

cheers, Barry

From: Grayaera51@aol.com
Date: Tue, 25 Nov 1997 11:40:27 -0500 (EST)
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: pumps

Barry,
Thank you very much
Subject: Re: flt 800

do you have any other NTSB photos?
Gary Deabler

Not yet but will when NTSB releases them soon.
Sincerely,
John Barry Smith

From: Gary <GDRdoc@swbell.net>
Date: November 29, 1997 1:26:52 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: flt 800
Reply-To: GDRdoc@swbell.net

do you have any other NTSB photos?
Gary Deabler

From: Gary <GDRdoc@swbell.net>
Date: November 29, 1997 1:47:27 PM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: flt 800
Reply-To: GDRdoc@swbell.net

You must be online, now.. I just sent it to you a few mins ago..
Thanks,
Gary

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: November 30, 1997 4:47:14 PM PST
To: briordan@cyberramp.net
Subject: So close to TWA 800

Mr. Riordan, right answer, aging door frame failure; wrong door, it's the forward cargo door that ruptured/failed. Check it out at www.corazon.com
Sincerely
John Barry Smith

From: "Abonnar" <abonnar@net1plus.com>
Date: November 30, 1997 4:23:20 PM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: student research

November 30, 1997

Dear Barry:

I am a student doing a research paper on commercial flight crashes. I am most interested in the causes of the crashes. Please email me information pertaining to this or refer me to a website. Thankyou.

Sincerely,
Shane Martin

From: "Mohr, Rolf" <rmohr@interactive.dreamworks.com>
Date: November 30, 1997 6:00:00 PM PST
To: "'barry@corazon.com'" <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: boeing crashes
John,
I was skimming your site with some interest.

(First I'd like to say that I don't have any strong conspiracy or cover-up theories regarding this subject.)

I was wondering
a. what you think of the reliability of Rodney Stich's book(s) such as 'Unfriendly Skies' and
b. What you think may have caused the plane doors to have become inadvertently opened? (TWA Flight 800, Pan Am Flight 103, and United Flight 811).

Regards,

Rolf Mohr
Rmohr@dreamworks.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 1, 1997 4:50:14 AM PST
To: "Mohr, Rolf" <rmohr@interactive.dreamworks.com>
Subject: Cargo door

a. what you think of the reliability of Rodney Stich's book(s)
such as
'Unfriendly Skies' and
b. What you think may have caused the plane doors to have become
inadvertently opened? (TWA Flight 800, Pan Am Flight 103, and United
Flight 811).

Mr. Hohr,

Most excellent questions.
a. I've quoted parts of his book and are on site at link below. I rely on his facts but not always his conclusions.
b. The big number one question, the real question. I've tried with the below link.

http://www.corazon.com/811skiesdoorcontents.html

http://www.corazon.com/mysterywhy.html

My latest letter is below:

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

Dear Fellow NTSB TWA 800 Hearing Attendees,

8 December 1997
We are allies, we are on the same side, we have the same goal.

I wish to prevent death by preventing airplane accidents by preventing fuselage disintegration in flight by preventing forward cargo door rupture at aft midspan latch on aging Boeing 747s. It's happened before and confirmed: UAL 811; and probably happened before on Pan Am 103, and before that Air India 182. It's probably happened again with TWA 800. The probable cause for all is probably the same as UAL 811, forward cargo door rupture in flight.

The Chairman of NTSB has said the whole issue of aging aircraft will be examined. TWA 800 was certainly that.

Let's assume a few things about TWA 800, AI 182, PA 103, and UAL 811:
1. TWA 800 (93,000 hours), AI 182 (23,624 hours), PA 103 (72,464 hours), and UAL 811 (58,815 hours) were high time, aging early model Boeing 747-100, -200 aircraft.
2. Explosive decompression makes a sudden loud sound. If explosive decompression does not make a sudden loud sound then the cargo door explanation is not valid.
3. TWA 800, Air India 182, PA 103, and UAL 811 all had sudden loud sounds on the CVR at event time. If not, then cargo door explanation for that aircraft is not valid.
4. If the forward cargo door were to rupture in flight and do the same damage as UAL 811, the nose could tear off, although it did not for UAL 811. If the nose of an aging 747 always stays on after forward door ruptures/opens, then the cargo door explanation is not valid.
4. Explosive decompression can be an explosion.
5. Destructive force of 300 knots onto weakened structure is
immense.

To explain TWA 800 from the top down is to match up four aging Boeing 747s which had fatal accidents with destruction starting in fuselage near leading edge of the wing, sudden loud sound on CVR, abrupt power cut to FDR, foded engines, never recovered bodies, severe starboard side damage, similar wreckage plots, and all were thought to be a bomb for some time. Only four 747 accidents fit that pattern, UAL 811, AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800. They belong to a group from which deductions can be made. The many other evidence matches of these four to each other are reported in the respective governments' AARs: UK AAIB 2/90, CASB and Indian Aviation Occurrence, and NTSB AAR 92/02; all available on web site www.corazon.com

To explain TWA 800 from the bottom up, the evidence pertaining to TWA 800 must be examined closely and deductions made. The following observations and explanations refer to TWA 800.

1. CVR sudden loud sound: Explosive decompression starts as air molecules rush against each other quickly. NTSB reported sudden loud sound.
2. FDR abrupt power cut: Severe disruption to cargo hold floor and adjacent main equipment compartment. NTSB reported abrupt power cut.
3. Streak: Top part of door with fuselage skin attached spinning away reflecting evening sunlight to ground observers appearing as streak as it decelerates. Door is shiny metal object and light source was orange setting sun.
4. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction can be seen at URL http://www.corazon.com/presskit.html and reveals the following: Red flags on top of door indicate it was found closest to airport. Top piece of door and fuselage skin were found closest to airport and
far apart from its usual frame and nose: Door ruptured/opened in flight and pieces spun away first, landed first, and found closest.

5. Red paint smears between passenger windows only found above forward cargo door: Red paint from door below transferred when door opened out, up, and slammed into fuselage above. Paint transfer between door and white fuselage principle matches UAL 811.

6. Missing red paint on trim above cargo door: Red paint from trim scraped off by friction of metal bending and rubbing together.

7. Inward bending of top of cargo door: Inward bend occurs when top of door hits fuselage. Inward bending of top door matches UAL 811 top door piece inward bend.

8. Most of middle of cargo door, aft midspan latch, door frame, and outer skin missing: Missing material not available for examination. Door can rupture even when bottom eight latches hold because only two midspan latches hold sixteen feet of door closed and have no locking sectors to prevent inadvertent unlatching.

9. Door hinges are attached to door and appear near normal: Hinges match UAL 811 hinge description in appearance and function.

10. Outward petal bulge rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door: Outward bulge rupture suggests rupture at aft latch. Petal pattern indicated outward, not inward force of rupture.

11. Outward peeled upper fuselage skin: Outward indicates internal force pushed outward, not external force, such as water, pushing inward.

12. Vertical tear line at station 741 between windows: Vertical tear line is nose cut off point and matches other two Boeing 747 nose cut off points, AI 182, and PA 103.

13. Starboard only shattered, torn, and frayed fuselage around forward cargo door: Unilateral rupture suggests explosive
decompression caused by inadvertent rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door in flight and discounts center tank fire/explosion as initial event.

From top to bottom, TWA 800 crash cause is clear to see, hear, and touch; fuselage rupture forward of the wing on right side on a very old and worn aircraft. The cargo door explanation is plausible, it's mechanical, it's happened before, and it fits the evidence. It also incorporates the center tank fire/explosion explanation as happening as described by NTSB but a few seconds later and and a few thousand feet lower than the initial event at 13700 feet/8:31 PM.

I first discovered the cargo door rupture problem on aging 747s after PA 103 in 1988 and confirmed for me by UAL 811 only three months later. My concerns were published first in an aviation newsletter in April, 1990 and in Flying magazine in July, 1992. I've had correspondence with a Pan Am 103 aviation insurance company representative in 1995 regarding the risk of another cargo door inadvertent opening. As soon as I heard that TWA 800 had disappeared from radar and disintegrated in flight shortly after takeoff I suspected cargo door and it was confirmed for me when the sudden loud sound and abrupt power cut to the FDR were reported by NTSB. All of the subsequent evidence confirms even stronger that the cause of TWA 800 was the aft midspan latch rupture in flight. This letter only describes a few of the linking clues, evidence, and closely reasoned deductions based on the observations of the evidence.

To sum up specific, irrefutable evidence that leads to conclusion of cargo door rupture for TWA 800:
1. Sudden loud sound on CVR.
2. Abrupt power cut to FDR.
3. Red flags on top of door in wreckage reconstruction.
4. Red paint smears on white paint between passenger windows.
5. Most of middle door, aft latch, outer skin, and door frame missing.
6. Shattered, torn, and frayed starboard fuselage structure surrounds the blown apart cargo door yet the opposite port side is smooth and relatively undamaged.
7. Visible bulging outward opening rupture hole at missing aft midspan latch of forward cargo door.

A confirming exercise would be to closely examine the door hinge of TWA 800 to see if it has overtravel impressions on the opposite hinge which would match the overtravel impressions on the UAL 811 door hinge as reported in NTSB AAR 92/02 and seen at http://www.corazon.com/811page40doorhinge.html

Cargo door explanation for TWA 800 is worthy of intense investigation. My intentions at the public hearing are to support such an investigation. I have formally offered to speak before the fact finding panel as a qualified technical person with special knowledge. I will be offering literature to attendees including pictures and text from NTSB AAR 92/02 showing big hole in nose of UAL 811.

What can be done to stop fuselage ruptures in high time Boeing 747s?
1. Boeing must modify/fix the cargo doors again.
2. FAA can direct Boeing to fix the doors with a sixth Airworthiness Directive.
3. NTSB can confirm door explanation and make recommendations to FAA.
4. NTSB public fact finding hearing can determine cargo door explanation worthy of investigation and confirm probable cause
5. Families of victims and their representatives may be persuaded to investigate the door and make recommendations to authorities.
6. Elected officials may be persuaded to conduct a parallel door investigation.
7. Media can draw attention to cargo door explanation and bring it to the attention of all concerned.

In all my discussions with persons involved with TWA 800, one person asked the key question: "Why do the doors open?" That was asked of me by my Congressman, Sam Farr, in his office as I presented the cargo door explanation to him. It is a good question.

I will reply now, as I did then, "I don't know for three of them, but for UAL 811 it was chafed wires shorting to turn on door motor which overrode safety features and unlatched the door which opened outward, up, and away, taking fuselage paint with it, killing nine passengers whose bodies were never recovered, leaving a sudden loud sound on the CVR, an abrupt power cut to the FDR, severe starboard side damage, and the cause was thought to be a bomb. The other three are probably the same reason but there are lots of other possibilities that need to be investigated."

(Regarding the AD 'fix' installed after UAL 811, it affected locking sectors yet the two midspan latches have no locking sectors to be 'fixed.' TWA 800 shattered door shows a midspan rupture with bottom latches in place. There were two pairs of door failure: UAL 811 and PA 103 had door rupture midspan and entire door open; AI 182 and TWA 800 had bottom latches hold and door ruptured/opened just at midspan latch.)
I hope to work with you, the authorities and all those concerned to confirm the probable cause of TWA 800. Please contact me with questions or rebuttal. My email is barry@corazon.com. I hope to see you at the NTSB public fact finding hearing about TWA 800 and aging aircraft.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 1, 1997 6:15:24 AM PST
To: "Abonnar" <abonnar@net1plus.com>
Subject: Re: student research

November 30, 1997

Dear Barry:

    I am a student doing a research paper on commercial flight crashes. I am most interested in the causes of the crashes. Please email me information pertaining to this or refer me to a website. Thankyou.

Sincerely,
Shane Martin
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 1, 1997 12:03:55 PM PST
To: marilyn@evcom.net
Subject: lat/long

On your website I saw the "event" coordinates as 40 40, 72 38.

What is your source for this? I haven't been able to find the same thing.

Thanks,

Marilyn Brady

I don't know where on the web site you found those numbers. They may have come from a newspaper. Regardless, all lat/long are suspect until I get the official numbers from NTSB. At the low level of raw data the facts are almost always accurate. It's only after that they get massaged. So time and location of everything is vitally important and no hard numbers yet that I trust.

But when I get them, I'll post them.

Cheers,

Barry.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 1, 1997 12:08:02 PM PST
To: rmohr@interactive.dreamworks.com
Subject: No conspiracy

Mr. Mohr, I firmly believe there is no conspiracy, no plot, no coverup in AI 182, PA 103 UAL 811 or TWA 800. Period. It was a door pop when mechanical conditions were right according to the laws of physics.

Really, no evil humans in this cause of tragedy.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

---

From: barry@corazon.com (John Smith)
Date: December 1, 1997 12:51:27 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Coordinates for Flight 800

To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Coordinates for Flight 800
Date: Mon, 01 Dec 97 12:24:30 -0500
From: "Marilyn (Net)" <marilyn@evcom.net>

-- [ From: Marilyn (Net) * EMC.Ver #3.1a ] --

JBS,

On your website I saw the "event" coordinates as 40 40, 72 38.

What is your source for this? I haven't been able to find the same thing.

Thanks,
Thanks very much for your reply John.

I'd already tried to find any comments you might have about Stich's writings, though I understand that you might not put such opinions on your site since it would not be strictly relevant to your findings and crash theory (which I find very, very convincing).

I can't help getting the impression that Stich has some sort of agenda in mind, since he is so active on various political matters such as his anti-government allegations (working with 'Chip' Tatum). I was wondering if you have ever considered the possibility that certain vested interests
might WANT such an accident to happen, say a rival airline that wants to prove another (e.g. United Airlines) has a bad safety record. Or that somebody such as a terrorist or whatever might have sabotaged the door to make it come open?

I might as well point out that I'm asking the question purely out of my own personal interest in this subject. I understand that this might be a sensitive question and I would not quote you or forward any reply from you. If I did want to quote you on something that's not on your website I would specifically ask for your permission first.

Cheers,
Rolf

Rmohr@dreamworks.com

--------
From: John Barry Smith
Sent: Monday, December 01, 1997 4:50 AM
To: Mohr, Rolf
Subject: Cargo door

a. what you think of the reliability of Rodney Stich's book(s)
such as 'Unfriendly Skies' and
b. What you think may have caused the plane doors to have become inadvertently opened? (TWA Flight 800, Pan Am Flight 103, and United Flight 811).

Mr. Hohr,

Most excellent questions.
a. I've quoted parts of his book and are on site at link below. I rely on his facts but not always his conclusions. 
b. The big number one question, the real question. I've tried with the below link.

http://www.corazon.com/811skiesdoorcontents.html

http://www.corazon.com/mysterywhy.html

My latest letter is below:

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

Dear Fellow NTSB TWA 800 Hearing Attendees,
We are allies, we are on the same side, we have the same goal.

I wish to prevent death by preventing airplane accidents by preventing fuselage disintegration in flight by preventing forward cargo door rupture at aft midspan latch on aging Boeing 747s. It's happened before and confirmed: UAL 811; and probably happened before on Pan Am 103, and before that Air India 182. It's probably happened again with TWA 800. The probable cause for all is probably the same as UAL 811, forward cargo door rupture in flight.

The Chairman of NTSB has said the whole issue of aging aircraft will be examined. TWA 800 was certainly that.

Let's assume a few things about TWA 800, AI 182, PA 103, and UAL 811:
1. TWA 800 (93,000 hours), AI 182 (23,624 hours), PA 103 (72,464 hours), and UAL 811 (58,815 hours) were high time, aging early model Boeing 747-100, -200 aircraft.
2. Explosive decompression makes a sudden loud sound. If
explosive decompression does not make a sudden loud sound then the cargo door explanation is not valid.

3. TWA 800, Air India 182, PA 103, and UAL 811 all had sudden loud sounds on the CVR at event time. If not, then cargo door explanation for that aircraft is not valid.

4. If the forward cargo door were to rupture in flight and do the same damage as UAL 811, the nose could tear off, although it did not for UAL 811. If the nose of an aging 747 always stays on after forward door ruptures/opens, then the cargo door explanation is not valid.

4. Explosive decompression can be an explosion.

5. Destructive force of 300 knots onto weakened structure is immense.

To explain TWA 800 from the top down is to match up four aging Boeing 747s which had fatal accidents with destruction starting in fuselage near leading edge of the wing, sudden loud sound on CVR, abrupt power cut to FDR, fodded engines, never recovered bodies, severe starboard side damage, similar wreckage plots, and all were thought to be a bomb for some time.

Only four 747 accidents fit that pattern, UAL 811, AI 182, PA
103, and
TWA
800. They belong to a group from which deductions can be
made. The many
other evidence matches of these four to each other are reported in the
respective governments' AARs: UK AAIB 2/90, CASB and
Indian Aviation
Occurrence, and NTSB AAR 92/02; all available on web site
www.corazon.com

To explain TWA 800 from the bottom up, the evidence pertaining
to TWA 800
must be examined closely and deductions made. The following observations
and explanations refer to TWA 800.
1. CVR sudden loud sound: Explosive decompression starts as
air molecules
rush against each other quickly. NTSB reported sudden loud sound.
2. FDR abrupt power cut: Severe disruption to cargo hold floor and
adjacent
main equipment compartment. NTSB reported abrupt power cut.
3. Streak: Top part of door with fuselage skin attached spinning away
reflecting evening sunlight to ground observers appearing as streak as it
decelerates. Door is shiny metal object and light source was orange
setting sun.
4. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction can be seen at URL
Red flags on top of door indicate it was found closest to airport. Top piece of door and fuselage skin were found closest to airport and far apart from its usual frame and nose: Door ruptured/opened in flight and pieces spun away first, landed first, and found closest.

5. Red paint smears between passenger windows only found above forward cargo door: Red paint from door below transferred when door opened out, up, and slammed into fuselage above. Paint transfer between door and white fuselage principle matches UAL 811.

6. Missing red paint on trim above cargo door: Red paint from trim scraped off by friction of metal bending and rubbing together.

7. Inward bending of top of cargo door: Inward bend occurs when top of door hits fuselage. Inward bending of top door matches UAL 811 top door piece inward bend.

8. Most of middle of cargo door, aft midspan latch, door frame, and outer skin missing: Missing material not available for examination. Door can rupture even when bottom eight latches hold because only two
midspan
latches hold sixteen feet of door closed and have no locking
sectors to
prevent inadvertent unlatching.
9. Door hinges are attached to door and appear near normal:
Hinges match
UAL 811 hinge description in appearance and function.
10. Outward petal bulge rupture at aft midspan latch of forward
cargo
door: Outward bulge rupture suggests rupture at aft latch. Petal
pattern
indicated outward, not inward force of rupture.
11. Outward peeled upper fuselage skin: Outward indicates
internal force
pushed outward, not external force, such as water, pushing
inward.
12. Vertical tear line at station 741 between windows: Vertical
tear line
is nose cut off point and matches other two Boeing 747 nose cut off
points,
AI 182, and PA 103.
13. Starboard only shattered, torn, and frayed fuselage around
forward
cargo door: Unilateral rupture suggests explosive decompression
caused by
inadvertent rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door in
flight
and discounts center tank fire/explosion as initial event.

From top to bottom, TWA 800 crash cause is clear to see, hear,
and touch;
fuselage rupture forward of the wing on right side on a very old
and worn aircraft. The cargo door explanation is plausible, it's mechanical, it's happened before, and it fits the evidence. It also incorporates the center tank fire/explosion explanation as happening as described by NTSB but a few seconds later and a few thousand feet lower than the initial event at 13700 feet/8:31 PM.

I first discovered the cargo door rupture problem on aging 747s after PA 103 in 1988 and confirmed for me by UAL 811 only three months later. My concerns were published first in an aviation newsletter in April, 1990 and in Flying magazine in July, 1992. I've had correspondence with a Pan Am 103 aviation insurance company representative in 1995 regarding the risk of another cargo door inadvertent opening. As soon as I heard that TWA 800 had disappeared from radar and disintegrated in flight shortly after takeoff I suspected cargo door and it was confirmed for me when the sudden loud sound
and abrupt power cut to the FDR were reported by NTSB. All of the subsequent evidence confirms even stronger that the cause of TWA 800 was the aft midspan latch rupture in flight. This letter only describes a few of the linking clues, evidence, and closely reasoned deductions based on the observations of the evidence.

To sum up specific, irrefutable evidence that leads to conclusion of cargo door rupture for TWA 800:
1. Sudden loud sound on CVR.
2. Abrupt power cut to FDR.
3. Red flags on top of door in wreckage reconstruction.
4. Red paint smears on white paint between passenger windows.
5. Most of middle door, aft latch, outer skin, and door frame missing.
6. Shattered, torn, and frayed starboard fuselage structure surrounds the blown apart cargo door yet the opposite port side is smooth and relatively undamaged.
7. Visible bulging outward opening rupture hole at missing aft midspan latch of forward cargo door.

A confirming exercise would be to closely examine the door hinge of TWA 800 to see if it has overtravel impressions on the opposite hinge.
which would
match the overtravel impressions on the UAL 811 door hinge as reported in
NTSB AAR 92/02 and seen at http://www.corazon.com/811page40doorhinge.html

Cargo door explanation for TWA 800 is worthy of intense investigation. My
intentions at the public hearing are to support such an investigation. I
have formally offered to speak before the fact finding panel as a
qualified
technical person with special knowledge. I will be offering
literature to
attendees including pictures and text from NTSB AAR 92/02
showing big
hole
in nose of UAL 811.

What can be done to stop fuselage ruptures in high time Boeing 747s?
1. Boeing must modify/fix the cargo doors again.
2. FAA can direct Boeing to fix the doors with a sixth
Airworthiness
Directive.
3. NTSB can confirm door explanation and make
recommendations to FAA.
4. NTSB public fact finding hearing can determine cargo door
explanation
worthy of investigation and confirm probable cause if valid.
5. Families of victims and their representatives may be persuaded
to
investigate the door and make recommendations to authorities.
6. Elected officials may be persuaded to conduct a parallel door investigation.
7. Media can draw attention to cargo door explanation and bring it to the attention of all concerned.

In all my discussions with persons involved with TWA 800, one person asked the key question: "Why do the doors open?" That was asked of me by my Congressman, Sam Farr, in his office as I presented the cargo door explanation to him. It is a good question.

I will reply now, as I did then, "I don't know for three of them, but for UAL 811 it was chafed wires shorting to turn on door motor which overrode safety features and unlatched the door which opened outward, up, and away, taking fuselage paint with it, killing nine passengers whose bodies were never recovered, leaving a sudden loud sound on the CVR, an abrupt power cut to the FDR, severe starboard side damage, and the cause was thought to be a bomb. The other three are probably the same reason but there are lots of other possibilities that need to be investigated."
(Regarding the AD 'fix' installed after UAL 811, it affected locking sectors yet the two midspan latches have no locking sectors to be 'fixed.' TWA 800 shattered door shows a midspan rupture with bottom latches in place. There were two pairs of door failure: UAL 811 and PA 103 had door rupture midspan and entire door open; AI 182 and TWA 800 had bottom latches hold and door ruptured/opened just at midspan latch.)

I hope to work with you, the authorities and all those concerned to confirm the probable cause of TWA 800. Please contact me with questions or rebuttal. My email is barry@corazon.com. I hope to see you at the NTSB public fact finding hearing about TWA 800 and aging aircraft.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/
Thanks again for taking time to answer my questions.

Keep up the good work,
Rolf

----------
From: John Barry Smith
Sent: Monday, December 01, 1997 12:08 PM
To: rmohr@interactive.dreamworks.com
Subject: No conspiracy

Mr. Mohr, I firmly believe there is no conspiracy, no plot, no coverup in
AI 182, PA 103 UAL 811 or TWA 800. Period. It was a door pop when mechanical
conditions were right according to the laws of physics.

Really, no evil humans in this cause of tragedy.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith
Dear Mr Smith,

I am writing a book about aviation safety and how it could be improved, particularly by regulators paying attention to faults before they end up claiming lives. I have visited your web-site and found it very interesting. I find your points about the common faults of the DC-10 and 747 electrically operated non-plug cargo doors particularly valid. I have found this often happens: a fault might be rectified on one plane, but even if the problem is common to other jets, usually only the "crash type" gets the fix.

Be that as it may I am compiling testimony of passengers' experiences of emergencies, crashes, or close calls. I noticed you mentioned
this, in your
post to the airliners forum I think. I wonder whether it would be possible
for you to let me know about your experiences, possibly for inclusion in my
book.

Finally, my publishers need me to do some picture research. Do you have a
reference for the agency or photographer of the pic of the hole in UAL 811?

I wonder also, BTW, whether the Mounties ever actually charged anyone in
connection with the Air India jumbo. I saw a post last March suggesting
they had some more evidence.

(Just as an aside, I thought I might mention this. I interviewed Eric
Newton, long retired AAIB man, about a year ago. He was hired by the Indian
government as an expert on bombs on planes to report on that crash. He said
he saw no bomb damage whatsoever, and that while he could not exclude a
bomb as having been responsible, they had not recovered enough wreckage to
make any such determination, and there was no evidence from the recovered
bodies, either. He says the Indians were not at all pleased with him).
Dear Mr. Weir,

you have jumped into something here. The NTSB hearings are about to begin in Baltimore and I hope to get the cargo door explanation into the public ear. We'll see.

I have visited your web-site and found it very interesting. I find your points about the common faults of the DC-10 and 747 electrically operated non-plug cargo doors particularly valid. I have found this often happens: a fault might be rectified on one plane, but even if the problem is common to other jets, usually only the "crash type" gets the fix.

NTSB AAR 92/02 excoriates Boeing for not fixing the doors after MD DC10 cargo door crash, so true what you say.

I wonder whether it would be possible for you to let me know about your experiences, possibly for
inclusion in my book.

None in civilian airliners, but several in military, including an ejection which killed my pilot. Story at http://www.corazon.com/eject.html

Finally, my publishers need me to do some picture research. Do you have a reference for the agency or photographer of the pic of the hole in UAL 811?

It's public domain and came from NTSB AAR 92/02 which you can order for 30$ from NTSB or there will refer you to agency to order from. You can used the picture of 811 with big hole off my web site too.

I wonder also, BTW, whether the Mounties ever actually charged anyone in connection with the Air India jumbo. I saw a post last March suggesting they had some more evidence.

Ah, every time I contact the TSB or RCMP about AI 182 and cargo door, a few days later, as in March and last month, the RCMP announce 'arrests are imminent' and they never occur. The AI 182 task force has been going on for years with no results and don't want to be disbanded. John Schnieder runs it and will say, arrests are imminent and I can't tell you any more because it's a criminal investigation. Story below.

Kallstrom of FBI has concluded his criminal investigation and still influenced NTSB to prohibit eyewitness accounts of TWA
(Just as an aside, I thought I might mention this. I interviewed Eric Newton, long retired AAIB man, about a year ago. He was hired by the Indian government as an expert on bombs on planes to report on that crash. He said he saw no bomb damage whatsoever, and that while he could not exclude a bomb as having been responsible, they had not recovered enough wreckage to make any such determination, and there was no evidence from the recovered bodies, either. He says the Indians were not at all pleased with him).

Can you refer him to me, do you have his email address? Can you direct him to the corazon web site? He's right, no bomb damage. In 1985 they did not have the benefit of hindsight and three other similar accidents to compare and did not have reasonable alternative explanation backed up by documents so picked the one that fitted their interests. I would love to talk to Mr. Newton. Other investigators associated with 182 have said the same thing, no bomb, particularly the Canadian aircraft accident investigators. The cops want it to be bomb and keep it that way.

103 as bomb easily debunked also.

Essentially I've discovered serial killer, cargo door, that other agencies have missed because they studied their own case closely and did not bring others in.
Regards,

John Barry Smith

Eyewitness Accounts Shelved

By Andrew Metz
Staff Writer

RESPONDING TO pressure from the FBI on the eve of the first public forum on the explosion of TWA Flight 800, the National Transportation Safety Board has canceled the discussion of eyewitness accounts and explosive residue at the five-day hearing into the cause of the crash.

After an exchange of letters Wednesday between Assistant FBI Director James Kallstrom and NTSB Chairman Jim Hall, the safety board eliminated scheduled sessions on the accounts and pulled a screening of the CIA video re-creation of the crash, according to a copy of Hall's letter obtained yesterday.

Reacting to Kallstrom's concerns that the information would hinder any revived criminal probe, the safety board also agreed to cut discussions of explosive residue found on the plane's seats during the hearings, which are set to
begin Monday in Baltimore.

In effect, the concessions redress all the objections set forth in Kallstrom's four-page letter to Hall. And it once again highlighted the discord between the two agencies.

Despite the fact that the FBI publicly concluded their criminal probe of the July 17, 1996, crash in which all 230 passengers died, Kallstrom warned Hall away from "the use of any of the 244 eyewitness [accounts] ... or summaries prepared ... by the NTSB." And he said that experts scheduled to analyze the eyewitness testimony "could complicate our efforts if the criminal investigation were to be reactivated."

"Until the NTSB has definitively determined an accidental cause for the crash, I believe it is prudent to withhold from public disclosure or discussion the identities of witnesses and the raw investigative details of the criminal investigation," Kallstrom wrote in his letter.

Since declaring that investigators found no evidence of sabotage in the tragedy, Kallstrom has consistently said the probe is not closed, opting to characterize it as inactive.
In his letter to Hall, he conceded that the possibility of rekindling the criminal query is "remote."

In a two-page response to the FBI objections, Hall told Kallstrom that he didn't "see any fundamental disagreement between our agencies." And while he said he would comply with the "general objections" he said he was "compelled to deny certain of your specific objections."

Those elements were not spelled out in the letter however, and FBI officials could not be reached yesterday.

Declining to comment further, Hall issued a statement yesterday, saying that he would honor the FBI's positions but that the NTSB would continue as planned to "discuss its work done outside the criminal investigative process -- including that work which overlaps in substance, such as wreckage documentation and the examination of any and all potential ignition sources."

The revision of the hearings, which are meant to present the NTSB's findings on the crash off Long Island, cancels testimony by two experts, including Elizabeth Loftus, a University of Washington psychology professor whose studies call into question the accuracy of eyewitness accounts,
Loftus could not be reached yesterday. But the message on her answering machine said she that she would be in Baltimore this weekend.

In his letter, Kallstrom said that "I believe that the presentation of expert testimony that could cast doubt on the eyewitness' veracity does not further the accident investigation."

Lauren Terrazzano contributed to this story.

November 28, 1997

CHARGES PENDING IN 1985 AIR INDIA BOMBING

By SEAN DURKAN -- Parliamentary Bureau

The RCMP is preparing to lay charges in the 1985 Air India bombing which killed 329 people on a flight from Canada, says Canada's top Mountie.

"We have quite a large number of investigators working very diligently in finalizing that matter as quickly as possible," RCMP commissioner Phil Murray announced yesterday.

"It's our intention to lay charges, but we can't at this particular time divulge exactly what those charges are or who they will involve because the matter is still ongoing," Murray told reporters.
Murray said the 12-year probe has been complicated because it involves jurisdictions in Japan, India and Britain.
"This is the most complex investigation in the history of Canada," Murray said.
Meanwhile, the RCMP is considering former Tory prime minister Brian Mulroney's demand that it withdraw a letter implicating him an alleged kickback scandal, Murray said.
Mulroney won an out-of-court settlement in January in which the RCMP apologized for wrongly stating, in request to the Swiss for bank records, that he was involved in a kickback scheme connected to Air Canada's purchase of several Airbus planes.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 6, 1997 5:23:11 AM PST
To: Andrew Weir <andyweir@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Experiences

Dear Mr. Weir, it rhymes every time...

(It's the writer in me playing the words in my head.)

is not of the email, or even computer, generation.

I run into people who think fax is cutting edge.

He simply said to the Indians that there was no bomb evidence in the wreckage that he had seen (I presume the bodies were X-rayed for
microscopic particles of metal that could have been shot into the bodies by a bomb) and that they had not recovered nearly enough wreckage, it being possible that there was evidence of a bomb in parts of the wreckage that was not recovered.

But exactly true. No bomb evidence. Always it's maybe later. Just as sudden loud sound was not bomb....but could be later.

ey put counterweights on the controls to stop the pilots tearing the wings off Spitfires when they pulled too tight a turn,

how they solved the mysteries of the Canberras that kept ploughing into the ground (elevators stuck in nose down position because of a cheap electrical switch),

and so on. How Bishop (designed the Comet and the Mosquito) always pushed things too far.

Three good anecdotes. A friend and I had a question of how many airplanes had downward ejection seats besides the Vulcan. I opinined the early B52 and B47.
my browser/computer/modem combination is antique and takes forever to download things (especially images). Thanks for the tip about the photo.

And I'm sorry to say my site is full of scanned in images which take a long time to download. I had to use the scanned images of the report page for authenticity. When I quote and link, it goes right to the actual report page, not a paraphrase or transcribed text.

There's a magistrate in Italy who has had a crash investigation going on a DC9 since 1980. There's jobs in these tragedies!

Exactly, and now Kallstrom is doing the same for TWA 800. Italy Canada and US law enforcement will not take their fingers out of that huge pie or airport security exploiting people's primal fear of falling.

Anyway, the biggest story of aviation in the past few decades, from my point of view, a story involving literally billions of dollars, politics of power of seven nations, and the deaths of 838, is the serial killer cargo door who has killed four machines but only been caught for one and that was fluke of good luck for the victim, UAL 811. The sleuth was an amateur, me, using new fangled thing called internet, and 45 years of aviation experience. The killer did what all uncaught serial killers do, spread the crime out over years (11), do the crime in far away different jurisdictions (4), make the crime appear to be something else palatable to the authorities (a bomb), and have friends in high
places (Boeing).

And, right up your alley, the regulators, manufacturers, and airline knew about the problem, (ruptured pressurized hulls,) before the 747 was designed, and built, and flown, and ruptured, and have turned a passive eye. The Comet showed the way. New boss same as the old boss.

And I know why, we are all to blame a little bit but no one is to blame for it all. We all want fast cheap transportation and acquiring consumer stuff and that means large cargo doors for large cargo loaded fast.

The public wants pleasant lies and rebuffs unpleasant truths.

I'm off to the airport for Baltimore from California in two hours for the hearings. We'll see.

Cheers,

Barry Smith

---

From: Andrew Weir <andyweir@compuserve.com>
Date: December 6, 1997 4:35:10 AM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Experiences

Dear Mr Smith

Thank you very much for your very full reply. Eric Newton, although a first-class engineer, is not of the email, or even computer,
generation. He is about 82, I think. Not sharp as a tack, I'd say, but definitely still has his marbles. I think the best way for you to get in touch with him would be by letter. His address is White Shutters, Pett, nr Hastings. Sorry, no postcode. I don't know where you are based but a visit probably be the best way to get what you want, especially as he may let you have a copy of his report to the Indian accident investigation commission. I shall drop him a note saying that I have given you his postal address.

I think that his evidence to you might not be exactly what you need. He simply said to the Indians that there was no bomb evidence in the wreckage that he had seen (I presume the bodies were X-rayed for microscopic particles of metal that could have been shot into the bodies by a bomb) and that they had not recovered nearly enough wreckage, it being possible that there was evidence of a bomb in parts of the wreckage that was not recovered. Anyway, that's between you and him.

Whatever happens, provided he is as lucid as when I saw him, over a year ago, you should enjoy his company, particularly with your military
background. He has some amazing stories about crash investigation during
WW2, how they put counterweights on the controls to stop the pilots tearing
the wings off Spitfires when they pulled too tight a turn, how they solved
the mysteries of the Canberras that kept ploughing into the ground
(elevators stuck in nose down position because of a cheap electrical
switch), and so on. How Bishop (designed the Comet and the Mosquito) always
pushed things too far.

None in civilian airliners, but several in military, including an
ejection
which killed my pilot. Story at http://www.corazon.com/eject.html

I will look that up. I haven't gutted your web-site completely
because my
browser/computer/modem combination is antique and takes
forever to download
things (especially images). Thanks for the tip about the photo.

years with no results and don't want to be disbanded. John Schnieder runs
it and will say, arrests are imminent and I can't tell you any more
because
it's a criminal investigation. Story below.

There's a magistrate in Italy who has had a crash investigation going on a
DC9 since 1980. There's jobs in these tragedies!

Regards,

Andrew Weir

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 13, 1997 8:11:57 AM PST
To: mike@CINTOS.COM
Subject: online chat

Mike, after reading your posts I believe you respect facts. We both pick up on the same discrepancies. I told the online chat person to include you when you showed up as you said you were. He said great. You and I would have been online answering question. I was alone and worked for an hour answering questions from all over the world.

Again, I think the meteor Cassidy guy helped you. He said it was possible but unlikely. My NTSB guy said it didn't happen.

Rebutting meteor is lack of evidence again and would have had to hit all four planes, not just one.

But it could happen.

And there were no questions to rebut the possibility.

I'm jealous you had a whole panel to present meteor. I had a sentence that eight of the ten latches were latched and that made the door closed.
Oh, well, back to the fray.

It wasn't center tank as initial event, that's clear.

Regards,
Barry

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 14, 1997 8:48:38 AM PST
To: calbrks@concentric.net
Subject: Final?

What's your final analysis as of now, Barry? A very cool site by the way - Thanks for posting it.

It's not final. Barely just started.

Still the aft midspan latch rupture. There is now more than ever supporting documentation of door rupture. I'm going to separate it out and start submitting it again for review.

Regards, Barry

From: Chris Brooks <calbrks@concentric.net>
Date: December 14, 1997 12:16:47 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: thanks
Reply-To: calbrks@concentric.net

What's your final analysis as of now, Barry? A very cool site by the
Hi Barry,

I am a graphic designer who has stumbled on your picture while surfing for airline disaster pictures. I know that sounds bad, but I'm doing some artwork for the cover of a book for a ghost writer in Dallas and was looking for some artwork for the cover/web page. After finding your site I would like to know if you would consider letting us use your picture of the ruptured cargo door area of TWA 800 for a collage on the front of the book.

The writer is publishing a book on the misadventures of the flight industry from a first hand point of view.

For the use of your photo, we would be happy to reproduce it as is, as well as give you full recognition and reference your web site in all media for your compensation. Please contact me ASAP and let me know if you are interested...

Thank you,
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 19, 1997 9:48:52 AM PST
To: lakewd@flash.net
Subject: Re: your picture of twa 800/which one?

After finding your site I would like to know if you would consider letting us use your picture of the ruptured cargo door area of TWA 800 for a collage on the front of the book.

Sure, no problem. It's in the public domain in the sense I scanned the official NTSB picture and then blew up that part and put it on the site. So I say it's yours already as a taxpayer. I would appreciate the link to my website for safety reasons but the photo use is yours. I blew it up but that the image came from NTSB. I annotated the blow up, that may be the one you are talking about? Either way, use it as you see fit. I would love the credit, wouldn't we all.

Thanks for asking.

Refer the publisher to me so I can present my cargo door theory to him for possible book, if you will.
The writer is publishing a book on the misadventures of the flight industry from a first hand point of view.

Yeah, I ejected from flaming jet and survived.

Needs a movie remake of 'Blowup" with modern computer techniques, yes?

I digitally altered the petal rupture hole on one picture, (there are many,) by moving the pieces and showing the hole was ruptured outward and not just torn. The whole reconstruction should have that digital effect of putting it back the way it was.

Regards, Barry Smith

For the use of your photo, we would be happy to reproduce it as is, as well as give you full recognition and reference your web site in all media for your compensation. Please contact me ASAP and let me know if you are interested...

Thank you,
Kelly C Hanna
Crystal Mountain Graphics
214-828-9973
lakewd@flash.net
419 N Paulus
Dallas, TX 75214
As a frequent trans Atlantic flyer, and one who can't get on a plane without getting blind drunk first, I found this web site fascinating and disturbing, hence the fact it's kept me awake this long!

While working in Philadelphia last year I heard about the cargo door fault theory from a girl who had witnessed the TWA disaster from a distance, from Long Island, she had also spoken with someone involved with the recovery of the wreckage and I got the impression that a faulty door was suspected early on, but later ruled out because of evidence of explosives, I'm sorry I can't remember any names or anything. It seems that the weight of evidence you present strongly links the cargo door to all four crashes, and certainly sways my opinion, but just for the sake of argument.... Wouldn't the first effect of a bomb in the cargo hold be to blow out the door thus causing the chain reaction of explosive decompression etc
almost simultaneously? Is there any evidence in the case of the TWA or the Pan Am plane (which came down near my own home town) that completely rules out the possibility of a bomb being the trigger of the door failing?
I realise that, as I have only read through a fraction of your site, you may have answered this somewhere, but I'd be grateful if you could let me know your opinion on this, in the meantime, I hope Boeing will not take the chance of ignoring this evidence.

-Steve Lomas
Edinburgh, Scotland

From: Kelly & Jana Hanna <lakewd@flash.net>
Date: December 22, 1997 2:43:03 PM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: your picture of twa 800/which one?
Reply-To: lakewd@flash.net

John Barry Smith wrote:

After finding your site I would like to know if you would consider letting us use your picture of the ruptured cargo door area of TWA 800 for a collage on the front of the book.
Sure, no problem. It's in the public domain in the sense I scanned the official NTSB picture and then blew up that part and put it on the site. So I say it's yours already as a taxpayer. I would appreciate the link to my website for safety reasons but the photo use is yours. I blew it up but that the image came from NTSB. I annotated the blow up, that may be the one you are talking about? Either way, use it as you see fit. I would love the credit, wouldn't we all.

Thanks for asking.

Refer the publisher to me so I can present my cargo door theory to him for possible book, if you will.

The writer is publishing a book on the misadventures of the flight industry from a first hand point of view.

Yeah, I ejected from flaming jet and survived.

Needs a movie remake of 'Blowup" with modern computer techniques, yes?

I digitally altered the petal rupture hole on one picture, (there are many,) by moving the pieces and showing the hole was ruptured outward and not just torn. The whole reconstruction should have that digital
effect of putting it back the way it was.

Regards, Barry Smith

For the use of your photo, we would be happy to reproduce it as is, as well as give you full recognition and reference your web site in all media for your compensation. Please contact me ASAP and let me know if you are interested...

Thank you,
Kelly C Hanna
Crystal Mountain Graphics
214-828-9973
lakewd@flash.net
419 N Paulus
Dallas, TX 75214

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/
the one we want is on the hullruption page of your site. Thanks for the permission, we will forward your name to the writer as the final copy has not been penned yet!

Thanks again, Kelly

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 22, 1997 7:31:11 PM PST
To: lakewd@flash.net
Subject: Re: your picture of twa 800/which one?

Dear Kelly,

please tell me the exact URL of the picture from my web site you wish to use. I have hundreds of pictures on web site. Some I have the right to give away and some I don't. And more important, if there is writing on the picture I must check to see if it is accurate and up to date with the latest NTSB released exhibits. So, please to know which picture URL you want.

the one we want is on the hullrupture page of your site.

Is it http://www.corazon.com/TWA800hullrupture.html ?
If so, great, it is a great picture. Please to request you include the margin notes as part of the picture. Please don't crop. I added margin notes to keep from overlaying evidence with text. It's a great picture, worthy of study. There is much intelligence in this picture. The wreckage is airplane in NTSB released photograph. Text and analysis is mine and am responsible for. Please direct any questions you may get about this amazing picture to me. There are more amazing pictures about Boeing 747s and everything about them on site. The TWA 800 is the most exciting. I have several other pictures that are knockouts too. Interested?

This is all so exciting. Please confirm exact URL of hull rupture so we think alike.

Regards,
Barry

John Barry Smith wrote:
After finding your site I would like to know if you would consider letting us use your picture of the ruptured cargo door area of TWA 800 for a collage on the front of the book.

Sure, no problem. It's in the public domain in the sense I scanned the official NTSB picture and then blew up that part and put it on the site. So I say it's yours already as a taxpayer. I would appreciate the link to my website for safety reasons but the photo use is yours. I blew it up but that the image came from NTSB. I annotated the blow up, that may be the one you are talking about? Either way, use it as you see fit. I would love the credit, wouldn't we all.

Thanks for asking.

Refer the publisher to me so I can present my cargo door theory to him for possible book, if you will.

The writer is publishing a book on the misadventures of the flight industry from a first hand point of view.

Yeah, I ejected from flaming jet and survived.
Needs a movie remake of 'Blowup" with modern computer techniques, yes?

I digitally altered the petal rupture hole on one picture, (there are many,) by moving the pieces and showing the hole was ruptured outward and not just torn. The whole reconstruction should have that digital effect of putting it back the way it was.

Regards, Barry Smith

For the use of your photo, we would be happy to reproduce it as is, as well as give you full recognition and reference your web site in all media for your compensation. Please contact me ASAP and let me know if you are interested...

Thank you,
Kelly C Hanna
Crystal Mountain Graphics
214-828-9973
lakewd@flash.net
419 N Paulus
Dallas, TX 75214

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/
the one we want is on the hullruption page of your site. Thanks for the permission, we will forward your name to the writer as the final copy
Hello, my name is Conrad B. Stergas (tel: 212 988-6612, FAX: 212 988-6613). I am an ex-airline pilot. While searching the internet under "TWA 800" and "Pan Am 103," I found your many postings. I have a significant interest in airline safety and would like to speak with you directly. Unfortunately, I do not have an e-mail address or a computer that is connected to the internet. Therefore, I am attempting to communicate with you through a third party; that is, (dick@superior.net). Please e-mail me your telephone number so that I can contact you, or please call me at 212 988-6612, or send me a FAX at 212 988-6613. Thank you for your interest.
From: arzudurak <arzudurak@hotmail.com>
Date: December 26, 1995 3:56:36 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: ài just wonder ...

how can i reach the faa training center of the faa.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 26, 1997 10:01:49 AM PST
To: arzudurak <arzudurak@hotmail.com>
Subject: Re: ài just wonder ...

how can i reach the faa training center of the faa.

http://www.faa.gov/

http://www.faa.gov/ats/atshome.htm

From: angels flight <GTE/Rich6651@gte.net>
Date: December 27, 1997 5:31:15 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: cargo door
Reply-To: Rich6651@gte.net

I read your site. You have some good ideas. Contact me. Lets chat on E.mail.

Best Rgards
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 27, 1997 6:19:25 PM PST
To: Rich6651@gte.net
Subject: Re: cargo door

I read your site. You have some good ideas. Contact me. Let's chat on E.mail.

Best Rgards

Dear Rest Rgards,

Huh?

John Barry Smith

---

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: December 28, 1997 8:31:03 AM PST
To: ron3b@cris.com
Subject: sudden sound is explosive decompression

Dear Mr. Katona, just read your analysis of FDR and CVR. Very good.

My explanation for sudden loud sound is explosive decompression. FDR cut is cargo floor disruption at adjacent main equipment compartment. Cause of both was rupture at aft midspan latch of the forward cargo door in flight for TWA 800 and others.
Cheers,

John Barry Smith

From: T Stolz <tstolz@pcisys.net>
Date: December 29, 1997 1:27:20 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Miscellaneous Items Relating to Web Page

Mr. Smith:

Thank You for your very informative web page regarding cargo door ruptures and accidents relating to the former. I consider myself an avid aviation enthusiast, especially in the commercial sector. The information provided (and it is copious to say the least!) had many elements in which I believe need immediate investigation by the FAA/NTSB and Boeing.

I am in a position that is somewhat unique. My father is currently an A&P mechanic at TWA who is very familiar with the 747 mechanicals and operations, especially that particular plane which perished. I showed him, and his fellow co-workers, this web site. The general feeling I
got was that the possibility is there for this to occur, but that TWA was up-to-date on all Air-Worthiness/Safety Bulletins/Modifications issued by the FAA. This, however, does not mean that those modifications are fool-proof, and may indicate an FAA pattern of 'patchwork' fixes which will sway public opinion in the favor of this agency. After all, the FAA and DOT have shown in the past 15 years, especially under the 'leadership' of Frederico Pena (i.e. the ValuJet fiasco), that agency image is far more important than actual substance and pro-active results for prevention.

Anyhow, I want ask you something...have you tried to contact CBS's 60 Minutes regarding your information? I know by reading your page that you have tried to contact the FAA directly, but were unsuccessful. I will give you an address that you can contact:

    CBS Audience Services
    524 West 57th Street
    New York, NY 10019
    (212) 975-3247

I believe they will be very interested in pursuing these items, and will get a story out on a future edition, since this case is still in limbo.
If you don't have an objection on appearing on TV and being interviewed, you will be a valuable asset to this investigation, even showing many of the shortcomings of the FAA which STILL exist (maybe forcing the FAA to do what it should??).

I still can't believe that the NTSB held a 2-week long mickey-mouse conference on TW800. They found absolutely NOTHING new. NO mention of any other failure was brought up, thereby wasting millions of dollars of taxpayer money on crap already drilled into all of us. It was actually encouraging to have all of these aviation electronics experts who mentioned that an electrical spark in a fuel probe cannot cause this center fuel tank explosion (as I always thought). The NTSB also couldn't simulate this situation in the desert with an old 747 last summer, never mentioned in this convention. So what's new? IMAGE...

If you wish, you can contact me at: tstolz@pcisys.net

I wish you well in finding the truth in this horrible tragedy which affected many at TWA-employees, relatives and friends-as well as the travelling public.

Regards.....
My father is currently an A&P mechanic at TWA who is very familiar with the 747 mechanicals and operations, especially that particular plane which perished. I showed him, and his fellow co-workers, this web site. The general feeling I got was that the possibility is there for this to occur, but that TWA was up-to-date on all Air-Worthiness/Safety Bulletins/Modifications issued by the FAA.

TWA employees wishful thinking is it was not their fault, like a missile, and that's why they all believe missile. Cargo door may not be their fault, but they will not investigate for fear it may be.

indicate an FAA pattern of 'patchwork' fixes

Of course, all ADs are bandaids over a larger problem.

Anyhow, I want ask you something...have you tried to contact CBS's 60 Minutes regarding your information?
No, my efforts are directed at Boeing, NTSB and FAA. If you think CBS should know, then you contact them. I will be glad to talk to them, just not glad to try to get their attention. I have no objection to TV or interviews, I've done a lot in the last year.

CBS Audience Services
524 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 975-3247

I still can't believe that the NTSB held a 2-week long mickey-mouse conference on TW800.

Yes, it was a show trial of innocent bystander, the center tank. It was not a fact finding public inquiry, as it was billed, it was a charade or infomercial for government in control and everything is all right.

If you wish, you can contact me at: tstolz@pcisys.net

I'll be glad to talk to any TWA employee with an open mind that knows about airplanes and will not talk about conspiracies. I'll talk to your Dad, although I'm sure he's a missile/conspiracy guy. They all are.

Cheers,
In 1993, a 707 (or KC-135R) blew up on the ramp in Milwaukee, and killed 6 fellow technicians. The cause was a fuel tank explosion caused by an arc between some pump wiring. I believe the pump was immersed in the fuel, or partially at least. (if memory serves). Could not the same thing occur on TWA800? I understand that one is a 707 and the other is a 747, but I wonder how different the fuel tank architecture is. Could you enlighten me please?

Another thing, why would foreign governments go at such great lengths to protect Boeing, ie sanctions against Lybia?

No conspiracy no coverup no plot.

They all believe a bomb did 103, it didn't. They all believe a bomb did 182, it didn't. They all thought for a few hours a bomb did 811, it didn't. They all thought for 16 months a bomb did 800, it didn't. See the pattern?

Cheers, Barry

---

From: class <enrich@bulldogs.org>
Date: January 8, 1998 1:32:31 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: no subject!!
Reply-To: enrich@bulldogs.org

fix them planes now!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

From: "Shawn King" <kinger@execulink.com>
Date: January 10, 1998 9:18:12 PM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Can't believe it

have you ever thought of presenting to Boeing or your gov't. It
all seems
to make sense.

From: kbozman@cvn.net (kbozman)
Date: January 11, 1998 11:15:34 AM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Cargo door failures on 747

Barry,

I would like to thank you for the information regarding 747 cargo door failures and I would like to say that I agree with you. There appears to be a pattern of failure particularly on the older 100's. This is cause for alarm and should make anyone sceptical before boarding an aged 747.

Question...... what is being done about it?

Keep up the good work, someone needs to do something about it since there seems to be a lack of acknowledgement on Boeing that this problem exists.

Please respond with any additional comments or findings

E-mail me at
kbozman@mail.cvn.net
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 11, 1998 9:08:08 AM PST
To: kbozman@cvn.net
Subject: Re: Cargo door failures on 747

Question...... what is being done about it?

Nine years of research, two years of constant effort, thousands of emails, hundreds of letters including text, documents, and photos, interviews, dozens of phone calls, and...and...nothing.

Please respond with any additional comments or findings

I'm never rebutted with facts, only opinions, the biggest of which is, how could so many officials be wrong? And I say, easy.

It makes sense when examined by evidence and history but doesn't make sense when looked at emotionally. Emotion, read fear, rules.

The last link in the mystery of years was solved for me last month when I saw water cascade out of the forward cargo hold of a 757 and I realized hot humid air in hold condenses when it is hit by cold air conditioned air after take off and water drips down on now shown to be often faulty poly x wiring which gets easily chafed through to bare wire by vibration. Water to bare wire, short to ground and door motor turns on and sequence starts. Why door opened was always big mystery to me, not whether or not it opened. And I've solved that too but need actual evidence to confirm. The door opened/ruptured event is confirmed by
evidence of NTSB exhibits, but now need actual TWA 800 chafed wire photographs and hinge overtravel damage but wreckage is sealed up tight.

I wrote after PA 103 and UAL 811 that after another 747 falls from the sky in pieces 103 will be reexamined, I was wrong.

Regards,

Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 12, 1998 9:01:48 AM PST
To: andyweir@compuserve.com
Subject: Book Publisher

Dear Mr. Weir, 11 Jan 98

Do you know of a book publisher that I could write to and enquire if they want to publish my cargo door theory for AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800?

Cheers,

Barry Smith

From: kbozman@cvn.net (kbozman)
Date: January 12, 1998 12:14:11 PM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: 747 Cargo door failure
Barry,

Thanks for responding promptly and don't forget....... Squeeky wheels get oiled first! Keep up the good fight and E-Mail me with any new info.

Thanks again,

John B.

---

From: Andrew Weir <andyweir@compuserve.com>
Date: January 12, 1998 1:36:47 PM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Book Publisher

Do you know of a book publisher that I could write to and enquire if they want to publish my cargo door theory for AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800?

Dear Mr Smith,

I came across my own publisher through my agent, who knows the publishing trade and put the book up to publishers he thought might be interested. He is not an aviation specialist and I should point out that my book is intended to be for the non-specialist. That's a long way of saying I don't know the specialist aviation publishing world. My wild guess is that you would probably get a wider readership for it on the Web than in
the
bookshops.

The best I can do is to suggest an aviation specialist publisher called
Airlife, on 01743 235651. I don't have any contacts there, but would guess
that if you could get chatting to an editor there you may learn more about
the kind of market they think there may or may not be for such a book. I
think that if you are hoping to do an exposee of this question, possibly a
newspaper might be the best way of getting support so long as you have the
concrete evidence.

Regards, Andrew Weir

---

From: lolly1@ix.netcom.com
Date: January 12, 1998 3:30:54 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: More info.
Reply-To: lolly1@ix.netcom.com

Hi, my name is Lauren Kween and I was wondering if you knew of any more
information on the web about flight 981.

---

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Hi, my name is Lauren Kween and I was wondering if you knew of any more information on the web about flight 981.

Flight 981? Need more info.

Cheers, Barry

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 12, 1998 4:16:44 PM PST
To: Andrew Weir <andyweir@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Book Publisher

Dear Mr. Weir, 12 Jan 98

The best I can do is to suggest an aviation specialist publisher called Airlife, on 01743 235651.

Thanks.

I think that if you are hoping to do an exposee of this question, possibly a newspaper might be the best way of getting support so long as you have the concrete evidence.
I've got the evidence, it's the interpretations that are not believed. I don't want to do an expose. I am for the Government. I'm not trying to embarrass anyone, just want the doors fixed. And actually, now the real culprit, bad wiring, poly-X to be precise.

People tell me to write a book. Yeah, OK. How hard can it be?

Actually, real hard. I have about 2000 pages of cargo door material. It's so boring for an audience, that's why missile sells, it's got intrigue. Cargo door has happened before and is technical. No human interest. Newspapers want excitement.

NTSB wants status quo. Nobody wants boring truth that is extremely unpleasant and I don't blame them.

So it's a problem with this TV and book thing. It seems an end run around the goal of safe flight. So I'm now concentrating on writing to the officials trying to get them to confirm door open by examining evidence further. But, no replies.

Boeing is the group to fix the problem and they are absolutely impenetrable. A lawyer for Boeing will not talk at all.

A person, an agency, and a business obsessed with safety act a certain way. Officials, NTSB, and Boeing do not act that way.

Thanks for info.

Cheers,
Barry Smith
From: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Date: January 19, 1998 5:03:23 AM PST
To: Barry <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: TW800

Barry,

I've had an interesting time reading your web page. I searched for TW800 info, because I wanted to find out the latest official line and theories about the crash. I have my own ideas about what is going on, but I am rather an amateur. Anyhow, I'm popping along to a lecture by the AAIB, on Wednesday, and while I can hardly ask too many specific questions and expect detailed answers, I do fancy asking about the disposal of evidence. What would you ask, given your current ideas? And can you fill me in on the latest official line - is it still the fuel pump?

Andy.

P.S. For amateur, read C.Eng, Senior Systems Engineer with avionics systems engineering experience, trying to make safe, reliable systems, and always keen
to know what stage in the process has caused problems. I'm also a pilot, when funds permit!

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 19, 1998 10:26:21 AM PST
To: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Subject: PA 103

Andy, official line is center tank explosion initial event, ignition source unknown.
My line is condensed water on cold metal sides of cargo hold drips down to bare chafed poly x wiring to turn on door motor which unlatches aft midspan latch of forward cargo door which ruptures then opens then explosive decompression then nose off then center tank explosion into fireball then water impact.
Ignition source is on fire engine number three or four. And of course documented every step of the way.

AAIB questions: Why is starboard side damage of 103 so much more severe than port side, the 'bomb' side? How can bomb not be heard on CVR? Why no pictures of starboard side in AAIB 2/90?

Give him the 'PA 103 not a bomb?' info below and on web site.

What I would like is a name and a contact to which to write to present my cargo door case. There must be somebody in AAIB still interested in PA 103 other than the police. 103 matches 800 in many many ways. The big difference is 103 had door open like 811 while the bottom locking sectors held on AI 182 and TWA 800 so door ruptured first, then opened. The AD to
strengthen locking sectors worked, too bad the aft midspan latches have no locking sectors.

I do fancy asking about the disposal of evidence.

Yes, the door and latches must be retained. A specific check is to see if the door hinge has overtravel impression damage similar to UAL 811 which would indicate outward opening. The evidence is all there for 103 to examine to prove cargo door opened first, then relatively mild sooty directed blast occurred, not a non sooty, strong, spherical blast a semtex bomb would do.

Ask AAIB person how a sooty directed small blast can act like a bomb. It can't, it is probably a 'rather large shotgun' as the AAIB report opines. A real mystery is the actual object that caused the relatively mild blast when exposed to large explosive decompression in the forward cargo hold when door popped open.

I would love to have an official contact within AAIB with an open mind in which to suggest the PA 103 investigation be reopened based upon new evidence and conclusions about TWA 800.

Or you be the middle man. Communication must be established with AAIB. 103 is a myth craft, like Titanic and Hindenberg. It was not a bomb that brought it down, a door popped. It wasn't huge iceberg gash but many small cracks from too much sulphur in the brittle 1912 steel.

Comet Yoke Peter old boss, 103 new boss, explosive decompression at structural failure. Icarus, structural failure. New boss same as the old boss. Good reputation of Comet
mystery solved by AAIB needs to be restored after nonsense of police driven conclusion of bomb for PA 103.

Well, I've rambled, but it's important. AAIB contact is most important.

Have you heard of John Ware of Panorama? He interviewed me; I don't know what happened after that.

Regards, Barry Smith

Also pilot and background in avionics.

Boeing 747  UAL 811 and PA 103 comparison is

www.corazon.com/811and103comparisonweb.html

The pictures are missing here but 103 and 811 match in damage on starboard side.

UAL 811
The above aircraft was an: (1) aged (2) high flight time (3) early model Boeing 747 (4) which took off in darkness (5) running late (6) and shortly after takeoff (7) experienced a sudden initial event in the forward cargo hold which left a (8) short (9) sudden (10) loud (11) sound on the cockpit voice recorder, an (12) abrupt (13) power cut to the flight data recorder, (14) foreign object damage to starboard engines #3 and (15) #4, (16) more severe inflight damage on starboard side, (17) nine never recovered
bodies, (18) torn off skin in forward cargo door area on starboard side, (19) longitudinal break at midline of the forward cargo door at midspan latch, (20) outward peeled skin on upper forward fuselage, (21) vertical fuselage tear lines forward of the wing and aft of forward cargo door, and (22) destruction initially thought to be have been caused by a bomb.

Pan Am 103
The above aircraft was an: (1) aged (2) high flight time (3) early model Boeing 747 (4) which took off in darkness (5) running late (6) and shortly after takeoff (7) experienced a sudden initial event in the forward cargo hold which left a (8) short (9) sudden (10) loud (11) sound on the cockpit voice recorder, an (12) abrupt (13) power cut to the flight data recorder, (14) foreign object damage to starboard engines #3 and (15) #4, (16) more severe inflight damage on starboard side, (17) nine never recovered bodies, (18) torn off skin in forward cargo door area on starboard side, (19) longitudinal break at midline of the forward cargo door at midspan latch, (20) outward peeled skin on upper forward fuselage, (21) vertical fuselage tear lines forward of the wing and aft of forward cargo door, and (22) destruction initially thought to be have been caused by a bomb.

The Air Accidents Investigation Branch of UK has given the probable cause for Pan Am 103 as the explosion of an improvised explosive device in the forward cargo hold. The probable cause of UAL 811 was the inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door inflight as described in NTSB AAR 92/02 from which all of the above twenty two significant observations were drawn. The twenty two significant observations about PA 103 were drawn from UK AAIB 2/90 released statements and photographs of wreckage reconstruction. barry@corazon.com www.corazon.com
How Could Pan Am 103 Not Be a Bomb?
Pan Am Flight 103 not brought down by bomb explanation.

The official UK AAIB report never says the word 'bomb' in the entire report; it calls the blast source an 'improvised explosive device'. The English writing in English about an English accident would have said 'bomb' if they wanted to mean bomb. They meant and said 'improvised explosive device'. They could have said 'plastic high explosive bomb' but they didn't. They didn't because the evidence is not there. There is evidence of an improvised explosive device, so they said it, leaving many choices but still unnamed specifically.

There was a blast in the forward cargo hold of Pan Am 103. It was not a bomb and the blast force was not enough to destroy the structural integrity of the nose and the relatively mild blast happened after the forward cargo door opened. It is also difficult to disprove a negative.

The conclusion that an improvised explosive device detonated inside the forward cargo hold of Pan Am 103 is based on several facts in official report:

1. A shatter zone was found on the port side just forward of the wing. This shatter zone reveals a reported hole of 18 to 20 inches in size. This small sized hole is too small to blow off the nose of a 747. Bombs have gone off in 747s before making small holes which did not destroy the plane which turned around and landed safely. The 747 was designed to withstand a small sized hole. All blast damage evidence is too weak for a bomb but normal for a small device.
2. The destruction area is described as if a rather large shotgun had gone off at close range. A rather large shotgun is not a bomb.

3. The destruction area is described as directed, with a straight line of destruction of 25 inches to 50 inches. A bomb blast is spherical. There is no evidence of a spherical blast but evidence of a straight line blast.

4. There is no evidence of plastic explosive in the blast area or shatter zone, only soot and explosive residue which might come from a shotgun.

5. All evidence of high plastic explosive is stated as being on passenger items which are never named, listed or described. Traces of explosive residue on fragments mean very small invisible amounts of something are found on something very small. There were millions of very small pieces of wreckage, including pieces of plastic in circuit boards in alarm clocks.

6. Evidence of traces of high explosive on fragments of wreckage is now shown to be benign and explained as normal heart medicine, or residue from the uniforms of soldiers, or traces left over from a dog sniffing exercise.

7. No pieces of a bomb were found.

8. FBI investigator who made his career on "cracking the mystery of the bombing Pan Am Flight 103 for Pan Am 103" in 1989 was removed and transferred by the FBI on 29 Jan, 1997. Tom Thurman, unit chief of the explosives division was transferred because of questions concerning sloppiness and mismanagement. The Justice report, prepared with the help of several world-renowned forensic experts, found that in some cases the bureau laboratory exercised lax control over evidence
and that accountability over findings needed to be improved.

Conflicting evidence that it was not a bomb was available for interpretation from official report:

1. Sudden loud sound on CVR matches Air India 182 sudden loud sound which matches explosive decompression on a cargo door caused crash of a DC-10. A bomb big enough to blow nose off of Boeing 747 would be heard on CVR. Sudden loud sound on Pan Am 103 does not match a bomb. The sound has been officially described as probably Pan Am 103 undergoing structural breakup.

2. Reconstruction diagrams show more severe damage on right side of fuselage, the cargo door side, while light damage is on left side, the small shatter zone side.

3. Reconstruction diagrams match the destruction pattern of a known cargo door failure in a Boeing 747, UAL 811, in amount of skin torn away, stringers exposed, bent floor beams, and cargo door broken in half.

4. Engines number three and four suffered foreign object damage, with engine number three on fire and landing separate from the engines number 1, 2, and 4. Engine number three suffered most inflight damage and it is on opposite side of small blast hold, but on cargo door side.

5. Blast was directed not spherical. Yet official report has an artist's interpretation of a large spherical blast, and the inaccurate drawing is repeated a few pages later.
6. Door coming off picked up on radar which would explain subsequent destruction.

7. Type and sequence of destruction matches other 747 crashes, a known cargo door caused crash, a tenuous bomb explanation crash, and an unknown crash.
8. "Relatively mild blast..."

9. Bomb theory as presented in AAIB report is contradictory, evasive, inconsistent, and has several errors of fact. There is mistaken grammar in verb tense and poor choice of verb 'exhibit.' These types of error are not made by British authors writing in English for an official United Kingdom report. This section was written by different person than rest of report. Later the same writer states noise is no doubt bomb. Next page of report, written by different person, refers to noise as most likely aircraft structure break-up. Serious contradiction in same report one page apart.

The condition of the aft door, far from locus of damage in forward cargo hold, is reported to be intact and latched. The condition of the forward cargo door, near the scene of damage start of forward cargo hold, is omitted, unreported, not stated, passed over, neglected. A glaring oversight.

10. For the bombers the sound on CVR was of the bomb, (although sound never matches any bomb sound.) it was lucky to have been placed near air conditioning ducts to direct to blast to other areas of the plane, (even though bombs that caused the same size hole in other Boeing 747s turn around and land safely.) the detonating altitude fuze did not go off on the flight from Frankfurt to London but did go off by itself over Lockerbie, but
distresses the Libyan secret agents who put the suitcase bought in Malta on the plane because now the evidence would show it was a bomb and the bombers are upset because they wanted the plane to explode over water so it would not be known it was a terrorist act? And the reason terrorists do terrorists acts is to be noticed for their cause and to be noticed is bad? Non sense, it makes no sense, it's entertaining nonsense.

What might explain the blast, if not a bomb? Diplomatic pouches were carried in the forward cargo hold. Guns or booby traps might have been inside them and went off when the huge explosive decompression occurred when the cargo door tore off at 31000 feet. Or a passenger had fireworks or other incendiary device inside his luggage, which was passed because cargo was not checked or the device did not look suspicious. The fireworks or blasting caps were not fuzed and would be safe as long as a explosive force was not present near it. But the explosive decompression might have set them off, after the door went. There may be other devices normally carried inside the cargo compartment which detonate when exposed to large explosive decompression such as fire extinguishers or emergency power units. There are many alternate explanations for the small blast hole and explosive residue and soot other than a bomb.

Based on the new research discovery that traces of explosive residue on aircraft fragments can be benign, the investigation into Pan Am 103 should be reopened on that information alone. If the traces are not from a bomb, then no bomb evidence. A small piece of plastic may give timer evidence, but no bomb evidence. There is no such thing as a stealth bomb which leaves no residue and makes no sound unless explosive decompression is accepted which makes a loud sound, causes loose items to crash into each
other, leaves no residue, and is not a bomb.

After all is said and done, it could have been a small blast which forced the door open, however, based on other accidents where the door opening led to destruction, the likely cause of the door opening is not a small blast in the forward cargo compartment but an electrical short which caused the door open motor to turn on, forcing the door to open past the cam locks, just like it did previously in three other instances of inadvertent cargo door openings.

OK, what about the wonderful spy story with foreign governments, CIA, coverups, bombs, timers, pants bought in Malta, etc, hey, great story, make a great movie, but not true; just entertaining fiction. That story has so many holes in it that it is incoherent. The tellers disagree among themselves every time they tell it. The exaggeration of the warning, the non explosion on the way from Frankfurt to London, the bad luck of flight course deviation, the exaggeration of the too small blast into reverberating around air conditioning ducts would all be funny, if not so serious consequences occurred later on. Pan Am 103 looked like AI 182, and so it should, the cause is the same. But the wrong conclusion of AI 182 led to the wrong conclusion of PA 103 which almost led to the wrong conclusion of TWA 800 as all being bombs.

Comment: How can so many experts be wrong? You'll have to ask the experts. There is no conspiracy, no coverup and no plot. Administrative errors are made and administrative errors get corrected. There was a small blast, but not a bomb. There was an explosion, explosive decompression, which makes a loud sound and mimics a bomb in consequences. Wishful thinking, blaming others, and avoiding responsibility leads to errors of fact. The explanation may end up with sequence in dispute: door opened then small blast, or small blast then door opened. PA 103 door
with cam lock evidence resides in hangar in UK. AI 182 door at bottom of sea. TWA 800 door in hangar in USA. 27 Mar 97

Barry,

I've had an interesting time reading your web page. I searched for TW800 info, because I wanted to find out the latest official line and theories about the crash. I have my own ideas about what is going on, but I am rather an amateur. Anyhow, I'm popping along to a lecture by the AAIB, on Wednesday, and while I can hardly ask too many specific questions and expect detailed answers, I do fancy asking about the disposal of evidence. What would you ask, given your current ideas? And can you fill me in on the latest official line - is it still the fuel pump?

Andy.
P.S. For amateur, read C.Eng, Senior Systems Engineer with avionics systems engineering experience, trying to make safe, reliable systems, and always keen to know what stage in the process has caused problems. I'm also a pilot, when funds permit!

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 19, 1998 10:39:15 AM PST
To: "Johan Lai" <jlai@css.filenet.com>
Subject: Re: Your Website

Hello Mr. Smith,

Your site has a considerable amount of information regarding aircraft safety, in particular the Boeing 747. I wanted to know the mission of your website. Are you in the airline industry? Did you lose a loved one?

I am not in the airline industry or otherwise involved. I was in a sudden night fiery jet airplane crash and try to prevent it from happening again.

The reason for my inquiry is that I represent a non-profit organization called Corazon. Unfortunately, the .org top level domain name space is
currently occupied by a for-profit company. We have contacted the owner and he is willing to relinquish the name if he could have the corazon.com domain. Since it is not obvious to me that you're trying to conduct a business in the .com domain, I thought perhaps you might consider changing your domain name.

Corazon is my wife.

There are many other domain name that may be suitable for your needs (e.g. boeing747.org, 747safety.org, etc). I believe either ourselves or the other company may be willing to pay the registration fee for you to relocate. I would very much like to hear your feedback on this. Thank you very much for your attention.

Changing corazon is technically easy. The problem now is my cargo door website is known as corazon the world over and until the cargo door problem is resolved I can't give it up. There could be something on the page to refer visitors to a new domain but I'm sold on corazon for sentimental reasons as well as practical reasons.

Thank you for your kind offer to pay for the registration fee to
switch over to new domain name. I prefer to stick with my corazon.com for now thank you.

I do get email to corazon.com all in Spanish once in a while. It looks like love letters.

Heart in Spanish, so pretty.

Regards,

Barry Smith

Johan Lai
Corazon webmaster

From: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Date: January 20, 1998 5:24:08 AM PST
To: Barry <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: PA 103

Barry,

Thanks for your email. I'll try to assist you, but I have to say that I'm not well read on these incidents. I tend to stick with systems, and human factors type accidents, and I'm not very learned on structural issues. Still, if I can
find an ear willing to listen, at AAIB...

The speaker tomorrow is Ken Smart, Chief Inspector of Accidents, at the Accident Investigation Branch, DRA Farnborough. Does he know about your concerns? Do you know whether he might be receptive to suggestions?

I can tell you have been at work on this for quite a while. I wasn't aware, until I explored your web site, that there were still concerns about the cause of PA 103. I thought that people had been expecting it to be the target of a terrorist attack, and that the US government advised staff not to take that flight number. Did I recall that bit correctly? Was that a red herring, or is it possible that an explosive device was on board, and that it was triggered by the door failing first, and left a sooty directed blast? What suggestions are there, as to what this device was? I can't recall the details of PA 103, but if the cabin pressure was still being adjusted, and a barometric triggered device was on board, it would be going off pretty soon after the door failed. Some coincidence, though, if there was such a device on board. An easier to accept scenario is that the explosive device popped the door open. What would
show which way round it occurred?

Where can I read about UAL 811? It is not at all familiar to me. Was it at a similar flight level, thereby permitting comparison of extent of damage?

I'm still digesting your email, so sorry if some of the above is covered.

Andy

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 20, 1998 9:46:19 AM PST
To: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Subject: AAIB

I tend to stick with systems, and human factors type accidents, and I'm not very learned on structural issues.

The system is how to keep pressurized hull pressurized. It's very complex with air conditioning packs, relief doors, bleed valves...

Still, if I can find an ear willing to listen, at AAIB...

The speaker tomorrow is Ken Smart, Chief Inspector of Accidents, at the Accident Investigation Branch, DRA Farnborough. Does he know about your concerns? Do you know whether he might be receptive to
suggestions?

No. I will write to AAIB attention Ken Smart. Thanks.

I thought that people had been expecting it to be the target of a terrorist attack, and that the US government advised staff not to take that flight number. Did I recall that bit correctly?

Well, that's in to the bomb conspiracy guy thing and they never agree on anything.

Was that a red herring, or is it possible that an explosive device was on board, and that it was triggered by the door failing first, and left a sooty directed blast? What suggestions are there, as to what this device was?

That's the big mystery of PA 103, the device that left soot, a directed mild blast, and was triggered off by large explosive decompression nearby, could be anything. Flare, etc. An easier to accept scenario is that the explosive device popped the door open.

Exactly.

What would show which way round it occurred?

Good question.
Where can I read about UAL 811?

On my web site, entire NTSB AAR 92/02 is scanned and on site. It is the model for 182, 103 and 800 and I always go back to it.

Was it at a similar flight level, thereby permitting comparison of extent of damage?

Different altitude but very close comparison of damage up until nose came off. Nose comes off and then the three match, 182, 103 and 800.

Comparison of extent of damage is a very important accident investigation technique, it's basic, and yet different country jurisdictions do not use it. UAL 811 happened three months after PA 103 and was never considered as similar.

The open minds ask these questions in any order:
1. How and why does forward cargo door open in flight?
2. How does open door in flight cause nose to come off for AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800?
3. Why did nose of UAL 811 stay on?
4. AI 182 and PA 103 not a bomb?
5. TWA 800 not center tank as initial event?
6. Explosive decompression enough to tear nose off?
7. Is there a conspiracy to keep cargo door explanation quiet?

Let me answer those basic questions briefly:
1. I don't know about AI 182, PA 103, or TWA 800, but UAL 811 door open
cause was electrical short to door motor to unlatch position which overrode safety locking sectors and failed switch and door unlatched and opened. PA 103 and UAL 811 had total forward cargo door openings while AI 182 and TWA 800 had rupture at aft midspan latch with bottom eight latches holding tight. Door openings were probably a result of aging aircraft, out of rig door, chafed aging faulty poly-x wiring, weakened Section 41 area, design weakness of no locking sectors for midspan latches, AAR 92/02, page 12, (Encl 26) and only one latch per eight feet of vertical door. AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800 had similar circumstances.

2. Cargo door opens and huge ten by thirty foot hole appears in nose, structural members of door and frame are missing, floor beams are fractured, bent, and broken, aircraft direction is askew, flight control surfaces affected, engines damaged, and 300 knots, more than the fastest hurricane or force five tornado on earth, hits damaged area and tears nose off within three to five seconds.

3. Nose of UAL 811 may have stayed on because pilot said he had just come off autopilot and did not fight plane as it gyrated, or plane was younger than others, or the time from door opening to tearing off was 1.5
seconds
and allowed the pressurization to be relieved somewhat and six
less feet of
width of hole was torn off. Cargo door inadvertently opened on
the ground
during UAL preflight in 1991 and no damage was done. Cargo
door opened in
flight two inches on PA 125 in 1987 and stayed attached to
fuselage and
only damage was cost of fuel dumped. Cargo door opened in
flight for UAL
811 in 1989 and nine died when door tore off. Cargo door
explanation for AI
182, PA 103, and TWA 800 has door opening inflight, tearing off,
and then
nose tearing off leading to three similar accident wreckage
patterns,
debris fields and total destruction. Door openings have different
consequences depending on altitude, speed and mode of flight.
4. Yes, not a bomb for AI 182 and PA 103 as initial event.
Evidence refutes
bomb explanation and is in government accident reports which
careful
analysis will reveal and documented on www.corazon.com.
Those accident
investigators did not have the benefit of hindsight, the internet, or
several subsequent similar accidents to compare and draw
different
conclusions.
5. Center tank exploded yes, but after door ruptured/opened, hole
appeared
in nose, nose torn off in wind, fuselage falling with disintegrating
fuel
tanks and ignited by foddled and on fire engine number 3 or 4 at 7500 feet
thereby explaining the Chairman's question, "Why so few bodies burned?" The
answer is they were not there to be burned. The nose came off with the
passengers inside cabin and descended to ocean alone. The center tank
exploded into nothingness not the passenger compartment.
6. Explosive decompression is enough to rupture pressurized hull at weak
spot, one latch for eight feet of door, in a weak area, Section 41, but not
enough to tear nose off. The ultimate destructive force is the 300
knots of slipstream, more powerful than any wind on earth. If cargo door popped in
balloon, the large hole would appear but the nose would stay on. In a
tornado, nose comes off within three to five seconds.
7. There is no conspiracy, no plot, no coverup by anyone involved with the
cargo door explanation:
a. No conspiracy of Sikh terrorists named Singh to put a bomb on AI 182;
the door ruptured in flight.
b. No conspiracy of Libyan terrorists or whoever to put a bomb on PA 103;
the door ruptured in flight.
c. No conspiracy to detonate a bomb on UAL 811 as the passengers thought,
as the crew thought and told the tower who told the Coast Guard and crash
crews on the ground as they prepared for a wounded 747 coming in after a bomb blast; the door ruptured in flight.
d. No conspiracy to put a bomb on TWA 800, no conspiracy of terrorists to shoot a missile, no coverup by US Navy to hide accidental shootdown, no coverup by Boeing, NTSB, FAA, TWA who know the cargo door is the problem and are hiding that knowledge; the door ruptured in flight.

Any more information about AAIB such as addresses and names are appreciated. I'm always looking for the open mind.

Regards, Barry Smith

Born in Birkenhead, as it turns out. Titanic is a great movie, especially from an accident cause point of view.

From: Dharmesh Patel <DHARMESH.PATEL@ual.com>
Date: January 20, 1998 5:51:41 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: copy of aeordyanmics for naval aviators

I would like to receive a copy of newly revised"Aeordynamcis for Naval Aviators". Please let me know what the price is and following is my address at UNITED AIRLINES.

DHARMESH PATEL
FLIGHT TEST/OPERATIONS ENGINEER
UNITED AIRLINES (BLDG. 10)
SFOEG
SFO INT'L AIRPORT
SAN FRANCISCO
CA 94128

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 21, 1998 10:40:28 AM PST
To: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Subject: Gigantic

Birkenhead, eh?

Parents emigrated in 1946, I was 2.

'twixt the Dee and the Mersey. I'm down in Kent, but occasionally get trips to Warton, Lancs to do systems integration work on a certain single seat development aircraft.

Cool.

I get the impression that you are the other side of the pond, 'though I don't know why I think that. Perhaps because you have already had a chance to see Titanic?

Yes, good deduction. California. Although Titanic should be released over there first. It's quite a movie, I'm still thinking
about. Such as, one passenger, one seat on a life boat, is a good rule. Now for one passenger, one parachute.

Especially since my life was saved by an ejection seat, British invention, and a parachute.

The parody of Titanic will be around soon. Then the musical.

I've typed out the letter to Ken Smart and will mail it today.

Regards, Barry

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>  
Date: January 21, 1998 10:45:53 AM PST  
To: Dharmesh Patel <DHARMESH.PATEL@ual.com>  
Subject: Water in cargo hold

I would like to recieve a copy of newly revised"Aeordynamcis for Naval Aviators". Please let me know what the price is and following is my address  
at UNITED AIRLINES.

DHARMESH PATEL  
FLIGHT TEST/OPERATIONS ENGINEER  
UNITED AIRLINES(BLDG. 10)  
SFOEG  
SFO INT'L AIRPORT
Aviation Supplies and Academics Inc
7005 132nd Place SE
Renton, WA Ashington 98059-2153

Or go to San Jose Airport on the Executive jet side and go to an Aviation gift and supply shop there. I bought it there for 17 dollars.

Have you ever heard of water in the forward cargo hold of 747s? The water may have come from condensation or other source but have you ever heard the baggage handlers talk about water falling on their heads when they open the forward cargo door?

Is the wiring bundle for EPR and forward door motor power in the same wire bundle in the forward cargo hold?

Cheers, Barry Smith

---

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 21, 1998 10:49:10 AM PST
To: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Subject: This is what I wrote to Ken Smart

Birkenhead, eh?

Parents emigrated in 1946, I was 2.

'twixt the Dee and the Mersey. I'm down in Kent, but
occasionally get trips to Warton, Lancs to do systems integration work on a certain single seat development aircraft.

Cool.

I get the impression that you are the other side of the pond, 'though I don't know why I think that. Perhaps because you have already had a chance to see Titanic?

Yes, good deduction. California. Although Titanic should be released over there first. It's quite a movie, I'm still thinking about. Such as, one passenger, one seat on a life boat, is a good rule. Now for one passenger, one parachute.

Especially since my life was saved by an ejection seat, British invention, and a parachute.

The parody of Titanic will be around soon. Then the musical.

I've typed out the letter to Ken Smart and will mail it today.

Regards, Barry

Ken Smart
Chief Inspector of Accidents,
Accident Investigations Branch
AAIB
DRA Farnborough
United Kingdom
Dear Mr Smart,

My name is John Barry Smith and I have been referred to you by someone who is to hear you speak at a lecture tonight, Wednesday.

Cargo door.

The cause of several Boeing 747s has been the inadvertent opening of the forward cargo door in flight. Analysis follows this introduction letter. UAL 811 NTSB AAR 92/02 is the model. The problem occurs to different airlines and different airports but only to high cycle Boeing 747s.

Based upon nine years hindsight, two other similar accidents to Boeing 747s (UAL 811 and TWA 800), the new knowledge of possible benign explanation for high explosive residue such as a dog sniffing test, troop uniform contamination, or heart medicine, and glaring inconsistencies and omissions in AAIB 2/90 such as no latch status of forward cargo door reported, Pan Am 103 should be reopened. It was not a conspiracy to put a bomb on board, the door popped.

It's a big deal. It's quite complex. I would hope you would check out www.corazon.com or email me at barry@corazon.com with questions.

My credential is I am a survivor of a sudden night fiery fatal jet airplane crash talking about sudden night fiery fatal jet airplane crashes.
Sequence of Destruction for TWA Flight 800
Friction, not Fiction.
John Barry Smith
11 Jan 98

Hot humid air in forward cargo compartment was subjected to cold conditioned air after takeoff on hot summer evening near New York on July 17, 1996. Condensation was precipitated out and formed on cold metal fuselage skin. Poly-X wire bundle which held cargo door motor on power was chafed by the friction of continuous vibration against clamp or many door openings and closings on it. Sheath around bundle was worn through to insulation and then worn through to bare wire. Condensed water met the bare wire and shorted against fuselage metal charring wires and powering on door motor which attempted to turn all ten cam sectors to unlocked position. At 13700 feet MSL and 300 KCAS, the eight lower cam sectors were prevented from unlocking because of strengthened locking sectors. However, the two midspan latches have no locking sectors. The slack in bellcranks, torque tubes, and high time worn cam latches allowed the aft midspan latch to rotate just past center allowing the 3.5
PSI internal pressure to rupture outward the forward cargo door at the aft midspan latch.

The nine foot by eight foot squarish door burst open at midspan latch sending the latch and door material spinning away in the setting sun which reflected upon the shiny metal as it spun away erratically and appeared as red-orange streak to ground observers moving all which ways. The aft door frame was clean of attachment to door and bulged outward. Fuselage skin was torn vertically. The door fractured and shattered. The bottom eight latches held tight to the bottom eight latch pins on bottom sill while bottom external skin of door blew away. The top piece of red topped cargo door opened out and up smashing into the white fuselage skin above it leaving the red paint of the door on the white paint between passenger windows above. The red paint of the trim was rubbed away showing the white paint underneath. The top piece of the door took the hinge with it and fuselage skin as it is tore away. The loose red painted trim piece and top of door flew directly aft and impacted the right horizontal stabilizer leaving a red paint transfer mark on it. The hinge still appears to be working normally likely having overtravel impression marks on the opposite hinge when door overextended to slam on fuselage above. The top piece of the door shows inward damage when it hit fuselage above.

The explosive decompression of the thirty eight thousand pounds of internal force on the door blew out a large hole about twenty feet wide and forty feet high on the right side of the nose forward of the wing. Parts of the cargo hold structure were the first parts to leave the aircraft. The now uncompressed air molecules rushed out of the huge hole equalizing high pressure inside to low pressure outside while making a very loud noise. Fuselage skin was peeled outward at various places on the right side of the
nose. The sudden rushing air was recorded on the Cockpit Voice Recorder as a sudden loud sound. The explosive decompression of the forward cargo hold severely disrupted the nearby main equipment compartment which housed power cables and abruptly shut off power to the Flight Data Recorder.

At least nine passenger's bodies were never found, only bone fragments. The number three engine also ingested metal in baggage and started on fire from inefficient burning of fuel. The number three engine with pylon started to vibrate and a stator blade from the engine was spit out and impacted directly behind it in the right horizontal stabilizer.

The floor beams above the cargo hold were bent downward, fractured and broken from the sudden decompression. The main structural members of door and frame were gone and compromised. The flight attitude of the aircraft was askew to the left from reaction of explosive decompression to the right. Air rushed into the hole and weakened other skin and frame peeling skin outward. The 300 knots of air pressed upon the weakened nose and crumpled it into the large hole. The nose tore off and landed in a dense debris heap apart from the rest of the plane.

The port side forward of the wing was smooth and unshattered while the starboard side forward of the wing was shattered, torn, and frayed at ruptured cargo door area and severely disturbed over twenty feet by forty foot explosive decompression zone. Outward petal shaped fuselage skin appeared at aft midspan latch from rupture. Aft midspan latch was blown away. Outward peeled skin appeared from blowout. Fuselage skin remained smooth next to blown out skin.

The rest of the plane without the nose suddenly decelerated from
300 knots and caused whiplash injuries to passengers. Passengers inside fuselage had baro-trauma to eardrums which ruptured trying to equalize middle ear pressure. The plane maneuvered with huge gaping wound in front increasing drag. The wind force disintegrated the fuselage and wings. Fuel poured out of ruptured tanks as wreckage fell. The broken fuselage, the ruptured wings, the fuel cloud, the center tank, and the spinning, on fire engine number three met at 7500 feet and exploded into a bright loud fireball putting singe marks on the fuselage skin while leaving earlier departed nose burn and singe mark free. The center tank exploded as well as other nearby fuel tanks. Forward passengers were not burned because they were in the earlier separated nose. The debris fell and spread out from 7500 feet to sea level in windblown southeast direction, leaving a wide debris field.

Ground observers heard the fireball explosion of the center tank and other fuel and looked up. They saw fire and smoke and falling debris.

Explosive decompression at the forward cargo hold led to suspicion of bomb in cargo compartment but bomb later ruled out. Debris ejected to the right from explosive decompression led to suspicion of missile exploding on left side of nose. Streak of shiny metal object spinning away reflecting evening sun to ground observers led to suspicion of missile exhaust but later ruled out.

Fire/explosion of center tank into fireball led to suspicion of center tank explosion as initial event. There were difficulties in determining ignition source, fuel volatility, unheard fuel explosion sound on CVR, unilateral fuselage damage, singe marks, and other evidence needed to corroborate center tank explosion as initial explosion.
Fuselage rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door inflight is initially rejected because bottom eight latches are found latched around locking pins while two midspan latches are unexamined and status unreported.

Questions about center tank explosion as initial event which evidence raises.

1. Sudden loud sound on Cockpit Voice Recorder is described as start of aircraft breakup but not sound of explosion. Sound on CVR does not match other staged Boeing 747 center tank explosion. How can an explosion in the center tank be powerful enough to start the aircraft breakup and blow off nose of Boeing 747 and not be heard on CVR?

Sudden loud sound is sound of explosive decompression which gives a sudden loud sound when forward cargo door ruptures/opens in flight. The TWA 800 sudden loud sound was linked to PA 103 sudden loud sound on CVR which was linked to AI 182 sudden loud sound on CVR which was linked to DC-10 cargo door explosive decompression on CVR. UAL 811 had a cargo door rupture/open in flight and recorded a sudden loud sound on the CVR. The sound is the sudden rushing of air molecules which were compressed now moving fast outward to equalize with the lower pressure outside air.

2. Center tank explosion would be spherical, not directed, and would either give no damage forward of the wing or about equal damage on both sides of the fuselage of TWA 800. The wreckage reconstruction shows smooth skin with little damage forward of the wing on the port/left side yet severe, shattered, torn, and frayed damage on the starboard/right side of the fuselage in the
cargo door area. How can a center tank explosion cause unilateral damage only on starboard side?

Explosive decompression and rupture of forward cargo door area when aft midspan latch ruptures would give shattered, torn and frayed, damage to cargo door area while leaving port/left/opposite side smooth and light damage. Cargo door rupture would give the unilateral damage on starboard side as shown by TWA 800 wreckage.

3. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction shows outward peeled skin, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers. Water impact damage would be inward, not outward. How could water impact damage produce outward peeled skin, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers?

Explosive decompression in nose of TWA 800 would give outward peeled skin in nose, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers as internal high pressure rushes outward to equalize with the low outside pressure.

4. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction shows red paints smears only above the forward cargo door area and nowhere else on both side of the Boeing 747 fuselage. This indicates that the red painted door below ruptured/opened outward, slammed upward, and smashed into the white painted area above and transferred red paint from door onto white paint between windows. How did red paint smears get where they are?

After the rupture at aft midspan latch the door fractured and upper piece of the red painted door was pushed outward, rotated on its hinge, slammed upward and smashed into the white painted fuselage skin above, transferring red paint to the white
painted area between the passengers windows, as shown by the TWA 800 reconstruction. UAL 811 also had paint transfer from door to fuselage when its door opened in flight.

5. A center tank explosion would be far enough away from power cables to allow the Flight Data Recorder to record longer than the abrupt power cut it suffered. How can a center tank explosion which is not loud enough to be heard on the CVR and some distance away be strong enough to abruptly cease power to the FDR?

The explosive decompression in the cargo compartment would severely disrupt the cargo hold floor and the adjacent main equipment compartment in which the FDR and power cables are located. The severe disruption would abruptly cease power to the FDR. UAL 811 also had abrupt power cut when its cargo door opened in flight.

6. How could forward cargo door rupture/open when bottom eight latches are latched and locked in TWA reconstruction?

The forward cargo door of Boeing 747s is about nine feet by eight feet square. It has a hinge on the top and eight cam latches on the bottom. On each nine foot side is one midspan latch. The bottom eight cam latches go around eight latching pins. Over each cam latch is a locking sector. The two midspan latches have no locking sectors. The forward cargo door could rupture at the midspan latch and the hinge and bottom eight latches could still be attached to fuselage skin. The top of the door with hinge attached would tear off with the fuselage skin and spin away. The bottom eight latches could stay attached to bottom sill and continue down to the sea with the nose. The middle of the large door can still be ruptured/opened while the lower part stays
attached to airframe. Doors can open/rupture with most or all latches latched. TWA 800 reconstruction shows aft mid span latch missing which implies it became unlatched. The aft door frame sill is smooth and not attached to door which implies door opened in that area.

7. How could forward cargo door rupture cause center tank explosion?

When cargo door ruptures in flight a huge hole is created in nose which the 300 knot slipstream tears off. The falling, noseless, structurally compromised aircraft disintegrated into wings of rupturing fuel tanks, fuselage pieces including center tank, and spinning hot on fire jet engine. When falling debris reached about 7500 feet, the foded on fire engine number three ignited the fuel cloud and center fuel tank into a fireball. Center tank fire/explosion occurred but later and lower than forward cargo door rupture initial event.

Event, consequence, significance, source for destruction sequence:

1. Hot humid air in forward cargo compartment was subjected to cold conditioned air after takeoff on hot summer evening near New York on July 17, 1996.

NTSB exhibits gave takeoff time and temperatures plus the airconditioning system in Boeing 747s.

2. Condensation was precipitated out and formed on cold metal fuselage skin.

Water was available to ground any bare wires to fuselage skin.
Observation made of water cascading out of forward cargo hold of Boeing airliner by John Barry Smith standing in concourse at San Francisco Airport on December 6, 1997.

3. Poly-X wire bundle which held cargo door motor on power was chafed by the friction of continuous vibration against clamp or many door openings and closings on it. Sheath around bundle was worn through to insulation and then worn through to bare wire.

Bare wires can be shorted to ground causing power to go to door motor. NTSB exhibits list two forward cargo hold charred wiring fires. NTSB hearing on aging aircraft detailed problems with poly-x wiring chafing from vibration. NTSB AAR 92/02 detailed problems with chafing wires causing door motor to turn on. TWA 800 had poly-x wiring.

4. Condensed water met the bare wire and shorted against fuselage metal charring wires and powering on door motor which attempted to turn all ten cam sectors to unlocked position.

Event explains how door motor got power to turn on. NTSB exhibits list two previous cargo hold charred wire fires. NTSB AAR 92/02 lists two uncommanded cargo door opening on Boeing 747s caused by electrical problems, UAL preflight and UAL 811.

5. At 13700 feet MSL and 300 KCAS, the eight lower cam sectors were prevented from unlocking because of strengthened locking sectors. However, the two midspan latches have no locking sectors.

The eight bottom latches held tight to locking pins because of
AD 88-12-04 which strengthened all the eight locking sectors. NTSB AAR 92/02 describes the AD, door, and all latches.

6. The slack in bellcranks, torque tubes, and high time worn cam latches allowed the aft midspan latch to rotate just past center allowing the 3.5 PSI internal pressure to rupture outward the forward cargo door at the aft midspan latch.

UAL 811 had small rupture at aft midspan latch as shown in photograph in NTSB AAR 92/02. NTSB exhibit lists 3.5 PSI pressure differential. TWA 800 was extremely old aircraft with over 93000 flight hours.

7. The nine foot by eight foot squarish door burst open at midspan latch sending the latch and door material spinning away in the setting sun which reflected upon the shiny metal as it spun away erratically and appeared as red-orange streak to ground observers moving all which ways.

Press reports reveal eyewitnesses say different colored streaks going every which way from all directions. Time of 8:31 PM and angle of low sun to aircraft in east and observers to the west had to be perfectly aligned for spinning falling shiny piece of metal to reflect as streak to observers.

8. The aft door frame was clean of attachment to door and bulged outward.

Aft midspan latch blown away at rupture time and caused outward bulge. NTSB reconstruction photograph shows bulge and missing latch.

9. Fuselage skin was torn vertically.
Explosive decompression bursts outward limited by stringers and bulkheads which are vertical and match the other cargo door accident, UAL 811. NTSB photograph shows the vertical tears of TWA 800.

10. The door fractured and shattered.

NTSB photograph shows the damage. 38000 pounds of force were suddenly released onto now weakened door and it burst apart. 99 inches times 110 inches times 3.5 PSI equals 38115 pounds of force on the ten latches and hinge.

11. The bottom eight latches held tight to the bottom eight latch pins on bottom sill while bottom external skin of door blew away.

The bottom of large door held tight while middle of door ruptured in a troublesome section of a high time Boeing 747, Section 41 and Section 42. TWA 800 had not yet had the Section 41 retrofit. NTSB exhibit states bottom eight latches latched.

12. The top piece of red topped cargo door opened out and up smashing into the white fuselage skin above it leaving the red paint of the door on the white paint between passenger windows above. The red paint of the trim was rubbed away showing the white paint underneath. The top piece of the door took the hinge with it and fuselage skin as it is tore away.

The loose red painted trim piece and top of door flew directly aft and impacted the right horizontal stabilizer leaving a red paint transfer mark on it.
The hinge still appears to be working normally likely having overtravel impression marks on the opposite hinge when door overextended to slam on fuselage above.

The top piece of the door shows inward damage when it hit fuselage above.

Sequence of door opening out and up and transferring paint above is described in text and drawing in NTSB AAR 92/02. Inward movement of top of door is described in AAR 92/02. Normal working hinge attached to top of door is described in AAR 92/02. Overtravel impression damage is described in text and picture in AAR 92/02.

13. The explosive decompression of the thirty eight thousand pounds of internal force on the door blew out a large hole about twenty feet wide and forty feet high on the right side of the nose forward of the wing.

NTSB photograph shows decompression rectangle zone on right side of nose.

14. Parts of the cargo hold structure were the first parts to leave the aircraft.

The first parts of plane to depart indicate trouble started there. NTSB exhibits show first parts to leave were from cargo structure.

15. The now uncompressed air molecules rushed out of the huge hole equalizing high pressure inside to low pressure outside while making a very loud noise.
NTSB AAR 92/02 states crew of UAL 811 heard a 'tremendous explosion,' when door opened in flight.

16. Fuselage skin was peeled outward at various places on the right side of the nose.

Outward peeling indicates force from within, not without. UAL 811 had same outward peeling of fuselage skin in cargo door area.

17. The sudden rushing air was recorded on the Cockpit Voice Recorder as a sudden loud sound.

Sound matches other Boeing 747 sudden loud sound of explosive decompression and a DC-10 cargo door decompression sound according to NTSB chart.

18. The explosive decompression of the forward cargo hold severely disrupted the nearby main equipment compartment which housed power cables and abruptly shut off power to the Flight Data Recorder.

Cables for power and signal run through the forward cargo hold to the adjacent MEC. The cargo floor is severely disrupted when explosive decompression occurs in cargo hold according to AAIB 2/90 report and will cut off power abruptly.

19. At least nine passenger's bodies were never found, only bone fragments.

Where did those bodies go? What happened to them to reduce them to bone fragments requiring DNA analysis to identify? At least nine bodies always disappear when explosive
decompression occurs in high time Boeing 747s according to AAIB, NTSB, TSB and Indian reports.

20. The number three engine also ingested metal in baggage and started on fire from inefficient burning of fuel. The number three engine with pylon started to vibrate and a stator blade from the engine was spit out and impacted directly behind it in the right horizontal stabilizer.

NTSB AAR 92/02 describes the sequence of FOD into number three and also number four and the subsequent vibration and fire.

21. The floor beams above the cargo hold were bent downward, fractured and broken from the sudden decompression. The main structural members of door and frame were gone and compromised.

AAR 92/02, AAIB 2/90, and NTSB TWA 800 exhibits describe the downward movement of the floor beams above cargo compartment.

22. The flight attitude of the aircraft was askew to the left from reaction of explosive decompression to the right. Air rushed into the hole and weakened other skin and frame peeling skin outward.

AAR 92/02 describes the actions of the aircraft after door opened in flight.

23. The 300 knots of air pressed upon the weakened nose and crumpled it into the large hole.

AAIB and TSB/Indian reports describe how nose came off after
explosion in forward cargo hold at 300 KCAS of two Boeing 747s.

24. The nose tore off and landed in a dense debris heap apart from the rest of the plane.

AAIB 2/90, TSB/Indian Court, and NTSB TWA 800 exhibits describe the dense nose debris field present when nose comes off in flight of three Boeing 747s.

25. The port side forward of the wing was smooth and unshattered while the starboard side forward of the wing was shattered, torn, and frayed at ruptured cargo door area and severely disturbed over twenty feet by forty foot explosive decompression zone. Outward petal shaped fuselage skin appeared at aft midspan latch from rupture. Aft midspan latch was blown away. Outward peeled skin appeared from blowout. Fuselage skin remained smooth next to blown out skin.

AAIB 2/90, TSB/Indian, and NTSB photographs describe the lesser damage port side nose compared to the more severely damaged starboard side as well as the outward peeled skin on nose of three Boeing 747s.

27. The rest of the plane without the nose suddenly decelerated from 300 knots and caused whiplash injuries to passengers. Passengers inside fuselage had baro-trauma to eardrums which ruptured trying to equalize middle ear pressure.

Passenger injuries are described in NTSB exhibits, TSB/Indian report, AAIB 2/90, and NTSB exhibits.

28. The plane maneuvered with huge gaping wound in front
increasing drag. The wind force disintegrated the fuselage and wings. Fuel poured out of ruptured tanks as wreckage fell. The broken fuselage, the ruptured wings, the fuel cloud, the center tank, and the spinning, on fire engine number three met at 7500 feet and exploded into a bright loud fireball putting singe marks on the fuselage skin while leaving earlier departed nose burn and singe mark free. The center tank exploded as well as other nearby fuel tanks. Forward passengers were not burned because they were in the earlier separated nose. The debris fell and spread out from 7500 feet to sea level in windblown southeast direction, leaving a wide debris field. Ground observers heard the fireball explosion of the center tank and other fuel and looked up. They saw fire and smoke and falling debris.

NTSB exhibits describe the breakup sequence and NTSB video shows fireball seconds later and thousands of feet lower than initial event. Engine number three was on fire for AAIB 2/90 and number four was on fire for NTSB AAR 92/02 after cargo hold ruptures.

29. Explosive decompression at the forward cargo hold led to suspicion of bomb in cargo compartment but bomb later ruled out.

Debris ejected to the right from explosive decompression led to suspicion of missile exploding on left side of nose.

Streak of shiny metal object spinning away reflecting evening sun to ground observers led to suspicion of missile exhaust but later ruled out.

Fire/explosion of center tank into fireball led to suspicion of center tank explosion as initial event.
Press reports, FBI reports, and NTSB reports describe the bomb, missile and center tank explanations.

30. There were difficulties in determining ignition source, fuel volatility, unheard fuel explosion sound on CVR, unilateral fuselage damage, singe marks, and other evidence needed to corroborate center tank explosion as initial explosion.

NTSB public hearing reveals the gaps in the center tank as initial event explanation.

31. Fuselage rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door inflight is initially rejected because bottom eight latches are found latched around locking pins while two midspan latches are unexamined and status unreported.

NTSB Exhibit 15C, part two, is used to rule out cargo door rupture. It has one sentence.

From: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Date: January 22, 1998 5:27:28 AM PST
To: Barry <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: AAIB

Barry,

Ken Smart is a pleasant chap. He gave us a good talk about the origins of the AAIB, and their role today. He talked about some specific cases that they had studied; one Jaguar that buried itself into a field, from a 70
degree nose
down, leaving a small crater - they found forward parts of the aircraft over 40 feet beneath the ground, when they excavated. Another case was PA103. He used the expression 'improvised explosive device', which I queried. He explained that it is their formal description of what we would call a bomb. I enquired how such a modest device could be the cause of such severe damage. He gave me the following explanation (at least this is how I understand it):-

the primary shockwave of the explosion was reflected off the bulkhead into the secondary shockwave. This creates an effect, the name of which escapes me, but essentially the effect is a powerful circular shockwave. This hit the hull of the aircraft, and travelled round, up past the lower deck floor which is held off from the hull of the aircraft, until it reached the upper deck floor, which is closely secured to the hull. When the energy reached this point it punched out a section of the top of the hull, which he referred to as the crown, I think.

It was interesting that he mentioned that they compared TW800 with PA103, since the effect of the explosion was similar, though the cause was believed to be
different. He ruled out a bomb on TW800, because they found no trace of explosives. The FBI had been hoping otherwise, I think.

Someone suggested a missile. He didn't rule this out, since he felt it was difficult to ignore 100 witnesses, although he mentioned that their accounts varied, and that some had seen the object flying away from the aircraft. Then someone suggested that if the missile went through, rather than exploding (as a trial unit - rather than a terrorist unit - might); that could have given the ignition source, and could explain the varied witness accounts.

(Wasn't there a report that the aircraft was flying within an active danger zone, where trials were being conducted?) Ken felt it was unlikely that the US Navy could keep something like that quiet.

But if it was terrorists, why did nobody claim it as their work?

I have to say that PA103 looks like it was caused by a bomb, but that such a small device can cause such a catastrophie is stunning. Perhaps that popped the door and the rest is as you describe. For TW800, I have difficulty discounting all those witnesses. Whatever, it does seem that 747s have a weak spot, and the cargo door, as evidence UAL 811, is wrapped up in
By the way, Mick Charles was IIC for PA103. I don't know whether he is still part of AAIB.

Andy

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 22, 1998 9:21:26 AM PST
To: Andrew C Jones <andrew.jones@gecm.com>
Subject: Re: AAIB

Another case was PA103. He used the expression 'improvised explosive device', which I queried.

It was, the cargo door was the device. Although they meant bomb, it was an IED.

He explained that it is their formal description of what we would call a bomb. I enquired how such a modest device could be the cause of such severe damage. He gave me the following explanation (at least this is how I understand it):- the primary shockwave of the explosion was reflected off the bulkhead into the secondary shockwave. This creates an effect, the name of which escapes me, but essentially the effect is a powerful circular shockwave. This hit
the hull of the aircraft, and travelled round, up past the lower deck floor which is held off from the hull of the aircraft, until it reached the upper deck floor, which is closely secured to the hull. When the energy reached this point it punched out a section of the top of the hull, which he referred to as the crown, I think.

Complete nonsense, mach stem it's called. It violates physical law of energy; dissipates not gains energy as it travels around being absorbed.

It was interesting that he mentioned that they compared TW800 with PA103, since the effect of the explosion was similar, though the cause was believed to be different. He ruled out a bomb on TW800, because they found no trace of explosives. The FBI had been hoping otherwise, I think. Someone suggested a missile. He didn't rule this out, since he felt it was difficult to ignore 100 witnesses, although he mentioned that their accounts varied, and that some had seen the object flying away from the aircraft. Then someone suggested that if the missile went through, rather than exploding (as a trial unit - rather than a terrorist unit - might); that could have given the ignition source, and could
explain the varied witness accounts.

(Wasn't there a report that the aircraft was flying within an active danger zone, where trials were being conducted?) Ken felt it was unlikely that the US Navy could keep something like that quiet.

Streak was door pieces flying away reflecting evening sunlight to ground observers as it spun erratically away.

But if it was terrorists, why did nobody claim it as their work?

Wasn't terrorists.

I have to say that PA103 looks like it was caused by a bomb, but that such a small device can cause such a catastrophe is stunning. Perhaps that popped the door and the rest is as you describe. For TW800, I have difficulty discounting all those witnesses. Whatever, it does seem that 747s have a weak spot, and the cargo door, as evidence UAL 811, is wrapped up in it.

By the way, Mick Charles was IIC for PA103. I don't know whether he is still part of AAIB.

Right, thanks. We'll see. Probably nothing as the myth of 103
bombing goes on.

Cheers,

Barry

From: Charles Drew <cdrew@mail.arc.nasa.gov>
Date: January 27, 1998 8:26:14 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com (Poster)
Subject: Re: can't download rtf

Barry,

Curious problem -- theses rtf files were created on a Mac and tested on (among other things) Netscape 4.0 and MS Internet Explorer 3.0 -- worked fine. What word processor do you have on your Mac? What happens when you click on the link to the Report Set? Can you try saving the Report Set as a "Source" document? Let me know and I'll try to help.

Charles Drew
ASRS Internet Administrator

--------

My mac can not download rft format. I keep getting error message from download manager of IE 4.0.
What can I do?

Thanks, Barry Smith at barry@corazon.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: January 27, 1998 9:35:48 AM PST
To: Charles Drew <cdrew@mail.arc.nasa.gov>
Subject: Re: can't download rtf

Barry,

Curious problem -- theses rtf files were created on a Mac and tested on (among other things) Netscape 4.0 and MS Internet Explorer 3.0 -- worked fine. What word processor do you have on your Mac? What happens when you click on the link to the Report Set?

My download manager says mechanic.rft for file, and status has error and time less than mone minute and transferred 0 kbytes. It tries to download and then as it starts to transfer it changes to error on status and stops. It does it for all the report sets.

I don't have Word but use Tex-edit for word processing and Ready Set Go for desktop publishing. Under helpers in IE 40 I have used several word processors but the file never gets downloaded for me to try to read.

I download lots of other stuff fine, from pdf to jpg to .doc but
I think the problem is on my end.

Thanks for replying.

Regards, Barry Smith

Can you try saving the Report Set as a "Source" document? Let me know and I'll try to help.

Charles Drew
ASRS Internet Administrator

---------

My mac can not download rft format. I keep getting error message fromn download manager of IE 4.0.

What can I do?

Thanks, Barry Smith at barry@corazon.com

Following are twenty (20) ASRS Database Report Sets on topics of interest to the aviation community. Each file (Report Set) is in Rich Text Format (RTF), which can be read by most word processors
and many other programs. Each Report Set consists of fifty (50) ASRS Database records, preceded by a note of introduction, caveats on use of ASRS data, and standard abbreviations and definitions used in ASRS Database records. All Report Sets have been pre-screened to assure their relevance to the pre-selected topic description. The report sets will be updated quarterly. New topics will be added - and outdated topics removed - in response to input from the ASRS user community, and analysis of Web site usage. To access a report set, click on the "GO" graphic or the linked subject title. Your browser may open the document in your word processor. If it does not, save the report set from your browser as a "SOURCE" document (remember to supply a file name if requested, and save the file to an appropriate location on your hard disk). You may THEN open the document in your word processor.

Comments?
Your comments on the usefulness of the "ASRS Database Report Sets" feature would be appreciated, and may be directed to ASRS's Web Site Administrator at webadmin@olias.arc.nasa.gov

| Title Description | Automated Weather Systems | A sampling of reports referencing the various automated weather systems |
(AWOS, ASOS, and AMOS).
Cabin Attendant Reports A sampling of reports from cabin crew members.
Checklist Incidents A sampling of reports from all aviation arenas referencing checklist issues (design, procedures, distraction, etc.).
Commuter and Corporate Flight Crew Fatigue Reports A sampling of reports referencing Commuter and Corporate flight crew fatigue issues and duty periods.
Commuter and GA Icing Incidents A sampling of aircraft icing encounter reports from GA and Commuter flight crews.
Controlled Flight Toward Terrain A sampling of reports referencing inadvertent controlled flight towards terrain.
CRM Issues Crew Resource Management (CRM) inflight situations (conflicts, NMACs, and emergencies).
Fuel Management Issues A sampling of reports referencing incidents of fuel mismanagement, and operational concerns for fuel planning.
Inflight Weather Encounters A sampling of reports from both air carrier flight crews and GA pilots referencing encounters with severe or unforecast weather.
Land and Hold Short Operations A sampling of reports concerning "Land and Hold Short" operations.
Mechanic Reports A sampling of reports from aircraft mechanics.
Multi-Engine Turbojet Aircraft Upsets Incidents Reports concerning turbojet uncommanded control surface movements and unusual aircraft attitudes.
Non-Tower Airport Incidents  A sampling of reports involving operations at non-tower airports.
Parachutist / Aircraft Conflicts  A sampling of reports involving parachuting activity and conflicts with aircraft.
Passenger Electronic Devices  A sampling of reports referencing avionics problems that may result from the influence of passenger electronic devices.
Pilot / Controller Communications  A sampling of reports which highlight issues involving communications between pilots and controllers.
Rotary Wing Aircraft Flight Crew Reports  A sampling of reports from flight crew of rotary wing aircraft.
Runway Incursions  A sampling of reports from all aviation arenas referencing runway incursions.
TCAS II Incidents  A sampling of TCAS II incident reports.
Wake Turbulence Encounters  A sampling of reports from flight crews encountering, or affected by, multi-engine turbojet wake turbulence.
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Charles R. Drew, ASRS Internet Administrator
Barry,

I agree. I think the problem is likely on your end. However, some UNIX platforms have problems with RTF as well, and we are considering offering PDF versions of the Report Sets, in addition to RTF at the next update (on April 1, no fooling). Although I am doubtful this will work, you may wish to try to set your MS IE 4.0 preferences to permit handling of text files by Ready Set Go or Tex-edit. As a favor (one time only) I am sending you an attachment of the Mechanic Report Set in PDF, and a copy in RTF just so you can experiment with it. Good luck, and let me know how it goes.

Attachment converted: Master: (RSGR/MEMR) (00000588)
Attachment converted: Master: (RSGR/MEMR) (00000588)

* * * *

Captain Charles R. Drew
NASA's Aviation Safety Reporting System
cdrew@mail.arc.nasa.gov
http://www-afo.arc.nasa.gov/ASRS/ASRS.html
Dear Captain Drew,

let me know how it goes.

Well, I got three emails. One had an attachment. The attachment did not download and gave error message of could not create an attachment to decode into. Of the two remaining emails, one was all binary which I am unable to decode. The last email was readable in plain text.

Strange. My ISP is UNIX. I think the problem is on his end.

Thank you for sending the mechanics reports.

My thing is fuselage rupture in high cycle Boeing 747s to include TWA 800.

I'll keep on trying to figure out my inability to download .rtf files.

Cheers, Barry Smith
The reason why I was examining ASRS files:

Sequence of Destruction for TWA Flight 800  
Friction, not Fiction.  
John Barry Smith  
11 Jan 98

Hot humid air in forward cargo compartment was subjected to cold conditioned air after takeoff on hot summer evening near New York on July 17, 1996. Condensation was precipitated out and formed on cold metal fuselage skin. Poly-X wire bundle which held cargo door motor on power was chafed by the friction of continuous vibration against clamp or many door openings and closings on it. Sheath around bundle was worn through to insulation and then worn through to bare wire. Condensed water met the bare wire and shorted against fuselage metal charring wires and powering on door motor which attempted to turn all ten cam sectors to unlocked position. At 13700 feet MSL and 300 KCAS, the eight lower cam sectors were prevented from unlocking because of strengthened locking sectors. However, the two midspan latches have no locking sectors. The slack in bellcranks, torque tubes, and high time worn cam latches allowed the aft midspan latch to rotate just past center allowing the 3.5 PSI internal pressure to rupture outward the forward cargo door
at the aft midspan latch.

The nine foot by eight foot squarish door burst open at midspan latch sending the latch and door material spinning away in the setting sun which reflected upon the shiny metal as it spun away erratically and appeared as red-orange streak to ground observers moving all which ways. The aft door frame was clean of attachment to door and bulged outward. Fuselage skin was torn vertically. The door fractured and shattered. The bottom eight latches held tight to the bottom eight latch pins on bottom sill while bottom external skin of door blew away. The top piece of red topped cargo door opened out and up smashing into the white fuselage skin above it leaving the red paint of the door on the white paint between passenger windows above. The red paint of the trim was rubbed away showing the white paint underneath. The top piece of the door took the hinge with it and fuselage skin as it is tore away. The loose red painted trim piece and top of door flew directly aft and impacted the right horizontal stabilizer leaving a red paint transfer mark on it. The hinge still appears to be working normally likely having overtravel impression marks on the opposite hinge when door overextended to slam on fuselage above. The top piece of the door shows inward damage when it hit fuselage above.

The explosive decompression of the thirty eight thousand pounds of internal force on the door blew out a large hole about twenty feet wide and forty feet high on the right side of the nose forward of the wing. Parts of the cargo hold structure were the first parts to leave the aircraft. The now uncompressed air molecules rushed out of the huge hole equalizing high pressure inside to low pressure outside while making a very loud noise. Fuselage skin was peeled outward at various places on the right side of the nose. The sudden rushing air was recorded on the Cockpit Voice
Recorder as a sudden loud sound. The explosive decompression of the forward cargo hold severely disrupted the nearby main equipment compartment which housed power cables and abruptly shut off power to the Flight Data Recorder.

At least nine passenger's bodies were never found, only bone fragments. The number three engine also ingested metal in baggage and started on fire from inefficient burning of fuel. The number three engine with pylon started to vibrate and a stator blade from the engine was spit out and impacted directly behind it in the right horizontal stabilizer.

The floor beams above the cargo hold were bent downward, fractured and broken from the sudden decompression. The main structural members of door and frame were gone and compromised. The flight attitude of the aircraft was askew to the left from reaction of explosive decompression to the right. Air rushed into the hole and weakened other skin and frame peeling skin outward. The 300 knots of air pressed upon the weakened nose and crumpled it into the large hole. The nose tore off and landed in a dense debris heap apart from the rest of the plane.

The port side forward of the wing was smooth and unshattered while the starboard side forward of the wing was shattered, torn, and frayed at ruptured cargo door area and severely disturbed over twenty feet by forty foot explosive decompression zone. Outward petal shaped fuselage skin appeared at aft midspan latch from rupture. Aft midspan latch was blown away. Outward peeled skin appeared from blowout. Fuselage skin remained smooth next to blown out skin.

The rest of the plane without the nose suddenly decelerated from 300 knots and caused whiplash injuries to passengers. Passengers
inside fuselage had baro-trauma to eardrums which ruptured trying to equalize middle ear pressure. The plane maneuvered with huge gaping wound in front increasing drag. The wind force disintegrated the fuselage and wings. Fuel poured out of ruptured tanks as wreckage fell. The broken fuselage, the ruptured wings, the fuel cloud, the center tank, and the spinning, on fire engine number three met at 7500 feet and exploded into a bright loud fireball putting singe marks on the fuselage skin while leaving earlier departed nose burn and singe mark free. The center tank exploded as well as other nearby fuel tanks. Forward passengers were not burned because they were in the earlier separated nose. The debris fell and spread out from 7500 feet to sea level in windblown southeast direction, leaving a wide debris field.

Ground observers heard the fireball explosion of the center tank and other fuel and looked up. They saw fire and smoke and falling debris.

Explosive decompression at the forward cargo hold led to suspicion of bomb in cargo compartment but bomb later ruled out. Debris ejected to the right from explosive decompression led to suspicion of missile exploding on left side of nose. Streak of shiny metal object spinning away reflecting evening sun to ground observers led to suspicion of missile exhaust but later ruled out.

Fire/explosion of center tank into fireball led to suspicion of center tank explosion as initial event. There were difficulties in determining ignition source, fuel volatility, unheard fuel explosion sound on CVR, unilateral fuselage damage, singe marks, and other evidence needed to corroborate center tank explosion as initial explosion.
Fuselage rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door inflight is initially rejected because bottom eight latches are found latched around locking pins while two midspan latches are unexamined and status unreported.

Questions about center tank explosion as initial event which evidence raises.

1. Sudden loud sound on Cockpit Voice Recorder is described as start of aircraft breakup but not sound of explosion. Sound on CVR does not match other staged Boeing 747 center tank explosion. How can an explosion in the center tank be powerful enough to start the aircraft breakup and blow off nose of Boeing 747 and not be heard on CVR?

Sudden loud sound is sound of explosive decompression which gives a sudden loud sound when forward cargo door ruptures/opens in flight. The TWA 800 sudden loud sound was linked to PA 103 sudden loud sound on CVR which was linked to AI 182 sudden loud sound on CVR which was linked to DC-10 cargo door explosive decompression on CVR. UAL 811 had a cargo door rupture/open in flight and recorded a sudden loud sound on the CVR. The sound is the sudden rushing of air molecules which were compressed now moving fast outward to equalize with the lower pressure outside air.

2. Center tank explosion would be spherical, not directed, and would either give no damage forward of the wing or about equal damage on both sides of the fuselage of TWA 800. The wreckage reconstruction shows smooth skin with little damage forward of the wing on the port/left side yet severe, shattered, torn, and frayed damage on the starboard/right side of the fuselage in the cargo door area. How can a center tank explosion cause
unilateral damage only on starboard side?

Explosive decompression and rupture of forward cargo door area when aft midspan latch ruptures would give shattered, torn and frayed, damage to cargo door area while leaving port/left/ opposite side smooth and light damage. Cargo door rupture would give the unilateral damage on starboard side as shown by TWA 800 wreckage.

3. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction shows outward peeled skin, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers. Water impact damage would be inward, not outward. How could water impact damage produce outward peeled skin, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers?

Explosive decompression in nose of TWA 800 would give outward peeled skin in nose, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers as internal high pressure rushes outward to equalize with the low outside pressure.

4. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction shows red paints smears only above the forward cargo door area and nowhere else on both side of the Boeing 747 fuselage. This indicates that the red painted door below ruptured/opened outward, slammed upward, and smashed into the white painted area above and transferred red paint from door onto white paint between windows. How did red paint smears get where they are?

After the rupture at aft midspan latch the door fractured and upper piece of the red painted door was pushed outward, rotated on its hinge, slammed upward and smashed into the white painted fuselage skin above, transferring red paint to the white painted area between the passengers windows, as shown by the
TWA 800 reconstruction. UAL 811 also had paint transfer from door to fuselage when its door opened in flight.

5. A center tank explosion would be far enough away from power cables to allow the Flight Data Recorder to record longer than the abrupt power cut it suffered. How can a center tank explosion which is not loud enough to be heard on the CVR and some distance away be strong enough to abruptly cease power to the FDR?

The explosive decompression in the cargo compartment would severely disrupt the cargo hold floor and the adjacent main equipment compartment in which the FDR and power cables are located. The severe disruption would abruptly cease power to the FDR. UAL 811 also had abrupt power cut when its cargo door opened in flight.

6. How could forward cargo door rupture/open when bottom eight latches are latched and locked in TWA reconstruction?

The forward cargo door of Boeing 747s is about nine feet by eight feet square. It has a hinge on the top and eight cam latches on the bottom. On each nine foot side is one midspan latch. The bottom eight cam latches go around eight latching pins. Over each cam latch is a locking sector. The two midspan latches have no locking sectors. The forward cargo door could rupture at the midspan latch and the hinge and bottom eight latches could still be attached to fuselage skin. The top of the door with hinge attached would tear off with the fuselage skin and spin away. The bottom eight latches could stay attached to bottom sill and continue down to the sea with the nose. The middle of the large door can still be ruptured/opened while the lower part stays attached to airframe. Doors can open/rupture with most or all
latches latched. TWA 800 reconstruction shows aft mid span latch missing which implies it became unlatched. The aft door frame sill is smooth and not attached to door which implies door opened in that area.

7. How could forward cargo door rupture cause center tank explosion?

When cargo door ruptures in flight a huge hole is created in nose which the 300 knot slipstream tears off. The falling, noseless, structurally compromised aircraft disintegrated into wings of rupturing fuel tanks, fuselage pieces including center tank, and spinning hot on fire jet engine. When falling debris reached about 7500 feet, the furred on fire engine number three ignited the fuel cloud and center fuel tank into a fireball. Center tank fire/explosion occurred but later and lower than forward cargo door rupture initial event.

Event, consequence, significance, source for destruction sequence:

1. Hot humid air in forward cargo compartment was subjected to cold conditioned air after takeoff on hot summer evening near New York on July 17, 1996.

NTSB exhibits gave takeoff time and temperatures plus the airconditioning system in Boeing 747s.

2. Condensation was precipitated out and formed on cold metal fuselage skin.

Water was available to ground any bare wires to fuselage skin. Observation made of water cascading out of forward cargo hold
of Boeing airliner by John Barry Smith standing in concourse at San Francisco Airport on December 6, 1997.

3. Poly-X wire bundle which held cargo door motor on power was chafed by the friction of continuous vibration against clamp or many door openings and closings on it. Sheath around bundle was worn through to insulation and then worn through to bare wire.

Bare wires can be shorted to ground causing power to go to door motor. NTSB exhibits list two forward cargo hold charred wiring fires. NTSB hearing on aging aircraft detailed problems with poly-x wiring chafing from vibration. NTSB AAR 92/02 detailed problems with chafing wires causing door motor to turn on. TWA 800 had poly-x wiring.

4. Condensed water met the bare wire and shorted against fuselage metal charring wires and powering on door motor which attempted to turn all ten cam sectors to unlocked position.

Event explains how door motor got power to turn on. NTSB exhibits list two previous cargo hold charred wire fires. NTSB AAR 92/02 lists two uncommanded cargo door opening on Boeing 747s caused by electrical problems, UAL preflight and UAL 811.

5. At 13700 feet MSL and 300 KCAS, the eight lower cam sectors were prevented from unlocking because of strengthened locking sectors. However, the two midspan latches have no locking sectors.

The eight bottom latches held tight to locking pins because of AD 88-12-04 which strengthened all the eight locking sectors.
NTSB AAR 92/02 describes the AD, door, and all latches.

6. The slack in bellcranks, torque tubes, and high time worn cam latches allowed the aft midspan latch to rotate just past center allowing the 3.5 PSI internal pressure to rupture outward the forward cargo door at the aft midspan latch.

UAL 811 had small rupture at aft midspan latch as shown in photograph in NTSB AAR 92/02. NTSB exhibit lists 3.5 PSI pressure differential. TWA 800 was extremely old aircraft with over 93000 flight hours.

7. The nine foot by eight foot squarish door burst open at midspan latch sending the latch and door material spinning away in the setting sun which reflected upon the shiny metal as it spun away erratically and appeared as red-orange streak to ground observers moving all which ways.

Press reports reveal eyewitnesses say different colored streaks going every which way from all directions. Time of 8:31 PM and angle of low sun to aircraft in east and observers to the west had to be perfectly aligned for spinning falling shiny piece of metal to reflect as streak to observers.

8. The aft door frame was clean of attachment to door and bulged outward.

Aft midspan latch blown away at rupture time and caused outward bulge. NTSB reconstruction photograph shows bulge and missing latch.

9. Fuselage skin was torn vertically.
Explosive decompression bursts outward limited by stringers and bulkheads which are vertical and match the other cargo door accident, UAL 811. NTSB photograph shows the vertical tears of TWA 800.

10. The door fractured and shattered.

NTSB photograph shows the damage. 38000 pounds of force were suddenly released onto now weakened door and it burst apart. 99 inches times 110 inches times 3.5 PSI equals 38115 pounds of force on the ten latches and hinge.

11. The bottom eight latches held tight to the bottom eight latch pins on bottom sill while bottom external skin of door blew away.

The bottom of large door held tight while middle of door ruptured in a troublesome section of a high time Boeing 747, Section 41 and Section 42. TWA 800 had not yet had the Section 41 retrofit. NTSB exhibit states bottom eight latches latched.

12. The top piece of red topped cargo door opened out and up smashing into the white fuselage skin above it leaving the red paint of the door on the white paint between passenger windows above. The red paint of the trim was rubbed away showing the white paint underneath. The top piece of the door took the hinge with it and fuselage skin as it is tore away.

The loose red painted trim piece and top of door flew directly aft and impacted the right horizontal stabilizer leaving a red paint transfer mark on it.

The hinge still appears to be working normally likely having
overtravel impression marks on the opposite hinge when door overextended to slam on fuselage above.

The top piece of the door shows inward damage when it hit fuselage above.

Sequence of door opening out and up and transferring paint above is described in text and drawing in NTSB AAR 92/02. Inward movement of top of door is described in AAR 92/02. Normal working hinge attached to top of door is described in AAR 92/02. Overtravel impression damage is described in text and picture in AAR 92/02.

13. The explosive decompression of the thirty eight thousand pounds of internal force on the door blew out a large hole about twenty feet wide and forty feet high on the right side of the nose forward of the wing.

NTSB photograph shows decompression rectangle zone on right side of nose.

14. Parts of the cargo hold structure were the first parts to leave the aircraft.

The first parts of plane to depart indicate trouble started there. NTSB exhibits show first parts to leave were from cargo structure.

15. The now uncompressed air molecules rushed out of the huge hole equalizing high pressure inside to low pressure outside while making a very loud noise.

NTSB AAR 92/02 states crew of UAL 811 heard a 'tremendous
explosion,' when door opened in flight.

16. Fuselage skin was peeled outward at various places on the right side of the nose.

Outward peeling indicates force from within, not without. UAL 811 had same outward peeling of fuselage skin in cargo door area.

17. The sudden rushing air was recorded on the Cockpit Voice Recorder as a sudden loud sound.

Sound matches other Boeing 747 sudden loud sound of explosive decompression and a DC-10 cargo door decompression sound according to NTSB chart.

18. The explosive decompression of the forward cargo hold severely disrupted the nearby main equipment compartment which housed power cables and abruptly shut off power to the Flight Data Recorder.

Cables for power and signal run through the forward cargo hold to the adjacent MEC. The cargo floor is severely disrupted when explosive decompression occurs in cargo hold according to AAIB 2/90 report and will cut off power abruptly.

19. At least nine passenger's bodies were never found, only bone fragments.

Where did those bodies go? What happened to them to reduce them to bone fragments requiring DNA analysis to identify? At least nine bodies always disappear when explosive decompression occurs in high time Boeing 747s according to
AAIB, NTSB, TSB and Indian reports.

20. The number three engine also ingested metal in baggage and started on fire from inefficient burning of fuel. The number three engine with pylon started to vibrate and a stator blade from the engine was spit out and impacted directly behind it in the right horizontal stabilizer.

NTSB AAR 92/02 describes the sequence of FOD into number three and also number four and the subsequent vibration and fire.

21. The floor beams above the cargo hold were bent downward, fractured and broken from the sudden decompression. The main structural members of door and frame were gone and compromised.

AAR 92/02, AAIB 2/90, and NTSB TWA 800 exhibits describe the downward movement of the floor beams above cargo compartment.

22. The flight attitude of the aircraft was askew to the left from reaction of explosive decompression to the right. Air rushed into the hole and weakened other skin and frame peeling skin outward.

AAR 92/02 describes the actions of the aircraft after door opened in flight.

23. The 300 knots of air pressed upon the weakened nose and crumpled it into the large hole.

AAIB and TSB/Indian reports describe how nose came off after explosion in forward cargo hold at 300 KCAS of two Boeing
24. The nose tore off and landed in a dense debris heap apart from the rest of the plane.

AAIB 2/90, TSB/Indian Court, and NTSB TWA 800 exhibits describe the dense nose debris field present when nose comes off in flight of three Boeing 747s.

25. The port side forward of the wing was smooth and unshattered while the starboard side forward of the wing was shattered, torn, and frayed at ruptured cargo door area and severely disturbed over twenty feet by forty foot explosive decompression zone. Outward petal shaped fuselage skin appeared at aft midspan latch from rupture. Aft midspan latch was blown away. Outward peeled skin appeared from blowout. Fuselage skin remained smooth next to blown out skin.

AAIB 2/90, TSB/Indian, and NTSB photographs describe the lesser damage port side nose compared to the more severely damaged starboard side as well as the outward peeled skin on nose of three Boeing 747s.

27. The rest of the plane without the nose suddenly decelerated from 300 knots and caused whiplash injuries to passengers. Passengers inside fuselage had baro-trauma to eardrums which ruptured trying to equalize middle ear pressure.

Passenger injuries are described in NTSB exhibits, TSB/Indian report, AAIB 2/90, and NTSB exhibits.

28. The plane maneuvered with huge gaping wound in front increasing drag. The wind force disintegrated the fuselage and
wings. Fuel poured out of ruptured tanks as wreckage fell. The broken fuselage, the ruptured wings, the fuel cloud, the center tank, and the spinning, on fire engine number three met at 7500 feet and exploded into a bright loud fireball putting singe marks on the fuselage skin while leaving earlier departed nose burn and singe mark free. The center tank exploded as well as other nearby fuel tanks. Forward passengers were not burned because they were in the earlier separated nose. The debris fell and spread out from 7500 feet to sea level in windblown southeast direction, leaving a wide debris field. Ground observers heard the fireball explosion of the center tank and other fuel and looked up. They saw fire and smoke and falling debris.

NTSB exhibits describe the breakup sequence and NTSB video shows fireball seconds later and thousands of feet lower than initial event. Engine number three was on fire for AAIB 2/90 and number four was on fire for NTSB AAR 92/02 after cargo hold ruptures.

29. Explosive decompression at the forward cargo hold led to suspicion of bomb in cargo compartment but bomb later ruled out.

Debris ejected to the right from explosive decompression led to suspicion of missile exploding on left side of nose.

Streak of shiny metal object spinning away reflecting evening sun to ground observers led to suspicion of missile exhaust but later ruled out.

Fire/explosion of center tank into fireball led to suspicion of center tank explosion as initial event.
Press reports, FBI reports, and NTSB reports describe the bomb, missile and center tank explanations.

30. There were difficulties in determining ignition source, fuel volatility, unheard fuel explosion sound on CVR, unilateral fuselage damage, singe marks, and other evidence needed to corroborate center tank explosion as initial explosion.

NTSB public hearing reveals the gaps in the center tank as initial event explanation.

31. Fuselage rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door inflight is initially rejected because bottom eight latches are found latched around locking pins while two midspan latches are unexamined and status unreported.

From: Charles Drew <cdrew@mail.arc.nasa.gov>
Date: January 27, 1998 4:07:16 PM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: Formats

Barry,

Strange, but you are likely correct, i.e., a problem on the ISP's end.
Could possibly be type, version, or configuration of your email package --
try using MIME (preferred) or BinHex for sending and receiving attachments.
Your comments and feedback are really appreciated.

Charles Drew
ASRS Internet Administrator
From: George Donaldson  
<BARFDONALDSON@worldnet.att.net>  
Date: February 2, 1998 6:18:29 PM PST  
To: barry@CORAZON.COM  
Subject: Keep it up. V 4.4.

John Barry Smith, (Sorry for the Knott's comment)

First: thank you for your input. Outstanding contribution.

I loved your reply to Tom Stalcup. He has already threatened to not read my posts but he keeps replying to them. Maybe, someone who is literate, is reading them to him.

Tom brought me into this forum after reading my views in the NYTimes forums. He must be kicking himself now. I have often thanked him saying that I am having a ball. He writes back saying that he is glad that "I" am having fun.

Most of the missile huggers can't tie a missile to the rest of the hard evidence, even William Donaldson. (No relative) I asked Bob Donaldson what was the effective force in ejecting the victims before the
CWT flareup
and he wrote back saying that the missile blew the nose off. I responded
writing: did someone stand in the opening and say "this way folks"?

I am glad that someone with brain tissue between their ears, such as
yourself, is in this circus. Bill and Sammy are also good. Some show only
enthusiasm but no trained common sense behind it. Ian seems to be trying
to sell something for income. We are all collectively better than the Feds
and that does give all some value. The cartoon and Newsday comic book are a
disgrace to the country. I have been a member of this group for such a
short time so maybe I shouldn't comment on people. My theory is based on a
fuel leak which started near takeoff. I think that Sammy is my only ally
unless others maybe just standing in the wings waiting to make a move. I
appreciate your putting water on Tom's comments to me. Looks like Bill
has come to my defense as well. This must be why I like Bill, Sammy and
yourself.

May I ask what is your professional background and what is any connection
to involved parties? I am an aeronautical engineer by training but
am prouder of my experience in designing domes. I was scheduled to supervise
the erection of the South Pole dome but was able to recommend a younger
engineer. I was the principal engineer behind the Fiske Planetarium dome
at Boulder and the Spruce Goose dome in Long Beach. The Goose Egg, now a
movie studio, is the world's largest clear span aluminum dome. The Fiske
dome has no subframe and uses its stressed skin to support the snow loads.
I was involved in the geometry and structural analysis of almost all
company projects: approximately 500 dome projects in total. I published
an engineering manual last year concerning dome design which included a
recent geometry invention. I have been retarded for twelve years and truly
enjoy this forum. I now receive a small Boeing pension due to spending 15
years at North American Aviation which was taken from Rockwell
International recently by Boeing. My nickname comes from the '50s when I
was the engineering flight test instrumentation design group checker, at
the Columbus division, and I often commented on some designs and the
comment stuck. Even my management club badge read Barf Donaldson. If
any of my former cohorts are still alive in Columbus, they probably remember me as Barf rather than George. I felt, all through my professional life, that I was being paid to have fun. I am still having fun without being paid. My wife thinks that I am only wasting my time sitting at the computer all day. She would prefer that I was doing house maintenance. We have three Macs and I use all three for different reasons. Each was purchased for a grandson whom my wife and I are legal guardians. He gets the best of each purchased. He is going on 14 and is the pride of our lives.

Keep the bastards on their toes.

With warmest regards,

BARF

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 3, 1998 8:17:12 AM PST
To: George Donaldson <BARFDONALDSON@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: Well well well

John Barry Smith, (Sorry for the Knott's comment)

No problem, freedom of speech rules. I just wanted to know the allusion.
Tom brought me into this forum after reading my views in the NYTimes forums. He must be kicking himself now.

I brought Stan Martin to the forum and he thinks it was secret ploy. Conspiracy guys are all the same.

They think I am a government agent out to discredit missile guys.

Most of the missile huggers can't tie a missile to the rest of the hard evidence,

Reality never stopped conspiracy guys.

I have been a member of this group for such a short time so maybe I shouldn't comment on people.

Archives cover a lot of current discussion.

My theory is based on a fuel leak which started near takeoff.

Could be, need corroborative evidence.

I appreciate your putting water on Tom's comments to me.

He's a censorship guy, they are recognized when they criticize the style, not the content or your contrary opinions. Soon, it will
be, you're off topic, when they talk about subs in an airplane forum and get upset at talk about cargo doors and DC-10s.

May I ask what is your professional background and what is any connection to involved parties?

Retired military. Not associated with manufacturer, lawyer, or airline.

I published an engineering manual last year concerning dome design which included a recent geometry invention.

A geometry invention?

There is a very important metal stress situation in TWA 800. This large nine foot door has one latch on each side to hole in 3.5PSI. It ruptured and the evidence is there to see at bulge of metal at aft midspan latch. My site has all the pictures. If you know about stressed metal and what it does when it fails I would appreciate your opinion on the cargo door area, and indeed, the whole forty foot explosive decompression rectangle forward or the wing on the right side. Photo attached. Outward peeled skin is called water impact damage by NTSB.

I have been retarded for twelve years and truly enjoy this forum.
Me for 13 years and the forums great except when you realize some of these guys are really nuts. They really think the government is out to discredit them, paranoia is real for them. The missile guys really think I work for a PR firm hired by CIA to tout cargo door to divert attention from missile theory.

I now receive a small Boeing pension due to spending 15 years at North American Aviation which was taken from Rockwell International recently by Boeing.

I ejected from a NAA RA-5C in 1967, it is my motive for trying to stop plane crashes. My buddy worked at Columbus in early 70s, Commander Bill Rosselle, we were both RANs in RVAH-1.

She would prefer that I was doing house maintenance.

Me too, and I do, and raise our six year old as my wife works full time as nurse.

We have three Macs.

They'll take my Mac clone away from me when they pry my cold dead fingers from around my single button mouse.

My domain is corazon for my wife Corazon.

Air India 182 is a metal stress situation and Indian report is on web site. PA 103 is all metal incredible malarkey of a small
directed blast, called a large shotgun in the report, which goes on to gain energy at is bounces around a cargo hold and air conditioning ducts to emerge strong enough to sever the nose of a 747, it's called Mach stem and what joke. It's a real stretch of these people to rule out explosive decompression of door opening and put in bomb or center tank explosion.

The clue is, it could be a bomb or center tank blowing door open, so why not investigate and say, well, yeah, door opened but it was bomb or tank explosion that did it?

Because it leads to UAL 811 and realistic cause of door opening, short to door motor to turn on to unlatch position. And door for TWA 800 leads right to PA 103. So, no coverup, just reluctance to work hard to undue years of wrong conclusions based on faulty incomplete research.

The four accidents are so similar as to be all leaking fuel before takeoff, yours, or bomb, Sammy, missile, or center tank or cargo door. They all have the same initial event because the consequences are so similar. I vote for something that's happened before and several times on same model and type of plane, inadvertent opening of forward cargo door in flight, electrically caused.

But, metal under stress and what happened when stress changes is very important to understanding TWA 800 and others. I contend a small rupture at aft midspan latch leads to door fracturing at midline and opening leading to large explosive decompression rectangle. Can you give opinion on that after examining attached photo?

If you want to get serious, BARF, the opportunity is here to
change the world of aviation forever. Essentially, don't cut holes in pressurized hulls. And if you have to, make them small, few, and plug type, not a big one that opens outward.

I'm dead serious about this, as dead as the pilot that told me to eject and saved my life. I respond seriously to facts, data, and evidence, particularly to evidence, such as metal from an airplane and the story the metal tells.

FAA Structural enginner and NTSB metallurgist are the ones saying TWA 800 cargo door was locked at water impact based upon checking eight of the ten latches only.

I am corresponding to them and would appreciate any technical explanation of why the shattered rectangle of TWA 800 in attached photo is not water impact damage from without but explosive decompression force from within.

My best effort was outward peeled skin, not inward, red paint smears above cargo door showing door opening up out and slamming upward, and round fuselage hitting water would give oval damage on skin, not rectangle.

Every step of the way is documented.

Well, it's a start.

Missile and bomb are better stories, I agree, and for entertainment that's fine. For life and death, facts, data, evidence rule, not wishful thinking.

I'm probably preaching to the choir on that. Domes respond to physical laws of balance and stress, not art of beauty, although
they are related, form follows function.

I just read a good article on soap bubbles in Scientific American. They always bend to least surface area.

Best Regards,
Barry Smith

From: George Donaldson
<BARFDONALDSON@worldnet.att.net>
Date: February 4, 1998 9:43:07 AM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: Planes

I love your comments. Hope that this does not end soon. It is amazing how serious Ian appears but when pushed to back up his theory, he may run and hide. Those missile huggers can't tie their "missile" to any sequence of events, I am sure. "But we KNOW what caused it and that is important."
Sure.

I keep thinking that the A5 had only one vertical from day one. I don't recall ever seeing any preliminary design showing two. I know
that our flight test vehicles had only one.

I saw one of the earliest F4s when it stopped in Columbus while on its way to Pax River. I think that it had the long horizontal stabs which were later shorted due to ground contact in roll extremes at takeoff/landing. That plane looks like a whole series of afterthoughts. I imagine that the wing tip crank up and the horizontal stab crank down had something to do with its free body roll axis. I often wonder what the A-10 Warthog free body roll axis looks like. When rolling, I would think that its nose would travel all over the place. It turned out much better than I had predicted. I felt that it would be a disaster, like the McDonnell F3 Demon. Is it true that more test pilots were killed in that bird than any other new design? I was in the St. Louis area at the time that it was designed and I recall pilots dying left and right. All production craft were barged to a Navy mechanics school in Memphis, I believe. It never did enter the fleet. McDonnell blamed Westinghouse because of the engines and Westinghouse said that the engines met spec which came from McDonnell. I think that it had J34 axials. The
Lockheed series, of that period, used centrifugal compressors and I always felt that that was too old of a design to be worth anything. The J79 sure brought technology to new heights. They were in both the A5 and F4s.

It is fun thinking of the 'good old days'.

Keep the faith,

BARF

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 4, 1998 12:58:24 PM PST
To: George Donaldson <BARFDONALDSON@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: Re: Planes

I keep thinking that the A5 had only one vertical from day one. I don't recall ever seeing any preliminary design showing two. I know that our flight test vehicles had only one.

Only in design, just like the RAN window was big too in design but later made small.

the McDonnell F3 Demon. Is it true that more test pilots were killed in that bird than any other new design?

I don't know, I saw several up close doing landings at Signonella
in '63. Screamin' Demon.

It never did enter the fleet.

Yes, it did.

I think that it had J34 axials.

P2V had two J34 and they took out my hearing.

It is fun thinking of the 'good old days'.

Yeah,

Regards,
Barry

---

From: "Colin Nicols" <cwnicols@tntcomputer.com>
Date: February 8, 1998 9:07:35 PM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>

Sources say that the cause was a friendly unarmed missle entering the fuel bay and igniting the fuel from the missle's exhaust.

Have you anything to add about this theory?

cn
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 9, 1998 8:56:35 AM PST
To: "Colin Nicols" <cwnicols@tntcomputer.com>
Subject: Nonsense

Sources say that the cause was a friendly unarmed missile entering the fuel bay and igniting the fuel from the missile's exhaust.

Have you anything to add about this theory?

cn

Nothing to add; only to subtract. Nonsense.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: "Palmer, Regina" <regina.palmer@lmco.com>
Date: February 10, 1998 6:13:57 AM PST
To: "'Barry'" <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Web Site Contents

I am in a class and have been given a case study to analyze on the 1972 DC-10 incident. I wanted to correlate the 1974 accident with my results. When I tried to read some of the pages that you have on your web site they were too blury to read. Could you send me a soft copy of those pages? If that is not possible, I'll try to find the book that you referenced.
I look forward to hearing from you.

Regina Palmer

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 10, 1998 7:49:23 AM PST
To: "Palmer, Regina" <regina.palmer@lmco.com>
Subject: Re: Web Site Contents

I am in a class and have been given a case study to analyze on the 1972 DC-10 incident. I wanted to correlate the 1974 accident with my results. When I tried to read some of the pages that you have on your web site they were too blurfy to read. Could you send me a soft copy of those pages? If that is not possible, I'll try to find the book that you referenced.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regina Palmer

Ah, the 1972 DC 10 Ontario crash. I used excerpts from that softcover paperback book. The answer is to download them from my site. If they are too blurfy there is a problem because they are clear on other computers. It also disturbs me that the scanned images are not clear for you. I would like to know why. What is the resolution of your monitor? I use 1280 by 1064. If all else fails I can send copies of the paper pages on the 1972 crash. A
cargo door popped before that cargo door, on the ground during test. That is also interesting. There were three cargo door pops on the DC 10.

What is your class?

I'll attach a DC 10 page to this email, can you view pictures that come across as.jpg?

Regards,

Barry Smith

From: "Palmer, Regina" <regina.palmer@lmco.com>
Date: February 10, 1998 8:11:31 AM PST
To: "Barry" <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: RE: Web Site Contents

I don't know what the resolution of my monitor is at home but I was able to read the pages on my machine here at work. Thanks for responding to my e-mail. My class is Managerial Communications and my instructor has given my team (7 of us) the task of analyzing the 1972 incident and presenting the results to the class. In our research of the 1972 incident, we found the 1974 accident. When I did my search on the internet, it brought me to your website right away. I was glad to see all of the information that you have on your website. It is very
helpful
to us. We wanted to use some the pictures that you have
displayed as
part of the presentation make the presentation more effective.
And,
yes, I can read the .jpg file. Thanks so much.

Regina Palmer

--------
From: John Barry Smith
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 1998 08:49 AM
To: Palmer, Regina
Subject: Re: Web Site Contents

<<File: DC-10p115.jpg>>
I am in a class and have been given a case study to analyze on
the
1972
DC-10 incident. I wanted to correlate the 1974 accident with my
results. When I tried to read some of the pages that you have on
your
web site they were too blurry to read. Could you send me a soft
copy
of
those pages? If that is not possible, I'll try to find the book that
you
referenced.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regina Palmer
Ah, the 1972 DC 10 Ontario crash. I used excerpts from that softcover paperback book. The answer is to download them from my site. If they are too blurry there is a problem because they are clear on other computers. It also disturbs me that the scanned images are not clear for you. I would like to know why. What is the resolution of your monitor? I use 1280 by 1064. If all else fails I can send copies of the paper pages on the 1972 crash. A cargo door popped before that cargo door, on the ground during test. That is also interesting. There were three cargo door pops on the DC 10.

What is your class?

I'll attach a DC 10 page to this email, can you view pictures that come across as.jpg?

Regards,

Barry Smith

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/
Barry/John, (which do you prefer? My attorney's name is Barry)

I must be controversial as you are. People keep quoting me. It's nice to be the center of attention. It is said that some kids misbehave because negative attention is better than no attention.

You and I are much alike in that neither of our theories is supported by any other than ourselves. This, I can contend with. I'm happy and what else matters.

I noticed that you picked up on my idle chatter and pigheaded stupidity comment. I fear that some may answer that they go together, unless their pigheaded stupidity precludes that.

Thank you for your rodent note. Levity makes the world go
around.

Your like idle chatterer,

BARF

From: "Scott D. Lindell" <scott.d.lindell@lmco.com>
Date: February 10, 1998 9:15:34 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: DC-10 aft luggage door incidents & Convair involvement

Hi,

My name is Scott Lindell and I am a member of the same MBA class as Regina Palmer who wrote you earlier.

We are doing a team case study of the Windsor incident in our MBA program. My responsibility is to understand Convair's involvement and "act" as a Convair VP to explain this involvement with McDonnell Douglas during an investigation hearing. I would very much appreciate any information or references you may to information which would describe Convair's involvement that lead up to the Windsor incident and the Orly crash.
What I know now is that they had involvement in the design of the door and latching mechanism. I also know they had conducted tests which they reported to McDonnell Douglas in which these latch problems were reported as a Class 4 problem.

First - I eager to learn more about the specifics of Convair's involvement in the design. Were they told what to design or did they develop they design themselves.

Second - I am eager to better understand the big picture relationship between Convair and McDonnell Douglass in the late '60's and early '70's. How much of Convair's business came from McD? What would Convair have been risking to bring these Class 4 problems directly to the FAA rather than working through McD. How much influence did McDonnell Douglas have over the technical aspects of Convair's design efforts?

Thirdly - How much involvement did Convair have in the various cluges that were done to "improve" the latches prior to the Orly crash which resulted from the same problem as Windsor.
Again, any information or references you may have to help me develop my Convair case would be most appreciated.

Scott Lindell
(303) 971-3253
scott.d.lindell@lmco.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 10, 1998 10:20:55 AM PST
To: George Donaldson <BARFDONALDSON@worldnet.att.net>
Subject: door first then fuel explosion

Barry to my friends. John to strangers, and asshole to those that disagree with me.

It isn't the theories that disturb me, it's the conspiracy guys. It's insanity and it is becoming more popular every day. Blame the other guy.

It is said that some kids misbehave because negative attention is better than no attention.

The negative attention is contrary opinion.

You and I are much alike in that neither of our theories is supported by any other than ourselves.

Naw, I've got real things that can be touched like bare wire and damaged pins and latches.
Attached picture is of a fuel fire in air. No streak, no explosion, white smoke. Leaking fuel fires do not lead to explosions. Leaking fuel rarely catches on fire from engine exhaust, needs to be midair or breakup, or afterburner, as we did in RA 5C for air shows, dump fuel, light burner, flame. Turn off burner with fuel still streaming, no fire, just vapor cloud. You need ignition source just like the CWT guys, and it ain't there for initial event.

The big picture, four fatal 747 accidents in which the aft midspan latch is ruptured and the forward cargo door separated in flight: AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800, and the cause is the same, either all bombs, or all missiles, or all center tank explosions or all meteors, or all chafed wire shorting to ground...as clearly described in NTSB AAR 92/02 for UAL 811, the tree in the forest that was not totally cut down and thus available to be examined closely for the cause that almost did it in.

Door separating first in flight explains streak, explains the non-burned bodies, explains the ignition source of the fireball, explains the abrupt stop of sooting on top of fuselage, explains intact passenger door and shattered nearby cargo door, explains location of cargo bay wreckage in red zone, explains sudden loud sound on CVR, and explains abrupt power cut to FDR.

But, we are the reality guys, it's more fun talking nonsense with the fantasy guys.

Regards,
Barry Smith
your history section on 747 the writing needs to be a little large.your
sincerely parker

Hey Barry,
I wrote you earlier about using your picture for the cover of a book...well now the author and his assistant want to collaborate with you concerning the book. Please send an e-mail if you could.

Thanks, Kelly
[lakewd@flash.net]
Hey Barry,

I wrote you earlier about using your picture for the cover of a book...well now the author and his assistant want to collaborate with you concerning the book. Please send an e-mail if you could.

Thanks, Kelly

[lakewd@flash.net]

Well, well, well, yes. I will collaborate with someone on a book. It depends on the someone. And I agree because they want to do it because they believe the cargo door/wiring cause may be true by the evidence, not because someone told them it was true.

So, set up an interview. My phone is 408 659 3552. Email is very good too, maybe better.

There have been significant changes in perspective among the NTSB and FAA in the last ten days, too. And it may have been because of the picture that you are going to use which I included in all my correspondence to them. The outward peeled skin, the bulge at latch, and the red paint smears were apparently too much too ignore, so they agreed with me, door opened in flight.

Regards,

John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 11, 1998 10:35:36 PM PST
To: "Scott D. Lindell" <scott.d.lindell@lmco.com>
Subject: Re: DC-10 aft luggage door incidents & Convair involvement

I would very much appreciate any information or references you may to information which would describe Convair's involvement that lead up to the Windsor incident and the Orly crash.

Nothing on Convair, sorry.

What I know now is that they had involvement in the design of the door and latching mechanism. I also know they had conducted tests which they reported to McDonnell Douglas in which these latch problems were reported as a Class 4 problem.

First - I eager to learn more about the specifics of Convair's involvement in the design. Were they told what to design or did they develop they design themselves.

Don't know. Outward opening doors on a pressurized hull is suicide.

Second - I am eager to better understand the big picture relationship between Convair and McDonnell Douglass in the late '60's and early '70's. How much of Convair's business came from McD?
What would Convair have been risking to bring these Class 4 problems directly to the FAA rather than working through McD.

Don't know.

How much influence did McDonnell Douglas have over the technical aspects of Convair's design efforts?

Don't know.

Thirdly - How much involvement did Convair have in the various cluges that were done to "improve" the latches prior to the Orly crash which resulted from the same problem as Windsor.

Don't know.

Again, any information or references you may have to help me develop my Convair case would be most appreciated.
Sorry, nothing on Convair, good questions though. Mostly political and change overnight.

Good Luck,

John Barry Smith

---

From: TrnPnt@aol.com  
Date: February 12, 1998 2:31:32 AM PST  
To: barry@corazon.com  
Subject: No Subject

I've read with interest, you're comments about plane crashes being attributed to explosive decompression rather than to bomb explosions. How does this sudden decompression happen? What causes the door to open? And, if you don't mind me playing devil's advocate, what kind of background do you have to reinforce your statements? The reason I ask all this is because I'm an author working on a bomb book being published next year. The book addresses some of the airline incidents you have focused on at your web page. Your insight is new and intriguing...which is why I decided to send you this e-mail. I'd appreciate hearing back from you.

Steve
Hi Steve,

How does this sudden decompression happen?

After pressurized hull rupture when aft latch ruptures of forward cargo door.

What causes the door to open?

Chafed to bare wire short to fuselage to turn on door unlatch motor which partially unlatches midspan latches of forward cargo door.

And, if you don't mind me playing devil's advocate, what kind of background do you have to reinforce your statements?

Aviation technician, crewman, navigator, pilot past 35 years, four thousand flight hours, and survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet airplane crash from mechanical reason.

The reason I ask all this is because I'm an author working on a bomb book being published next year. The book addresses some of
the airline incidents you have focused on at your web page.

I understand. But believe this, there is on person on this planet that believes that AI 182 and PA 103 were not bombs but doors. I didn't pick the flight numbers, the evidence did, sudden loud sound on CVR, abrupt power cut to FDR and dozens more similarities that allowed me to put those two planes into the forest of four, AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800.

The bomb explanation is yes, it could happen, but no it didn't. The evidence is not there. And a door opening leading to explosive decompression mimics a bomb which is a politically popular solution so it is accepted quickly, if possible. A bomb or missile exonerates the manufacturer, the airline, and the government while a door blames everyone.

With PA 103 and the one half fingernail sized piece of plastic from which the entire craziness of timer and bomb and Libyan secret agent nonsense derived, interview the man who found it, a year after the crash, in a field already searched by thousands who couldn't find nine whole passengers with clothing, Tom Thurman, recently removed from his position as head of the FBI evidence lab...for mismanagement of evidence and other irregularities.

A lot bigger story than one or two maybe bombs is the for sure three cargo door/bad wiring caused fatal accidents, AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800.

I also understand cargo doors don't sell while bombs, missiles, and conspiracies do.

Web site www.corazon.com has all the above answers and many more.
The reason I answered here is you asked one of the six questions that open minded persons ask, 'What causes the door to open?''

Two more questions you will think of is how did the nose of UAL 811 stay on and last, 'Is there a conspiracy to keep the door/wiring solution secret?' Answer: No.

Below is from my web site:

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

How Could Pan Am 103 Not Be a Bomb?
Pan Am Flight 103 not brought down by bomb explanation.

The official UK AAIB report never says the word 'bomb' in the entire report; it calls the blast source an 'improvised explosive device'. The English writing in English about an English accident would have said 'bomb' if they wanted to mean bomb. They meant and said 'improvised explosive device'. They could have said 'plastic high explosive bomb' but they didn't. They didn't because the evidence is not there. There is evidence of an improvised explosive device, so they said it, leaving many choices but still unnamed specifically.

There was a blast in the forward cargo hold of Pan Am 103. It was not a bomb and the blast force was not enough to destroy the structural integrity of the nose and the relatively mild blast happened after the forward cargo door opened. It is also difficult to disprove a negative.
The conclusion that an improvised explosive device detonated inside the forward cargo hold of Pan Am 103 is based on several facts in official report:

1. A shatter zone was found on the port side just forward of the wing. This shatter zone reveals a reported hole of 18 to 20 inches in size. This small sized hole is too small to blow off the nose of a 747. Bombs have gone off in 747s before making small holes which did not destroy the plane which turned around and landed safely. The 747 was designed to withstand a small sized hole. All blast damage evidence is too weak for a bomb but normal for a small device.

2. The destruction area is described as if a rather large shotgun had gone off at close range. A rather large shotgun is not a bomb.

3. The destruction area is described as directed, with a straight line of destruction of 25 inches to 50 inches. A bomb blast is spherical. There is no evidence of a spherical blast but evidence of a straight line blast.

4. There is no evidence of plastic explosive in the blast area or shatter zone, only soot and explosive residue which might come from a shotgun.

5. All evidence of high plastic explosive is stated as being on passenger items which are never named, listed or described. Traces of explosive residue on fragments mean very small invisible amounts of something are found on something very small. There were millions of very small pieces of wreckage, including pieces of plastic in circuit boards in alarm clocks.
6. Evidence of traces of high explosive on fragments of wreckage is now shown to be benign and explained as normal heart medicine, or residue from the uniforms of soldiers, or traces left over from a dog sniffing exercise.
7. No pieces of a bomb were found.
8. FBI investigator who made his career on "cracking the mystery of the bombing Pan Am Flight 103 for Pan Am 103" in 1989 was removed and transferred by the FBI on 29 Jan, 1997. Tom Thurman, unit chief of the explosives division was transferred because of questions concerning sloppiness and mismanagement. The Justice report, prepared with the help of several world-renowned forensic experts, found that in some cases the bureau laboratory exercised lax control over evidence and that accountability over findings needed to be improved.

Conflicting evidence that it was not a bomb was available for interpretation from official report:

1. Sudden loud sound on CVR matches Air India 182 sudden loud sound which matches explosive decompression on a cargo door caused crash of a DC-10. A bomb big enough to blow nose off of Boeing 747 would be heard on CVR. Sudden loud sound on Pan Am 103 does not match a bomb. The sound has been officially described as probably Pan Am 103 undergoing structural breakup.

2. Reconstruction diagrams show more severe damage on right side of fuselage, the cargo door side, while light damage is on left side, the small shatter zone side.

3. Reconstruction diagrams match the destruction pattern of a known cargo door failure in a Boeing 747, UAL 811, in amount
of skin torn away, stringers exposed, bent floor beams, and cargo door broken in half.

4. Engines number three and four suffered foreign object damage, with engine number three on fire and landing separate from the engines number 1, 2, and 4. Engine number three suffered most inflight damage and it is on opposite side of small blast hold, but on cargo door side.

5. Blast was directed not spherical. Yet official report has an artist's interpretation of a large spherical blast, and the inaccurate drawing is repeated a few pages later.

6. Door coming off picked up on radar which would explain subsequent destruction.

7. Type and sequence of destruction matches other 747 crashes, a known cargo door caused crash, a tenuous bomb explanation crash, and an unknown crash.  
8. "Relatively mild blast..."

9. Bomb theory as presented in AAIB report is contradictory, evasive, inconsistent, and has several errors of fact. There is mistaken grammar in verb tense and poor choice of verb 'exhibit.' These types of error are not made by British authors writing in English for an official United Kingdom report. This section was written by different person than rest of report. Later the same writer states noise is no doubt bomb. Next page of report, written by different person, refers to noise as most likely aircraft structure break-up. Serious contradiction in same report one page apart.
The condition of the aft door, far from locus of damage in forward cargo hold, is reported to be intact and latched. The
condition of the forward cargo door, near the scene of damage start of forward cargo hold, is omitted, unreported, not stated, passed over, neglected. A glaring oversight.

10. For the bombers the sound on CVR was of the bomb, (although sound never matches any bomb sound.) it was lucky to have been placed near air conditioning ducts to direct to blast to other areas of the plane, (even though bombs that caused the same size hole in other Boeing 747s turn around and land safely.) the detonating altitude fuze did not go off on the flight from Frankfurt to London but did go off by itself over Lockerbie, but distresses the Libyan secret agents who put the suitcase bought in Malta on the plane because now the evidence would show it was a bomb and the bombers are upset because they wanted the plane to explode over water so it would not be known it was a terrorist act? And the reason terrorists do terrorists acts is to be noticed for their cause and to be noticed is bad? Non sense, it makes no sense, it's entertaining nonsense.

What might explain the blast, if not a bomb? Diplomatic pouches were carried in the forward cargo hold. Guns or booby traps might have been inside them and went off when the huge explosive decompression occurred when the cargo door tore off at 31000 feet. Or a passenger had fireworks or other incendiary device inside his luggage, which was passed because cargo was not checked or the device did not look suspicious. The fireworks or blasting caps were not fuzed and would be safe as long as a explosive force was not present near it. But the explosive decompression might have set them off, after the door went. There may be other devices normally carried inside the cargo compartment which detonate when exposed to large explosive decompression such as fire extinguishers or emergency power units. There are many alternate explanations for the small blast hole and explosive residue and soot other than a bomb.
Based on the new research discovery that traces of explosive residue on aircraft fragments can be benign, the investigation into Pan Am 103 should be reopened on that information alone. If the traces are not from a bomb, then no bomb evidence. A small piece of plastic may give timer evidence, but no bomb evidence.

There is no such thing as a stealth bomb which leaves no residue and makes no sound unless explosive decompression is accepted which makes a loud sound, causes loose items to crash into each other, leaves no residue, and is not a bomb.

After all is said and done, it could have been a small blast which forced the door open, however, based on other accidents where the door opening led to destruction, the likely cause of the door opening is not a small blast in the forward cargo compartment but an electrical short which caused the door open motor to turn on, forcing the door to open past the cam locks, just like it did previously in three other instances of inadvertent cargo door openings.

OK, what about the wonderful spy story with foreign governments, CIA, coverups, bombs, timers, pants bought in Malta, etc, hey, great story, make a great movie, but not true; just entertaining fiction. That story has so many holes in it that it is incoherent. The tellers disagree among themselves every time they tell it. The exaggeration of the warning, the non explosion on the way from Frankfurt to London, the bad luck of flight course deviation, the exaggeration of the too small blast into reverberating around air conditioning ducts would all be funny, if not so serious consequences occurred later on. Pan Am 103 looked like AI 182, and so it should, the cause is the same. But the wrong conclusion of AI 182 led to the wrong conclusion of PA 103 which almost led to the wrong conclusion of TWA 800 as
all being bombs.
Comment: How can so many experts be wrong? You'll have to ask the experts. There is no conspiracy, no coverup and no plot. Administrative errors are made and administrative errors get corrected. There was a small blast, but not a bomb. There was an explosion, explosive decompression, which makes a loud sound and mimics a bomb in consequences. Wishful thinking, blaming others, and avoiding responsibility leads to errors of fact. The explanation may end up with sequence in dispute: door opened then small blast, or small blast then door opened. PA 103 door with cam lock evidence resides in hangar in UK. AI 182 door at bottom of sea. TWA 800 door in hangar in USA. 27 Mar 97

From: TrnPnt@aol.com  
Date: February 12, 1998 10:21:06 AM PST  
To: barry@corazon.com  
Subject: Re: Chafed wire/latch rupture/explosive decompression  

John:

Thanks for sending along the info. I find it very intriguing and, if it is indeed what happened, then I can better understand why everyone immediately points at a bomb as being the culprit. It removes personal liability.
In your research, it appears that you feel that at least four incidents are attributable to explosive decompression. Is that so?

Also, I have to wonder a bit here.... Aren't planes built to sustain sudden decompression? I mean, doesn't the airframe hold everything together? I recall seeing a plane land in Hawaii that had its roof ripped off. Remember that? The plane held together pretty well. So, if the door fell off, why would a plane disintegrate? I'm not challenging you, I'm just curious. You're the aircraft technician here, not me. I'd appreciate it if you could explain this to me in easy to understand terms.

Thanks!
Steve

P.S. If you don't mind me asking, what aircraft accident did you survive?

P.S.S. Also, did you try to tell the media or the FAA about explosive decompression after Flt. 800 went down? If not, I can give you the phone and fax number of ABC news in New York City.
I can better understand why everyone immediately points at a bomb as being the culprit. It removes personal liability.

More than that, the people get to vent their grief with anger at somebody, not some stupid piece of metal.

In your research, it appears that you feel that at least four incidents are attributable to explosive decompression. Is that so?

AI 182, PA 103, UAL 811, and TWA 800, all fatal accidents.

Also, I have to wonder a bit here.... Aren't planes built to sustain sudden decompression?

Only the size of the passenger window, not twenty foot by forty foot hole in fuselage.

I mean, doesn't the airframe hold everything together? I recall seeing a plane land in Hawaii that had its roof ripped off. Remember that? The plane held together pretty well.

Aloha airlines B737 was unilateral non structural bearing loss of top skin, not structural member of door on one side only.
So, if the door fell off, why would a plane disintegrate?

See, I predicted that thought of yours in my previous email, it's 'UAL 811 nose stayed on, why?'

(The reason I answered here is you asked one of the six questions that open minded persons ask, 'What causes the door to open?"

Two more questions you will think of is how did the nose of UAL 811 stay on and last, 'Is there a conspiracy to keep the door/wiring solution secret?" Answer: No)

I'd appreciate it if you could explain this to me in easy to understand terms.

UAL 811 had much smaller hole, ten by twenty foot explosive decompression so nose stayed on, the other three had much larger holes so came off. Pictures and drawings of decompression holes in noses of 747s are on web site.

P.S. If you don't mind me asking, what aircraft accident did you survive?

RA-5C, Navy jet, I ejected. It's on web site, the Navy accident report.

P.S.S. Also, did you try to tell the media or the FAA about explosive decompression after Flt. 800 went down?
Of course, hundreds of letters, I'm in discussion right now with FAA and NSTB. They now say door opened in flight but center tank explosion did it.

If not, I can give you the phone and fax number of ABC news in New York City.

You thought of it, you do it. Media is not my thing, Boeing and FAA and NSTB are the people I'm trying to persuade to investigate the avenue of door first then center tank explosion. I will of course talk to them with evidence to support claim.

Regards,
John Barry Smith

When the forward cargo door on Boeing 747s opens inadvertently several consequences can occur.

1. Door opens and minor consequences if plane is on ground. (UAL preflight)

2. Door opens two inches but the mid span latches hold and no baggage is sucked into number 3 engine: Minor consequences as plane turns around and lands. (Pan Am 125).

3. Door opens, mid span latches hold but baggage is possibly sucked into number three engine: Severe consequences as number 3 engine is foded, blades nicked, vibration, fire, and engine separates and strikes number 4 engine which fails and separates from wing also. Plane then crashes with total destruction and death. (Possibly El Al 747 and China Airlines
4. Door opens, mid span latches hold for 1.5 seconds, then give way and door is torn away exposing huge hole in side of nose: Moderate consequences as nine people are sucked out to deaths, number three engine is foddled and throws engine parts into number 4 engine which fails also. Engines stay on wing if shut down in time and plane lands if near airport. (UAL 811)

5. Door opens, mid span latches don't delay full opening, door tears up and away exposing huge hole in nose into which 300 knot slipstream enters and same force presses on weakened, damaged nose, tearing it off, severing power and destroying airworthiness: Severe consequences as headless plane crashes with total destruction and death (AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800)

How can nose come off when door opens and tears away?

The door is eight feet by nine feet in size and outward opening, hinged on top. When it bulges out into the 300 knot slipstream just a few inches, or just a few degrees of its opening arc, the slipstream pushes against the door and flips it up and away tearing off fuselage skin and stringers with it. The amount of skin torn away is a minimum additional area of nine feet by ten feet. So a hole estimated officially of between nine by 15 feet or estimated by others of ten by forty feet is opened on the front right side of the airborne 747. Assuming a conservative estimate of ten by fifteen feet, that is one hundred and fifty square feet of hole exposed to the slipstream.

The structurally important floor beams above the absent door are bent, missing, and fractured during the explosive decompression and the pressure equalizing process.
The slipstream is 300 knots or 330 miles per hour of air flowing over the nose and into the hole. The same high pressure air is also pressing on the front of the now weakened and slightly canted nose. The 300 knots is not ground speed or true air speed but the actual speed of the air molecules pressing against the speed sensor, the pitot tube. Three hundred knots is twice as fast but ten times the power of the fastest winds on earth. Ten times the force of the hurricanes that tear boarded up buildings apart enters the nose of the 747.

The nose of the 747 has been considerably weakened when the door comes off and exposes the huge hole. The door is a structural member and contributes to the strength of the forward fuselage when pressurized. When the door goes the nose is now weakened by the absence of that structural member which departs taking the top reinforced sill. The reinforced frame is now compromised on one side, the top. When the door goes, explosive decompression occurs, the severity of which is dependent upon the altitude of the plane, that is, the pressure differential between the inside cargo compartment and the outside free air. If the plane is high enough when the door comes off, the higher pressure air in the cargo compartment rushes out to equalize with the lower pressure outside air. The passenger compartment high pressure air now tries to equalize with the now lower pressure cargo compartment air. It does and pushes down on the structural member floor beams, breaking, bending, and fracturing them downward. The nose is now severely weakened by the missing door, missing skin and stringers, and bent and fractured floor beams.

The passing 300 knot air molecules alongside the nose enter the huge hole and puff up and blow out the side of the fuselage on the other side of the nose, the port side. Now debris from the left
side and the right side enter the number two and three engines causing them to fail, throwing off parts which are ingested by numbers one and four engines. All four engines fail and tear away with their pylons from the wing destroying the structural integrity of the fuel laden wing which disintegrates into a ball of parts, fuel, and hot spinning jet engines.

The nose of the 747 now has a huge amount of fuselage skin torn away, the structural beams are weakened, the flight attitude of the plane is askew, and extremely high wind pressure is pressing into and onto the compromised nose of the 747 forward of the wing as well as the front of the nose. The ejection of the cargo door to the right may have yawed the nose to the left or induced a roll to the left wing down position. The autopilot may attempt to correct the yaw with stabilizer inputs putting directional stress on the airframe. The nose crumples into the huge hole on the starboard side. The entire forward section of the plane, (one of the three sections joined in construction,) is torn away and falls alone in a dense heap on the ground or under the water. The sequence takes under three seconds to twenty four seconds from the time the door opens just a few inches to nose separation.

Brutal analogy: The nose of the 747 is really the head which holds the brain of the main electrical compartment and the flight crew. The neck of the 747 is the area just forward of the wing. The body of the 747 is the wings and center fuselage. The tail of the 747 is the aft fuselage and vertical and horizontal stabilizers.

When the door goes it tears a gash in the neck which severs tendons and muscles holding the head on and up. A huge outside force then pushes into the hole in the neck blowing out the other side of the neck, cutting more muscles and tendons. The weakened head lolls about and is then decapitated by the fast
wind force. The head smashes to the surface in a dense heap. The lifeless body and tail fall to the surface coming apart as they fall laying a large destruction pattern.

A less brutal anthropomorphic analogy is an egg which is strong until creased with a spoon, then weak. Or a soda can strong until tab pops can, then weak. Or a balloon is strong until pricked. Comet jet airliners were strong until metal fatigue around a large window tore away. Boeing 747s are strong until door opens, gets torn out, up and away taking skin, stringers with it and bending and fracturing floor beams. Then all those wonderfully designed strong objects are weak, and fail.

That's how the nose of a Boeing 747 comes off when the forward cargo door opens inadvertently in flight. (AI 182, PA 103, and TWA 800.)

Above is how they are put together and how they come apart, at the seams. Note forward cargo door open.

The Amateur Scientist was a series that ran in the Scientific American for years. It showed that a layman with ordinary tools could simulate and create the same results as expensive experiments. I have done this Boeing 747 at 300 knots and door opens experiment with a four window American sedan at 70 knots on long stretch of highway. At 70 knots, (75 mph) in smooth air with all windows up, no unwanted air enters the car/passenger cabin. Air entering via the air conditioning is equal by air venting outside. The passengers inside the car feel no wind and no pressure difference. As soon as the right front window is 'cracked' by lowering it using the electric switch, air enters the cabin and pressure difference is felt as air is pressed inside car. Even though the window is flush with outside of car and the air
flow is parallel, the fast air enters cabin at high speed about twelve inches after the forward part of the window. The right front passenger is buffeted by air. The air is completely felt by passenger in right rear seat. The windstream continues to be felt to a lesser degree in entire rear seating area of six passenger, two bench seat sedan. If the right rear window is lowered to create a large hole on the right side of the car, two widows wide, the buffeting in right forward seating area is reduced but the full force of the windstream is now felt in entire rear seating area. The buffeting continues as long as car is at speed. The rear windows did not pop out, the frame was not bent, the floor beams were not fractured, and the car did not split in two. The windows are not structural members of the body of the car. The wind was not 300 knots. The window did not open suddenly. The inside pressure was not different from the outside. The window was designed to be opened during movement of the car.

A Boeing 747 has a large nine foot by eight foot door that is an important structural member of the forward fuselage which is already weak by design of changing a military front loading cargo plane into a civilian cargo side loading plane. The door tears much more skin, stringers, and frame with it when it gets torn away exposing a huge hole of nine feet by 15 or more feet to the outside fast moving air. The hole appears suddenly allowing no stretching. The hole is not designed to be there when the aircraft is moving; only at zero airspeed is it supposed to open. Structural floor beams are bent and fractured by the explosive decompression as nature attempts to equalize the outside low pressure. 300 knots is twice the highest speed of wind on earth and ten times the force. When that strong force meets the weakened defense, destruction occurs.

My conclusion based upon this amateur research is that fast moving parallel air passing a large hole in the side of a body will enter that hole and press against the opposite side of the body.
Assuming a very high airspeed of 300 knots and a damaged and extensively weakened nose it is reasonable to conclude that the entire aircraft aft of the cargo door hole will be torn away from the nose when the slipstream ruptures the opposite fuselage side, presses onto the front, and the severely structurally compromised and aerodynamically unstable aircraft crumples and disintegrates by the force of the 300 knot wind.

Reference: Pressure differential at different altitudes for Boeing 747
10000--4.588 psid
15000--6.405 psid
20000--7.943 psid
22000--8.493 psid
23000--8.753 psid
25000--8.9 psid
All altitudes above 25000 maintain 8.9 psid while the cabin altitude climbs to 7600 ft

Comment: The chasm of disbelief is 'how can a door opening hole have such severe consequences?' 27 Mar 97 14 Aug 97

Sequence of Destruction for TWA Flight 800
Friction, not Fiction.
John Barry Smith
11 Jan 98

Hot humid air in forward cargo compartment was subjected to cold conditioned air after takeoff on hot summer evening near New York on July 17, 1996. Condensation was precipitated out and formed on cold metal fuselage skin. Poly-X wire bundle which held cargo door motor on power was chafed by the friction of continuous vibration against clamp or many door openings and closings on it. Sheath around bundle was worn through to insulation and then worn through to bare wire. Condensed water
met the bare wire and shorted against fuselage metal charring wires and powering on door motor which attempted to turn all ten cam sectors to unlocked position. At 13700 feet MSL and 300 KCAS, the eight lower cam sectors were prevented from unlocking because of strengthened locking sectors. However, the two midspan latches have no locking sectors. The slack in bellcranks, torque tubes, and high time worn cam latches allowed the aft midspan latch to rotate just past center allowing the 3.5 PSI internal pressure to rupture outward the forward cargo door at the aft midspan latch.

The nine foot by eight foot squarish door burst open at midspan latch sending the latch and door material spinning away in the setting sun which reflected upon the shiny metal as it spun away erratically and appeared as red-orange streak to ground observers moving all which ways. The aft door frame was clean of attachment to door and bulged outward. Fuselage skin was torn vertically. The door fractured and shattered. The bottom eight latches held tight to the bottom eight latch pins on bottom sill while bottom external skin of door blew away. The top piece of red topped cargo door opened out and up smashing into the white fuselage skin above it leaving the red paint of the door on the white paint between passenger windows above. The red paint of the trim was rubbed away showing the white paint underneath. The top piece of the door took the hinge with it and fuselage skin as it is tore away. The loose red painted trim piece and top of door flew directly aft and impacted the right horizontal stabilizer leaving a red paint transfer mark on it. The hinge still appears to be working normally likely having overtravel impression marks on the opposite hinge when door overextended to slam on fuselage above. The top piece of the door shows inward damage when it hit fuselage above.
The explosive decompression of the thirty eight thousand pounds of internal force on the door blew out a large hole about twenty feet wide and forty feet high on the right side of the nose forward of the wing. Parts of the cargo hold structure were the first parts to leave the aircraft. The now uncompressed air molecules rushed out of the huge hole equalizing high pressure inside to low pressure outside while making a very loud noise. Fuselage skin was peeled outward at various places on the right side of the nose. The sudden rushing air was recorded on the Cockpit Voice Recorder as a sudden loud sound. The explosive decompression of the forward cargo hold severely disrupted the nearby main equipment compartment which housed power cables and abruptly shut off power to the Flight Data Recorder.

At least nine passenger's bodies were never found, only bone fragments. The number three engine also ingested metal in baggage and started on fire from inefficient burning of fuel. The number three engine with pylon started to vibrate and a stator blade from the engine was spit out and impacted directly behind it in the right horizontal stabilizer.

The floor beams above the cargo hold were bent downward, fractured and broken from the sudden decompression. The main structural members of door and frame were gone and compromised. The flight attitude of the aircraft was askew to the left from reaction of explosive decompression to the right. Air rushed into the hole and weakened other skin and frame peeling skin outward. The 300 knots of air pressed upon the weakened nose and crumpled it into the large hole. The nose tore off and landed in a dense debris heap apart from the rest of the plane.

The port side forward of the wing was smooth and unshattered while the starboard side forward of the wing was shattered, torn,
and frayed at ruptured cargo door area and severely disturbed over twenty feet by forty foot explosive decompression zone. Outward petal shaped fuselage skin appeared at aft midspan latch from rupture. Aft midspan latch was blown away. Outward peeled skin appeared from blowout. Fuselage skin remained smooth next to blown out skin.

The rest of the plane without the nose suddenly decelerated from 300 knots and caused whiplash injuries to passengers. Passengers inside fuselage had baro-trauma to eardrums which ruptured trying to equalize middle ear pressure. The plane maneuvered with huge gaping wound in front increasing drag. The wind force disintegrated the fuselage and wings. Fuel poured out of ruptured tanks as wreckage fell. The broken fuselage, the ruptured wings, the fuel cloud, the center tank, and the spinning, on fire engine number three met at 7500 feet and exploded into a bright loud fireball putting singe marks on the fuselage skin while leaving earlier departed nose burn and singe mark free. The center tank exploded as well as other nearby fuel tanks. Forward passengers were not burned because they were in the earlier separated nose. The debris fell and spread out from 7500 feet to sea level in windblown southeast direction, leaving a wide debris field.

Ground observers heard the fireball explosion of the center tank and other fuel and looked up. They saw fire and smoke and falling debris.

Explosive decompression at the forward cargo hold led to suspicion of bomb in cargo compartment but bomb later ruled out. Debris ejected to the right from explosive decompression led to suspicion of missile exploding on left side of nose. Streak of shiny metal object spinning away reflecting evening sun to ground observers led to suspicion of missile exhaust but later
ruled out.

Fire/explosion of center tank into fireball led to suspicion of center tank explosion as initial event. There were difficulties in determining ignition source, fuel volatility, unheard fuel explosion sound on CVR, unilateral fuselage damage, singe marks, and other evidence needed to corroborate center tank explosion as initial explosion.

Fuselage rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door inflight is initially rejected because bottom eight latches are found latched around locking pins while two midspan latches are unexamined and status unreported.

Questions about center tank explosion as initial event which evidence raises.

1. Sudden loud sound on Cockpit Voice Recorder is described as start of aircraft breakup but not sound of explosion. Sound on CVR does not match other staged Boeing 747 center tank explosion. How can an explosion in the center tank be powerful enough to start the aircraft breakup and blow off nose of Boeing 747 and not be heard on CVR?

Sudden loud sound is sound of explosive decompression which gives a sudden loud sound when forward cargo door ruptures/opens in flight. The TWA 800 sudden loud sound was linked to PA 103 sudden loud sound on CVR which was linked to AI 182 sudden loud sound on CVR which was linked to DC-10 cargo door explosive decompression on CVR. UAL 811 had a cargo door rupture/open in flight and recorded a sudden loud sound on the CVR. The sound is the sudden rushing of air molecules which were compressed now moving fast outward to equalize
with the lower pressure outside air.

2. Center tank explosion would be spherical, not directed, and would either give no damage forward of the wing or about equal damage on both sides of the fuselage of TWA 800. The wreckage reconstruction shows smooth skin with little damage forward of the wing on the port/left side yet severe, shattered, torn, and frayed damage on the starboard/right side of the fuselage in the cargo door area. How can a center tank explosion cause unilateral damage only on starboard side?

Explosive decompression and rupture of forward cargo door area when aft midspan latch ruptures would give shattered, torn and frayed, damage to cargo door area while leaving port/left/opposite side smooth and light damage. Cargo door rupture would give the unilateral damage on starboard side as shown by TWA 800 wreckage.

3. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction shows outward peeled skin, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers. Water impact damage would be inward, not outward. How could water impact damage produce outward peeled skin, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers?

Explosive decompression in nose of TWA 800 would give outward peeled skin in nose, outward rupture hole, and paint transfers as internal high pressure rushes outward to equalize with the low outside pressure.

4. TWA 800 wreckage reconstruction shows red paints smears only above the forward cargo door area and nowhere else on both side of the Boeing 747 fuselage. This indicates that the red painted door below ruptured/opened outward, slammed upward,
and smashed into the white painted area above and transferred red paint from door onto white paint between windows. How did red paint smears get where they are?

After the rupture at aft midspan latch the door fractured and upper piece of the red painted door was pushed outward, rotated on its hinge, slammed upward and smashed into the white painted fuselage skin above, transferring red paint to the white painted area between the passengers windows, as shown by the TWA 800 reconstruction. UAL 811 also had paint transfer from door to fuselage when its door opened in flight.

5. A center tank explosion would be far enough away from power cables to allow the Flight Data Recorder to record longer than the abrupt power cut it suffered. How can a center tank explosion which is not loud enough to be heard on the CVR and some distance away be strong enough to abruptly cease power to the FDR?

The explosive decompression in the cargo compartment would severely disrupt the cargo hold floor and the adjacent main equipment compartment in which the FDR and power cables are located. The severe disruption would abruptly cease power to the FDR. UAL 811 also had abrupt power cut when its cargo door opened in flight.

6. How could forward cargo door rupture/open when bottom eight latches are latched and locked in TWA reconstruction?

The forward cargo door of Boeing 747s is about nine feet by eight feet square. It has a hinge on the top and eight cam latches on the bottom. On each nine foot side is one midspan latch. The bottom eight cam latches go around eight latching pins. Over
each cam latch is a locking sector. The two midspan latches have no locking sectors. The forward cargo door could rupture at the midspan latch and the hinge and bottom eight latches could still be attached to fuselage skin. The top of the door with hinge attached would tear off with the fuselage skin and spin away. The bottom eight latches could stay attached to bottom sill and continue down to the sea with the nose. The middle of the large door can still be ruptured/opened while the lower part stays attached to airframe. Doors can open/rupture with most or all latches latched. TWA 800 reconstruction shows aft mid span latch missing which implies it became unlatched. The aft door frame sill is smooth and not attached to door which implies door opened in that area.

7. How could forward cargo door rupture cause center tank explosion?

When cargo door ruptures in flight a huge hole is created in nose which the 300 knot slipstream tears off. The falling, noseless, structurally compromised aircraft disintegrated into wings of rupturing fuel tanks, fuselage pieces including center tank, and spinning hot on fire jet engine. When falling debris reached about 7500 feet, the foded on fire engine number three ignited the fuel cloud and center fuel tank into a fireball. Center tank fire/explosion occurred but later and lower than forward cargo door rupture initial event.

Event, consequence, significance, source for destruction sequence:

1. Hot humid air in forward cargo compartment was subjected to cold conditioned air after takeoff on hot summer evening near New York on July 17, 1996.
NTSB exhibits gave takeoff time and temperatures plus the airconditioning system in Boeing 747s.

2. Condensation was precipitated out and formed on cold metal fuselage skin.

Water was available to ground any bare wires to fuselage skin. Observation made of water cascading out of forward cargo hold of Boeing airliner by John Barry Smith standing in concourse at San Francisco Airport on December 6, 1997.

3. Poly-X wire bundle which held cargo door motor on power was chafed by the friction of continuous vibration against clamp or many door openings and closings on it. Sheath around bundle was worn through to insulation and then worn through to bare wire.

Bare wires can be shorted to ground causing power to go to door motor. NTSB exhibits list two forward cargo hold charred wiring fires. NTSB hearing on aging aircraft detailed problems with poly-x wiring chafing from vibration. NTSB AAR 92/02 detailed problems with chafing wires causing door motor to turn on. TWA 800 had poly-x wiring.

4. Condensed water met the bare wire and shorted against fuselage metal charring wires and powering on door motor which attempted to turn all ten cam sectors to unlocked position.

Event explains how door motor got power to turn on. NTSB exhibits list two previous cargo hold charred wire fires. NTSB AAR 92/02 lists two uncommanded cargo door opening on Boeing 747s caused by electrical problems, UAL preflight and
5. At 13700 feet MSL and 300 KCAS, the eight lower cam sectors were prevented from unlocking because of strengthened locking sectors. However, the two midspan latches have no locking sectors.

The eight bottom latches held tight to locking pins because of AD 88-12-04 which strengthened all the eight locking sectors. NTSB AAR 92/02 describes the AD, door, and all latches.

6. The slack in bellcranks, torque tubes, and high time worn cam latches allowed the aft midspan latch to rotate just past center allowing the 3.5 PSI internal pressure to rupture outward the forward cargo door at the aft midspan latch.

UAL 811 had small rupture at aft midspan latch as shown in photograph in NTSB AAR 92/02. NTSB exhibit lists 3.5 PSI pressure differential. TWA 800 was extremely old aircraft with over 93000 flight hours.

7. The nine foot by eight foot squarish door burst open at midspan latch sending the latch and door material spinning away in the setting sun which reflected upon the shiny metal as it spun away erratically and appeared as red-orange streak to ground observers moving all which ways.

Press reports reveal eyewitnesses say different colored streaks going every which way from all directions. Time of 8:31 PM and angle of low sun to aircraft in east and observers to the west had to be perfectly aligned for spinning falling shiny piece of metal to reflect as streak to observers.
8. The aft door frame was clean of attachment to door and bulged outward.

Aft midspan latch blown away at rupture time and caused outward bulge. NTSB reconstruction photograph shows bulge and missing latch.

9. Fuselage skin was torn vertically.

Explosive decompression bursts outward limited by stringers and bulkheads which are vertical and match the other cargo door accident, UAL 811. NTSB photograph shows the vertical tears of TWA 800.

10. The door fractured and shattered.

NTSB photograph shows the damage. 38000 pounds of force were suddenly released onto now weakened door and it burst apart. 99 inches times 110 inches times 3.5 PSI equals 38115 pounds of force on the ten latches and hinge.

11. The bottom eight latches held tight to the bottom eight latch pins on bottom sill while bottom external skin of door blew away.

The bottom of large door held tight while middle of door ruptured in a troublesome section of a high time Boeing 747, Section 41 and Section 42. TWA 800 had not yet had the Section 41 retrofit. NTSB exhibit states bottom eight latches latched.

12. The top piece of red topped cargo door opened out and up smashing into the white fuselage skin above it leaving the red paint of the door on the white paint between passenger windows
above. The red paint of the trim was rubbed away showing the white paint underneath. The top piece of the door took the hinge with it and fuselage skin as it is tore away.

The loose red painted trim piece and top of door flew directly aft and impacted the right horizontal stabilizer leaving a red paint transfer mark on it.

The hinge still appears to be working normally likely having overtravel impression marks on the opposite hinge when door overextended to slam on fuselage above.

The top piece of the door shows inward damage when it hit fuselage above.

Sequence of door opening out and up and transferring paint above is described in text and drawing in NTSB AAR 92/02. Inward movement of top of door is described in AAR 92/02. Normal working hinge attached to top of door is described in AAR 92/02. Overtravel impression damage is described in text and picture in AAR 92/02.

13. The explosive decompression of the thirty eight thousand pounds of internal force on the door blew out a large hole about twenty feet wide and forty feet high on the right side of the nose forward of the wing.

NTSB photograph shows decompression rectangle zone on right side of nose.

14. Parts of the cargo hold structure were the first parts to leave the aircraft.
The first parts of plane to depart indicate trouble started there. NTSB exhibits show first parts to leave were from cargo structure.

15. The now uncompressed air molecules rushed out of the huge hole equalizing high pressure inside to low pressure outside while making a very loud noise.

NTSB AAR 92/02 states crew of UAL 811 heard a 'tremendous explosion,' when door opened in flight.

16. Fuselage skin was peeled outward at various places on the right side of the nose.

Outward peeling indicates force from within, not without. UAL 811 had same outward peeling of fuselage skin in cargo door area.

17. The sudden rushing air was recorded on the Cockpit Voice Recorder as a sudden loud sound.

Sound matches other Boeing 747 sudden loud sound of explosive decompression and a DC-10 cargo door decompression sound according to NTSB chart.

18. The explosive decompression of the forward cargo hold severely disrupted the nearby main equipment compartment which housed power cables and abruptly shut off power to the Flight Data Recorder.

Cables for power and signal run through the forward cargo hold to the adjacent MEC. The cargo floor is severely disrupted when explosive decompression occurs in cargo hold according to
AAIB 2/90 report and will cut off power abruptly.

19. At least nine passenger's bodies were never found, only bone fragments.

Where did those bodies go? What happened to them to reduce them to bone fragments requiring DNA analysis to identify? At least nine bodies always disappear when explosive decompression occurs in high time Boeing 747s according to AAIB, NTSB, TSB and Indian reports.

20. The number three engine also ingested metal in baggage and started on fire from inefficient burning of fuel. The number three engine with pylon started to vibrate and a stator blade from the engine was spit out and impacted directly behind it in the right horizontal stabilizer.

NTSB AAR 92/02 describes the sequence of FOD into number three and also number four and the subsequent vibration and fire.

21. The floor beams above the cargo hold were bent downward, fractured and broken from the sudden decompression. The main structural members of door and frame were gone and compromised.

AAR 92/02, AAIB 2/90, and NTSB TWA 800 exhibits describe the downward movement of the floor beams above cargo compartment.

22. The flight attitude of the aircraft was askew to the left from reaction of explosive decompression to the right. Air rushed into the hole and weakened other skin and frame peeling skin outward.
AAR 92/02 describes the actions of the aircraft after door opened in flight.

23. The 300 knots of air pressed upon the weakened nose and crumpled it into the large hole.

AAIB and TSB/Indian reports describe how nose came off after explosion in forward cargo hold at 300 KCAS of two Boeing 747s.

24. The nose tore off and landed in a dense debris heap apart from the rest of the plane.

AAIB 2/90, TSB/Indian Court, and NTSB TWA 800 exhibits describe the dense nose debris field present when nose comes off in flight of three Boeing 747s.

25. The port side forward of the wing was smooth and unshattered while the starboard side forward of the wing was shattered, torn, and frayed at ruptured cargo door area and severely disturbed over twenty feet by forty foot explosive decompression zone. Outward petal shaped fuselage skin appeared at aft midspan latch from rupture. Aft midspan latch was blown away. Outward peeled skin appeared from blowout. Fuselage skin remained smooth next to blown out skin.

AAIB 2/90, TSB/Indian, and NTSB photographs describe the lesser damage port side nose compared to the more severely damaged starboard side as well as the outward peeled skin on nose of three Boeing 747s.

27. The rest of the plane without the nose suddenly decelerated
from 300 knots and caused whiplash injuries to passengers. Passengers inside fuselage had baro-trauma to eardrums which ruptured trying to equalize middle ear pressure.

Passenger injuries are described in NTSB exhibits, TSB/Indian report, AAIB 2/90, and NTSB exhibits.

28. The plane maneuvered with huge gaping wound in front increasing drag. The wind force disintegrated the fuselage and wings. Fuel poured out of ruptured tanks as wreckage fell. The broken fuselage, the ruptured wings, the fuel cloud, the center tank, and the spinning, on fire engine number three met at 7500 feet and exploded into a bright loud fireball putting singe marks on the fuselage skin while leaving earlier departed nose burn and singe mark free. The center tank exploded as well as other nearby fuel tanks. Forward passengers were not burned because they were in the earlier separated nose. The debris fell and spread out from 7500 feet to sea level in windblown southeast direction, leaving a wide debris field. Ground observers heard the fireball explosion of the center tank and other fuel and looked up. They saw fire and smoke and falling debris.

NTSB exhibits describe the breakup sequence and NTSB video shows fireball seconds later and thousands of feet lower than initial event. Engine number three was on fire for AAIB 2/90 and number four was on fire for NTSB AAR 92/02 after cargo hold ruptures.

29. Explosive decompression at the forward cargo hold led to suspicion of bomb in cargo compartment but bomb later ruled out.

Debris ejected to the right from explosive decompression led to
suspicion of missile exploding on left side of nose.

Streak of shiny metal object spinning away reflecting evening sun to ground observers led to suspicion of missile exhaust but later ruled out.

Fire/explosion of center tank into fireball led to suspicion of center tank explosion as initial event.

Press reports, FBI reports, and NTSB reports describe the bomb, missile and center tank explanations.

30. There were difficulties in determining ignition source, fuel volatility, unheard fuel explosion sound on CVR, unilateral fuselage damage, singe marks, and other evidence needed to corroborate center tank explosion as initial explosion.

NTSB public hearing reveals the gaps in the center tank as initial event explanation.

31. Fuselage rupture at aft midspan latch of forward cargo door in flight is initially rejected because bottom eight latches are found latched around locking pins while two midspan latches are unexamined and status unreported.

From: TrnPnt@aol.com
Date: February 13, 1998 2:04:19 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: Re: Chafed wire/latch rupture/explosive decompression

Thanks for the information and for being so patient with me. I appreciate it.
I'm going to take a visit of your web site. If I have any questions, which I'm sure I will, I'll drop you an e-mail. Hope you don't mind.

Steve

P.S. RA-5C....weren't those used for reconnaissance missions? Are you one of those individuals known today as a "crow?" (i.e., ELINT stuff?)

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 13, 1998 8:15:09 AM PST
To: TrnPnt@aol.com
Subject: Re: Re: Chafed wire/latch rupture/explosive decompression

Thanks for the information and for being so patient with me. I appreciate it.
I'm going to take a visit of your web site. If I have any questions, which I'm sure I will, I'll drop you an e-mail. Hope you don't mind.

Great, I appreciate all the insight I can get.

Steve
P.S. RA-5C...weren't those used for reconnaissance missions? Are you one of those individuals known today as a "crow?" (i.e., ELINT stuff?)

Vigilante, RA-5C, yes, recon, and bombing if necessary.

I was an RAN reconnaissance attack navigator. Yes to all the ELINT stuff, although I'm sure it's much more advanced since I was there in Vietnam. We were the first to do low level infrared recon. Amazing stuff and now they the police do it.

PECM was passive electronic countermeasures. We would troll up and down the coast reading the radar as they fired.

Cheers,

John Barry Smith

---

From: "Palmer, Regina" <regina.palmer@lmco.com>
Date: February 13, 1998 11:25:41 AM PST
To: "'Barry'" <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: RE: Web Site Contents

I was able to read your .jpg file just fine. Do you happen to have pictures of the 1974 crash in .jpg format. We would like to display the pictures as background when we are doing our presentation. Any help you could give us would be appreciated.

Regina Palmer
I am in a class and have been given a case study to analyze on the 1972 DC-10 incident. I wanted to correlate the 1974 accident with my results. When I tried to read some of the pages that you have on your web site they were too blurry to read. Could you send me a soft copy of those pages? If that is not possible, I'll try to find the book that you referenced.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regina Palmer

Ah, the 1972 DC 10 Ontario crash. I used excerpts from that softcover paperback book. The answer is to download them from my site. If they are too blurry there is a problem because they are clear on other computers. It also disturbs me that the scanned images are not clear for you. I would
like to know why. What is the resolution of your monitor? I use 1280 by 1064. If all else fails I can send copies of the paper pages on the 1972 crash. A cargo door popped before that cargo door, on the ground during test. That is also interesting. There were three cargo door pops on the DC 10.

What is your class?

I'll attach a DC 10 page to this email, can you view pictures that come across as.jpg?

Regards,

Barry Smith

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 13, 1998 4:22:06 PM PST
To: "Palmer, Regina" <regina.palmer@lmco.com>
Subject: pictures

I was able to read your .jpg file just fine. Do you happen to have pictures of the 1974 crash in .jpg format.

Got to web site, click on pages about DC-10 until you find the pictures you want. Click on picture and download it to your hard drive. Then view pictures. They already are in .jpg.

A lot better management story than DC-10 doors is Boeing 747 doors, tell your instructor that.

Regards,
John Barry Smith

We would like to display the pictures as background when we are doing our presentation. Any help you could give us would be appreciated.

Regina Palmer

--------
From: John Barry Smith
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 1998 08:49 AM
To: Palmer, Regina
Subject: Re: Web Site Contents

I am in a class and have been given a case study to analyze on the 1972 DC-10 incident. I wanted to correlate the 1974 accident with my results. When I tried to read some of the pages that you have on your web site they were too blury to read. Could you send me a soft copy of those pages? If that is not possible, I'll try to find the book that you referenced.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regina Palmer

Ah, the 1972 DC 10 Ontario crash. I used excerpts from that softcover paperback book. The answer is to download them from my site. If they are too blury there is a problem because they are clear on other computers. It also disturbs me that the scanned images are not clear for you. I would like to know why. What is the resolution of your monitor? I use 1280 by
1064. If all else fails I can send copies of the paper pages on the 1972 crash. A cargo door popped before that cargo door, on the ground during test. That is also interesting. There were three cargo door pops on the DC 10.

What is your class?

I'll attach a DC 10 page to this email, can you view pictures that come across as.jpg?

Regards,

Barry Smith

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/

From: BMROTHRING@aol.com
Date: February 14, 1998 12:32:20 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Research on "Pan Am Flight 103"
When looking for research on the historic crash of Pan Am Flight 103 we happen to come across your name quite often. I was wondering if it was at all possible to be sent some or any information regarding the incident, more specifically those who were involved. Your help is greatly appreciated.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 14, 1998 4:40:43 PM PST
To: BMROTHRING@aol.com
Subject: Re: Research on "Pan Am Flight 103"

There's lots and lots, too much to be sent by email, on my web site at www.corazon.com

The 103 section has entire AAIB report and my analysis of why not bomb and why it was cargo door.

Tom Thurman was FBI guy who said he found tiny piece of plastic.

AAIB report has other names.
Sean Connery is doing a movie about 103, he plays an inspector.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

When looking for research on the historic crash of Pan Am Flight 103 we happen to come across your name quite often. I was wondering if it was at all possible to be sent some or any information regarding the incident, more specifically those who were involved. Your help is greatly appreciated.
Subject: NTSB Info

Dear Sir,

I was wondering if you knew of a way to obtain color photographs from the NTSB of aviation accidents. I've obtained several reports, but the photos are in black & white and are often unusable for analysis purposes.

Any information you could provide would be helpful.

Thank You,

Roger Lang

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>  
Date: February 15, 1998 12:29:12 PM PST  
To: F15Bound@aol.com  
Subject: Re: NTSB Info

Good question. NTSB reports that I have use Black and white. AAIB British have color.

I've obtained several reports, but the photos are in black & white and are often unusable for analysis purposes.

So true, it's disgraceful. The Indian reports are the same way, unusable.
TWA 800 from NTSB has a CD Rom of TWA 800 that has hundreds of color photos, again, not too clear. CD Rom available from their NTSB from their web site.

Archive photos from newspapers sometimes help.

Good luck,
John Barry Smith

Dear Sir,

I was wondering if you knew of a way to obtain color photographs from the NTSB of aviation accidents. I've obtained several reports, but the photos are in black & white and are often unusable for analysis purposes.

Any information you could provide would be helpful.

Thank You,

Roger Lang

From: F15Bound@aol.com
Date: February 15, 1998 12:31:47 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: NTSB Info
Thanks for replying so quickly to my inquiry. I just recently graduated from college and am interested in the A/C accident investigations business, that's why I was asking.

I'll give those idea's a try, thanks.

Enjoyed your report on the web also, makes you stop and think about this whole thing in perspective.

Thanks again

From: Mitch0520@aol.com
Date: February 16, 1998 5:43:26 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Jet speed at takeoff

Do you know the speed of a commercial jet at takeoff? Could you tell me how you found it? Thank you.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 16, 1998 8:56:47 AM PST
To: Mitch0520@aol.com
Subject: Re: Jet speed at takeoff

Do you know the speed of a commercial jet at takeoff? Could you tell me how
you found it? Thank you.

Don't know about commercial jets, they are all different too.

My military jet too off at 135 Knots.

There's different speeds, there is a rotation speed which brings the nose up, there is rejection speed if not reached the flight is aborted, and airborne speed, then gear up speed, then flap up speed, the cruise climb speed, then cruise speed, then descent speed, then landing speed.

I would guess a 747 takes off at 150 knots indicated air speed.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

---

From: Mitch0520@aol.com
Date: February 16, 1998 12:19:32 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: Jet speed at takeoff

Don't want to be a pain, but what is 150 knots converted to mph? Thanks

---

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 16, 1998 1:33:40 PM PST
To: Mitch0520@aol.com
Subject: Re: Jet speed at takeoff

Don't want to be a pain, but what is 150 knots converted to
mph?  Thanks

No problem, about 168 mph.

5280 feet is a statute mile and 6000 feet is a nautical mile. Nautical is 12% higher than statute.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: Mike Cairo <73001.2651@compuserve.com>
Date: February 20, 1998 7:34:00 AM PST
To: "barry@corazon.com" <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Recent Air China Crash

Where can I find information such as Flight Number, Date, Possible cause?
Any help would be appreciated.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 20, 1998 9:40:17 AM PST
To: Mike Cairo <73001.2651@compuserve.com>
Subject: Re: Recent Air China Crash

Where can I find information such as Flight Number, Date, Possible cause?
Any help would be appreciated.

Search engines will lead you there.

http://web.inter.NL.net/users/H.Ranter/98-06.htm is a good site.
location: Taibei (Taiwan)
Nature: Scheduled Passenger
phase: Final Approach flight Denpasar-Ngurah Rai APT - Taibei-Chang Kai Shek IAP Flightnr.: CI676 The Airbus approached Taibei Chiang Kai Shek Airport in light rain and fog when the pilot reported he wanted to go around and try another approach. Moments later the aircraft struck buildings in a residential area and crashed in flames. Source: JP Airline Fleets; Bill Harms; Hans Wilbrink; ARFF HOT NEWS

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: D <ebox@rocketmail.com>
Date: February 20, 1998 5:29:51 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Hi!

Hi john!

I was surfing the net for some info about United airlines flight 826
that was struck by severe turbulence. Me and my girlfriend was on that flight, we are from Sweden and we where going to Hawaii for vacation and we had to switch planes in Tokyo.

And in one of the links i got from my search sent me to one of your Boeing pages. It look´s like you know a lot about these thing´s.

I just wonder if you have heard some resent news about this accident?

Sencerely
Leo from Sweden.

mailto:ebox@rocketmail.com

____________________________________________________

DO YOU YAHOO!? Get your free @yahoo.com address at http://mail.yahoo.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 21, 1998 9:58:41 AM PST
To: inscom@usa.net
Subject: Re: pam am 103

Thanks for taking the time to straighten me out.
Cheers,
John Barry Smith

Pam Am 103 caused by cargo doors?
false.
Lt. Col. Lester Coleman (USA ret.) is completely correct.
See Operation Goldenrod/ capture of Fawaz Younes, US News-world report
KGB-Syrian elements compromised goldenrod which was run by
Revell-FBI,
Hurley-DEA, Ames & Cannistraro-CIA . Same personnel
involved in pam am
103 investigation.
It was a bomb, sir.
NMCA/MC10/INSCOM

Get free e-mail and a permanent address at http://
www.netaddress.com

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 21, 1998 11:05:19 AM PST
To: D <ebox@rocketmail.com>
Subject: UAL 826

Hi, the below is the best I have.
Cheers,

John Barry Smith

NTSB Identification: DCA98MA015 Scheduled 14 CFR 121 operation of UNITED AIRLINES, INC. (D.B.A. UNITED AIRLINES, INC) Accident occurred DEC-28-97 at PACIFIC OCEAN, P0Aircraft: Boeing 747-122, registration: N4723 Injuries: 1 Fatal, 17 Minor, 378 Uninjured. On December 28, 1997, at 2310 Japanese Standard Time (1410 UTC), a United Airlines Boeing 747-122, N4723U, experienced an episode of severe turbulence about 950 miles east southeast of New Tokyo International Airport, Narita, Japan. The airplane was in VFR conditions at the time of the accident and was bound for Honolulu, Hawaii. 374 passengers including 5 infants and 19 crewmembers were on board. Twelve passengers and one flight attendant received serious injuries and one passenger was a fatality. An unknown number of minor injuries were sustained by flight attendants and passengers. Following the turbulence, the airplane returned to New Tokyo Airport for an uneventful landing. The flight was operating under
Hi John!

I was surfing the net for some info about United Airlines flight 826 that was struck by severe turbulence. Me and my girlfriend were on that flight, we are from Sweden and we were going to Hawaii for vacation and we had to switch planes in Tokyo.

And in one of the links I got from my search sent me to one of your Boeing pages. It looks like you know a lot about these things.

I just wonder if you have heard some recent news about this accident?

Sincerely
Leo from Sweden.

mailto:ebox@rocketmail.com

DO YOU YAHOO!? 
I noticed I was cc'ed an interesting message originally addressed to you. I wondered what your role in this was. Do you have a listing on the Web?
I noticed I was cc'ed an interesting message originally addressed to you. I wondered what your role in this was. Do you have a listing on the Web?

www.corazon.com website

Cheers,
John Barry Smith
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 26, 1998 1:56:49 PM PST
To: Pepper Kay <PepperKay@aol.com>
Subject: http://www.corazon.com/eject.html

What is an RA 5C... North American Vigilante ... and what is "742 frame"?

http://www.corazon.com/eject.html

has a picture, specifics, and ejection story. 742 frame was a bulkhead behind landing gear that cracked and was very expensive to fix.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: February 27, 1998 9:24:11 AM PST
To: whistle@whistleblowers.org
Subject: For Dr. Whitehurst regarding Tom Thurman

Dear Dr. Whitehurst, I have strong circumstantial evidence that Tom Whitehurst planted the tiny piece of plastic called a piece of timer for a bomb in the Pan Am 103 wreckage evidence. The main reason is that 103 was not a bomb but a mechanical problem. I know the profound implications of that claim and have substantial real evidence and documentation to support it.
It is not a coincidence that the only hard piece of evidence that links to bomb is the one half fingernail piece of plastic 'discovered' months later that just happens to have serial numbers on it and just happens to be found by a person with access to timers, and just happens to be found by person relieved of position in lab years later for evidence mismanagement.

To first suspect Tom Thurman planted the tiny piece you should be persuaded 103 was not a bomb. I can do that but it will take time and a thorough review of AAIB 2/90, the UK report on PA 103. That is available at my web site at www.corazon.com

His probable single act of treachery and self aggrandizement has seriously affected air travel safety around the world by putting emphasis on terrorists and not mechanical causes.

But, let the evidence speak for itself. I'm available for clarification at 408 659 3552 and barry@corazon.com. Call anytime.

Sincerely,

John Barry Smith

From: Pepper Kay <PepperKay@aol.com>
Date: February 27, 1998 10:20:01 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: was ... RA-5C

In a message dated 98-02-26 16:55:43 EST, you write:
has a picture, specifics, and ejection story. 742 frame was a bulkhead behind landing gear that cracked and was very expensive to fix.

Hi John:

Thanks for your prompt response ... re my question and your answer, I thought so ... and I thought so ...

Think I was just checking to make sure my gray matter was still functioning ...

As an aside, 2 years ago, a good friend from VFA-22, took me on a top-to-bottom tour of the USS Lincoln, when it made a port call in San Diego ...

standing at the rear of the flight deck, I remember myself thinking; "geez, there's lots of room here" ... later on, looking down on the deck from the bridge, I was amazed at how small the deck looked, and thought; "geez, there's no way I'd even try this" ... my hat's off to you and all Naval aviators ...

You might remember the Lincoln ... the 1st female F-14 pilot was killed trying to trap one gray day ... the RIO survived, but she didn't ... I did see a successful ejection of both flight crew from an F-14 (at NAS
Miramar), in circumstances very much as you describe ...

After reading (and re-reading) your pages last night, I'm thinking you very well may be correct in your assessment of TWA 800 ... whatever happened, I would like to get a definitive answer to the cause of her crash and see where that takes us all ...

Thanks again,

Pepper

From: inscom@usa.net
Date: February 28, 1998 4:49:56 AM PST
To: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: Re: pam am 103

iole
esso
brega
sirte
auc
bartlett
fuisz
??
Hi, I am writing a paper for a graduate level investigations class. The information you have on Flight 103 is extensive, but blurred. Do you have a copy of this information I could obtain? If not, where did you obtain the information and I will ask the source that provided you with the information.

Thank You. Rich

Hi Barry.
I came across your web site about the 747 crashes and found it quite
interesting. Are you under the opinion that the TWA 800 and PanAm 103 crashes were due to the same causes? I assume that you believe that the forward front cargo door caused the crashes in the TWA and Pan Am based on the UAL 811 flight out of Honolulu. It is quite possible. May I ask if your background is in aviation and whether in maintenance, engineering etc. Thanks and have a good day.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: March 12, 1998 10:34:47 AM PST
To: Miknat1 <Miknat1@aol.com>
Subject: Re: B-747

Hi Barry.
I came across your web site about the 747 crashes and found it quite interesting. Are you under the opinion that the TWA 800 and PanAm 103 crashes were due to the same causes?

Yes.

I assume that you believe that the forward front cargo door caused the crashes in the TWA and Pan Am based on the UAL 811 flight out of Honolulu.
Yes

It is quite possible. May I ask if your background is in aviation and whether in maintenance, engineering etc. Thanks and have a good day.

Pilot, crewman, technician, owner, and survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet plane crash.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: Miknat1 <Miknat1@aol.com>
Date: March 17, 1998 11:28:38 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re B-747

Hi Barry:
Thanks for your answer about your web-site concerning the 747 crashes. I think that all the B-747 crashes (series 100) have a striking similarity but I still have a few questions.

I thought the Air India Flt 182 went down in deep water in the Irish Sea and not much if anything was salvaged from it. Also it was my understanding this aircraft was not a high time one. Maybe 20,000 hrs as opposed to 60,000 to 100,000 hrs for the other 747's that experience problems.
In addition I also was under the impression that the Pan Am 103 was supposed to have been a bomb on the LH side of the aircraft opposite to that of the cargo door which is on the RH side.

No matter what, I don't think it was a missile of friend or foe. I do not know what angle the missile theory people have. Anyhow I am glad you survived your bad plane experience and thanks again. Regards:

Subj: Re: B-747
Date: 98-03-12 13:33:21 EST
From: barry@corazon.com (John Barry Smith)
To: Miknat1@aol.com (Miknat1)

Hi Barry.
I came across your web site about the 747 crashes and found it quite interesting. Are you under the opinion that the TWA 800 and PanAm 103 crashes were due to the same causes?

Yes.

I assume that you believe that the forward front cargo door caused the crashes in the TWA and Pan Am based on the UAL 811 flight out of Honolulu.
Yes

It is quite possible. May I ask if your background is in aviation and whether in maintenance, engineering etc.
Thanks
and have a good day.

Pilot, crewman, technician, owner, and survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet plane crash.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

---

From: Frogfly23 <Frogfly23@aol.com>
Date: March 25, 1998 4:23:21 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: hey can you help me

I am a ninth grade student here in massachusetts and i have been asked to due a project on terrorism and Libya.i saw your webpage and was wondering if you could answer a couple questins: i was wondering if you could give me a breaf paragraph on what happened with Pan-am flight 103 . I know that the Libans bombed our plane but i was wondering why they bombed our plane and what we did after . Also i was
wondering if the U.N. is doing anything about these conflicts. I would be very greatful if you could answer these questions sincerely, frogfly23

From: "Doug Tracy" <duke-d-fresh@email.msn.com>
Date: March 26, 1998 12:45:04 AM PST
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Qualifications

Dear Sir,

I'm writing in regards to your qualifications held in the fields of aviation and accident investigation. I'm very interested in your theories concerning TWA 800 and would like to use some of your thoughts for a technical paper I'm writing for a class at Metropolitan State College of Denver. My paper is titled "Accidents Resulting from Erroneous Mandatory Aircraft Inspections."

If you wouldn't mind, please e-mail me back concerning the information requested. I appreciate your time and concern to this matter.

Doug Tracy
Tracyd@mscd.edu
duke-d-fresh@msn.com
Denver, CO
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: March 25, 1998 11:34:19 PM PST
To: "Doug Tracy" <duke-d-fresh@email.msn.com>
Subject: Re: Qualifications

Dear Sir,

I'm writing in regards to your qualifications held in the fields of aviation and accident investigation.

Accident investigation: None formal. Navy squadron safety officer.
Accident experience: survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet plane crash.
Aviation qualifications: Commercial pilot, instrument rated, Part 135 certificate holder, Navy aircrewman, navigator, aircraft owner.
Aircraft accident conclusions: Facts, data, evidence speak for themselves.

I'm very interested in your theories concerning TWA 800 and would like to use some of you thoughts for a technical paper I'm writing for a class at Metropolitan State College of Denver. My paper is titled "Accidents Resulting from Erroneous Mandatory Aircraft Inspections."
Here's a good one I just learned about. Wiring inspections cause more trouble than they are worth. That's from an FAA inspector in testimony at Baltimore public hearings into TWA 800.

Another, my Mooney had to have mandatory corrosion inspection which required taking about passenger cabin. Putting it back together caused more problems than it was worth.

Erroneous is a funny adjective, what was in error, the mandatory part or the inspection part.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: "Doug Tracy" <duke-d-fresh@email.msn.com>
Date: March 26, 1998 9:26:20 AM PST
To: "John Barry Smith" <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Re: Qualifications

Dear Mr. Smith,

Thank you for your prompt reply. It will help in muy reserach for my paper and presentation. If you would like, I can share information with you at a later date when I compile paper. Thanks Again

Doug Tracy
-----Original Message-----
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Dear Sir,

I'm writing in regards to your qualifications held in the fields of aviation and accident investigation.

Accident investigation: None formal. Navy squadron safety officer.
Accident experience: survivor of sudden night fiery fatal jet plane crash.
Aviation qualifications: Commercial pilot, instrument rated, Part 135 certificate holder, Navy aircrewman, navigator, aircraft owner.
Aircraft accident conclusions: Facts, data, evidence speak for themselves.

I'm very interested in your theories concerning TWA 800 and would like to use some of your thoughts for a technical paper I'm writing for a class at Metropolitan State College of Denver. My paper is titled "Accidents Resulting from Erroneous Mandatory Aircraft Inspections."

Here's a good one I just learned about. Wiring inspections cause more
trouble than they are worth. That's from an FAA inspector in testimony at Baltimore public hearings into TWA 800.

Another, my Mooney had to have mandatory corrosion inspection which required taking about passenger cabin. Putting it back together caused more problems than it was worth.

Erroneous is a funny adjective, what was in error, the mandatory part or the inspection part.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

barry@corazon.com
http://www.corazon.com/
From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: March 26, 1998 10:36:55 AM PST
To: "Doug Tracy" <duke-d-fresh@email.msn.com>
Subject: Finished paper

If you would like, I can share information with you at a later date when I compile paper. Thanks Again

Sure. Thanks
Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: Steve Isbill <isbills@db.erau.edu>
Date: March 31, 1998 4:34:41 PM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Voice Recorder

I have been looking into aviation crashes out of interest and was wondering if you knew of a web sight which contains sound clips from the voice recorder

From: "László Viktor" <lici@mail.matav.hu>
Date: April 5, 1998 6:58:51 AM PDT
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: Requesting photoes!

<html><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-/W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>
Dear Barry,

I visited your home page, and it was very interesting. If you can send me photos about 747s for private use, I would be happy. Thank you!

Viktor Laszlo
e-mail: lici@mail.matav.hu

---

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: April 5, 1998 7:34:39 AM PDT
To: "László Viktor" <lici@mail.matav.hu>
Subject: Re: Requesting photos!

Dear Barry, I visited your home page, and it was very interesting. If you can send me photos about 747s for private use, I would be happy. Thank you! Viktor Laszlo e-mail:
You can download the photos from my site, or go to Boeing site. Or put Boeing 747 pictures into Lycos search engine and get lots of pictures. Good luck. Rick

From: "Neal Goldner" <neal2800@prodigy.net>
Date: April 9, 1998 7:51:56 PM PDT
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: The 747

<html>
<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<html>
<head>
<meta content=text/html;charset=iso-8859-1 http-equiv=Content-Type>
<meta content=""MSHTML 4.72.2106.6"
name=GENERATOR>
</head>
<body bgcolor=#ffffff>
<div><font color=#000000 size=2>Flying on a 747 is safer than taking the garbage to the curb.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;Boeing is the top exporter in America and the best company in the world.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;The 747 is a design miracle and has saved many thousands perhaps millions of lives.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;There is no problem with the forward cargo door on this plane.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;The only problem is the false hypotheses and fact twisting used to support your
From: Jake Goodman <Jgoodma@shs.edu>
Date: April 2, 1998 9:09:01 AM PST
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Sehome High School Student: Jessica Snow

I am doing a project for my Marketing class. I have chosen to do an International project on Boeing Company. I have received some information in the mail from Boeing like magazines and brochures, etc. I have questions that I really need to find out about. I am having a hard time looking them up on the Internet. Could you please help me?

The questions are:

1. In what countries does your firm do business?
2. What percentage of its business is conducted abroad?
3. What kind of economic system exists in your firm's home country?
4. Can you think of any ways in which your firm is regulated by the home government?
5. Does your firm have any trademarks or patents? If so, list and describe them.

If you could please help me, I would really appreciate it.

If you find any information, could you please send it to:
Jessica Snow  
1233 West Racine St.  
Bellingham, Wa. 98226  

Or  

snowjay@earthlink.com  

I would really appreciate it. Thank you for your time and hope to hear from you.  

Sehome High School Student,  
Marketing class,  

Jessica Snow.  

---  

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>  
Date: April 10, 1998 9:36:36 AM PDT  
To: snowjay@earthlink.com  
Subject: Re: Sehome High School Student: Jessica Snow  

Dear Miss Snow, 10 Apr 98  

Could you please help me?  
The questions are:  

1. In what countries does your firm do business?
I'm an amateur sleuth working on my own in my home using the net for research and communication around the world, but no business.

2. What percentage of its business is conducted abroad?
No business but communicate abroad about 20%.

3. What kind of economic system exists in your firm's home country?

Now that's a good question.

4. Can you think of any ways in which your firm is regulated by the home government?

Not much but they would like to try.

5. Does your firm have any trademarks or patents? If so, list and describe them.

My web site name www.corazon.com and all material on my website, especially the intellectual discovery/property that wiring is causing cargo doors open in early model Boeing 747s.

snowjay@earthlink.com

Why use Jake Goodman address and not the above?

Cheers,
John Barry Smith
Hi Barry: I presume you are John Barry Smith from digging around a small bit into your website. Periodically - every few weeks - I check on Pan Am 103 entries for anything new - and also check into TWA 800 since I have written extensively on both incidents from before Pan Am 103 - because I was involved before it happened! On your analysis of 747 incidents, you did an immense amount of good work and undoubtedly spent hours - days - weeks and even years of work and background experiences to come up with your writings and good exposition of the incidents. But I must disagree with your analysis most vigorously! I do not have the time to go into it all but will quickly write my basic contention - "off the cuff" uncorrected due to the press of time. In both the mentioned incidents - from the reports - there was a fraction of a second where a problem was likely recorded on the "black"
orange boxes
before cutoff. It a door had come off for any reason and caused the
disintegration of the plane, there would have been an appreciable period
of time to have recorded not only crew reaction but flight data information. None was available in either case which meant that some
form of catastrophic explosion severed communications in virtually nano
seconds. If the door and or mounting failed, there would have been an
"instant" decompression with attendant recordings showing progressive
destruction. This did not happen.
I did not fly the 747 but retired flying the DC-8-63 getting 747 pay
since I had less than a year to tran - fly it and retire. However I know
not one of my collegues still flying it or any of my "generation" who
flew it believe the explosion - and it was an explosion of the center
fuel tank - in the case of TWA 800 was caused by electrical or mechanical abnormality. Even the active 747 captain running and owning
an ISP told me as an aside to my Christmas greeting last year that he
had been ordered not to talk about it and he flies for TWA!
You write some pretty good stories - and seem to have the ability to put
words together in and interesting and exciting way. It seems you have
ither a vivid imagination with a keen sense of observation - or a world
of experience to write as you do! Congratulations!
Do you own the fast 4 seater Mooney with 3 wheels? If so, how about a
ride! Your fast 2 seater with 3 wheels - the Navy big boys' playtoy is a
great picture but far too big. One cannot appreciate the feeling when it
has to be scrolled to see it. Besides it takes too long to download all
that blue sky and light tan tarmac as well as landscapoe before and
behind!
I like your long download index which is easy to use and comprehensivie.
What is your thing? Where do you live etc?
I have my own "biased" reporting on both the Pan Am 103 and TWA 800 on
my website at http://www.flinet.com/~tiojuan where I defend Liberty -
Justice - Equality for all and also delve into other less political issues. I have some good aircraft pictures on my website integrated here
and there including some of the RAF when I was flying for it.
Gotta go and write about the extension of PBIA runway 2000 feet eastward
being fought by the local authorities. I am for it! But I'm an educated
rebel!
I also have to write on Cuba, N. Ireland, Iraq, Iran and Israeli atrocities today. Must speak to Maureen Dowd on ethics and Anthony Lewis
on peace! Then I must dig out my buried golf clubs to take to Vermont in
a month. Also have to seek why I have a wet corner of the living room
carpet! Shower pan leak? Gorsh! So you see an "old codger" like me has
nothing to do! No time at moment for memories put down for my book. Too
much I owe to assisting peace and truth!
Gotta go. Bye for now. What you think? Sincerely, John W.
Willmott at
0927

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: April 15, 1998 9:17:03 AM PDT
To: tiojuan@flinet.com
Subject: Re: Website and Pan Am 03

John W. Willmott, 224 Pershing, WPB, FL 33401   April 15, 1998

Dear John, your polite reply with your name and reference to facts prompts me to immediately reply.

- and also check into TWA 800 since I have written extensively on both incidents from before Pan Am 103 - because I was involved before it happened!

But I must disagree with your analysis most vigorously!
Great.

I do not have the time to go into it all

Ah, OK, no time.

there was a fraction of a second where a problem was likely recorded on the "black" orange boxes before cutoff.

That is the sudden loud sound on the CVR and is my linchpin of explosive decompression as heard by all four planes, 182, 103, 811, and 800. No sudden loud sound on the CVR and then no wiring/cargo door explanation for that fatal accident.

It a door had come off for any reason and caused the disintegration of the plane, there would have been an appreciable period of time to have recorded not only crew reaction but flight data information.

Absolutely incorrect. Wrong. Not right. Error. You might think so but reality proves you wrong. NTSB also thought that way. They are wrong too.

The proof is UAL 811. Door pop, sudden loud sound, abrupt power cut, no crew reaction on tape, no flight data information on tape, just abrupt power cut immediately after sudden loud sound, just like 182, 103 and 800.
When your gas tank door flaps open in your car you talk about it, when a nine foot by eight foot door ruptures in flight and tears away taking 30 by 40 foot skin with it, and the 300 knots of wind hits the weakened nose and tears it off, there is no talking about it.

You use conjecture to deduce what would happen if door motor shorts on to unlatch position and door ruptures in flight; I use reality of history as shown in NTSB AAR 92/02.

None was available in either case which meant that some form of catastrophic explosion severed communications in virtually nano seconds.

Right, Explosive decompression has the word explosive in there for a reason.

If the door and or mounting failed, there would have been an "instant" decompression with attendant recordings showing progressive destruction.

Wrong.

This did not happen.

And it did not happen with UAL 811 either.
I did not fly the 747 but retired flying the DC-8-63 getting 747 pay since I had less than a year to fly it and retire. However I know not one of my colleagues still flying it or any of my "generation" who flew it believe the explosion - and it was an explosion of the center fuel tank - in the case of TWA 800 was caused by electrical or mechanical abnormality.

Pilots, and I'm a pilot, can not fly airplanes thinking the nose is going to tear off unexpectedly without reason at any time. There has to be a reason and missile exonerates the manufacturer for designing an outward opening non plug door, the airline for possible improper maintenance, and government for poor oversight of bad poly x wiring. Just because wishful thinking says no wiring/door problem does not mean it didn't happen.

Even the active 747 captain running and owning an ISP told me as an aside to my Christmas greeting last year that he had been ordered not to talk about it and he flies for TWA!

Everybody is afraid. Jobs, money, career, family, and reputations are at stake, and of course, life and death. I knew about this cargo door problem years before TWA 800, when it happened I was not surprised and knew immediately what it was and predicted the entire following sequence from bomb to missile to wreckage recovery and what they would find. I didn't make it up, I just followed the sequence that the Indians, the Canadians, the British did for 182, 103 and now 800. It's not our fault is the governing
principle, now to find some evidence to support that.

Do you own the fast 4 seater Mooney with 3 wheels?

I had the M20C for four years, sold it as it needed engine overhaul. The plane then went up in price 20000 dollars.

I just went to your web site. I disagree with your religious and political opinions but love the web and the freedom of speech.

Free press is everything.

Good bye,

Barry Smith

From: "John W. Willmott" <tiojuan@flinet.com>
Date: April 15, 1998 10:13:49 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Reply ref TWA800 et al
Reply-To: tiojuan@flinet.com

Thanks for prompt reply! Also for your defense of free speech! I did not think you would appreciate my views as expressed on my website. Few have the knowledge - the personal experience - the courage or the reason to address the subjects I take seriously on my site and try to make it interesting - fun - attractive and informative with my limited net
experience but a world of experience traveling and being exposed to the inherent dangers in flight. One does not fly - and do it gracefully and well if he/she is always expecting the worst. I have a saying I mostly adhere to: I was not there. I don't sleep with her or him. I know what I think I saw and know. I report the truth as closely as I can with the knowledge I have. I am also wrong many times because I am not a follower sitting back while others take risks and then hanging onto coat tails for rewards I had nothing to do about! I admit to probably being biased on TWA 800 but since there are no other "acceptable" reasons found - and there are many others unexplored or reported on - even yours - that TWA 800 tragedy is a good vehicle to carry my anti terrorist campaign alive. Furthermore after the known and admitted (at one time) coverups or disengenuous statements ref Pan Am 103, is it any wonder that many look for the ulterior motive in 800. And I know many who can and still might blow planes from the sky and do it with virtually complete immunith and credible deniability if and when needed. Some just wait for the time and place. It is unfortunate that this has to be but wen one dances -
he/she must pay the piper - usually!
Then there was the Arrow Air "accident" in Gander which is not
what the
public was told. In addition the coverup of the "accident" in
Pakistan
that killed Zia just adds more to prove that those in Washington in
power doing nasties will do anything to protect their butts - Just
like
George Bush did repeatedly. Those who think Clinton dangerous
should
study Bush.
You see - the Zia - Arrow Air and Pan Am 103 all were lied
about -
covered up and essentially forgotten by most except the victims.
Pan AM
was the first airline I flew for in Miami on the boats and in NY too
into early 41 when I volunteered for the RCAF
Politics became my game because it seemed to be smoke and
mirroris and
not what I saw and knew which was the "truth" from the
beginning. Early
on I believed I must follow my country - right or wrong. Sort of
like a
"good Roman Catholic" blind belief or carry guilt around.
I don't know what you mean about my religious views. I do not
push any
religion although brought up an Episcopalian. I believe in a
founding
something or other and the three letter word God fits easily for
convenience. I respect every man's religion even if it is none -
nada
and nil - along with his/her/its right to believe or not to believe. Few are as broadminded as I am. Look at your family. Mine. Neighbors. and at N. Ireland - Palestine - Israel and the history of the Crusades! What is wrong is that some use religion to take advantage of others rather than get along - even if at arms length. I got into Corozon and found it interesting. Again not time to do it deeply. I did get out a letter this morning as I mentioned then did many other things. I've one ear on Rush and getting ready for lunch before going to paint more pictures! Are you connected with Corozon? Letter follows just for fun! Best wishes, John W. Willmott

Subject: PBIA expansion.
Date: Wed, 15 Apr 1998 11:31:38 -0400
From: "John W. Willmott" <tiojuan@flinet.com>
Organization: The Progressive Liberty Party
To: lrawls@pbdailynews.com
CC: fcohen@pbdilynews.com

John W. Willmott, 224 Pershing Way, WPB, FL 33401
1-561-832-0070 April
15, 1998

Letters to the Editor  
The Palm Beach Daily News

Dear Editor:

The hoopla about extending the runway at PBIA continues with the Shiny Sheet today reporting "PB, WPB on same side in PBIA fight." Essentially, the anti-extensionists seem to say that increased traffic in the air and on the ground will "lower their quality of life." And it seems the anti group are those with the most money and clout who live under the runway extended flight path so have no concern for the benefits the airport provides for the other 99.9 percent.

However, Palm Beach County is blessed to have the airport close in and easily accessible rather than in Ft Lauderdale or some equally distant place. It just "ain't going to happen" that the airport be moved west into growing suburban developments and the ecologically sensitive Everglades.

We should all be greatly pleased to have such a fine airport so close-in
which could have been and still can be a good neighbor were it not for
greed and selfishness of some few who bought in line with the airport
runways at reduced prices and taxes due to the overflight of aircraft.
They now want their cake and eat it too at the expense of the
mass of population who would be even better served with more
connecting flights and commerce in an out.

The answer was and still is to commit the traffic to fly only straight
in and straight out aligned with the runway with no fanning to "spread
the wealth" of noise, soot and oil pollution which seems not to have
adversely affected the growth of grass, flowers, shrubs and trees in the
now gorgeous open park-like setting of what once was a nice residential
section, Highland Park.

The Donald is running a commercial establishment now alongside of some
of the other anti expansion complainers - all of whom benefit by having
bought cheaply and receive lower tax bills were there no overflights but
want to live in quiet grandiose splendor and then eventually sell at
super prices. Why should this greed and fanning pollution be
passed on
to others?

All of Palm Beach County - and adjacent counties - along with the
remaining Palm Beach Islanders should be pressing their local
governmental and Federal authorities to cease fanning immediately, build
the expansion and open direct access to I-95 to keep heavy airport
traffic out of local residential, business and commuting streets.
We, the mass of the people would be better off in every way with this implemented - and it is the only fair way to do it.

Sincerely, John W. Willmott

Appropriate copies. File: newspapers\pbdnews\pbia0415

From: "John W. Willmott" <tiojuan@flinet.com>
Date: April 15, 1998 10:13:49 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Reply ref TWA800 et al
Reply-To: tiojuan@flinet.com

Thanks for prompt reply! Also for your defense of free speech! I did not
think you would appreciate my views as expressed on my website. Few hve
the knowledge - the personal experience - the courage or the reason to
address the subjects I take seriously on my site and try to make it
interesting - fun - attractive and informative with my limited net experience but a world of experience traveling and being exposed to the inherent dangers in flight. One does not fly - and do it gracefully and well if he/she is always expecting the worst.
I have a saying I mostly adhere to: I was not there. I don't sleep with her or him. I know what I think I saw and know. I report the truth as closely as I can with the knowledge I have. I am also wrong many times because I am not a follower sitting back while others take risks and then hanging onto coat tails for rewards I had nothing to do about!
I admit to probably being biased on TWA 800 but since there are no other "acceptable" reasons found - and there are many others unexplored or reported on - even yours - that TWA 800 tragedy is a good vehicle to carry my anti terrorist campaign alive. Furthermore after the known and admitted (at one time) coverups or disengenuous statements ref Pan Am 103, is it any wonder that many look for the ulterior motive in 800. And I know many who can and still might blow planes from the sky and do it with virtually complete immunity and credible deniability if and when needed. Some just wait for the time and
place. It is unfortunate that this has to be but when one dances - he/she must pay the piper - usually!
Then there was the Arrow Air "accident" in Gander which is not what the public was told. In addition the coverup of the "accident" in Pakistan that killed Zia just adds more to prove that those in Washington in power doing nasties will do anything to protect their butts - Just like George Bush did repeatedly. Those who think Clinton dangerous should study Bush.
You see - the Zia - Arrow Air and Pan Am 103 all were lied about - covered up and essentially forgotten by most except the victims. Pan AM was the first airline I flew for in Miami on the boats and in NY too into early 41 when I volunteered for the RCAF Politics became my game because it seemed to be smoke and mirrors and not what I saw and knew which was the "truth" from the beginning. Early on I believed I must follow my country - right or wrong. Sort of like a "good Roman Catholic" blind belief or carry guilt around.
I don't know what you mean about my religious views. I do not push any religion although brought up an Episcopalian. I believe in a founding something or other and the three letter word God fits easily for convenience. I respect every man's religion even if it is none -
nada
and nil - along with his/her 'its right to believe or not to believe.
Few
are as broadminded as I am. Look at your family. Mine.
Neighbors. and at
N. Ireland - Palestine - Israel and the history of the Crusades!
What is wrong is that some use religion to take advantage of
others
rather than get along - even if at arms length.
I got into Corozon and found it interesting. Again not time to do
it
deeply. I did get out a letter this morning as I mentioned then did
many
other things. I've one ear on Rush and getting ready for lunch
before
going to paint more pictures! Are you connected with Corozon?
Letter
follows just for fun! Best wishes, John W. Willmott
Subject:
    PBIA expansion.
Date:
From:
    "John W. Willmott" <tiojuan@flinet.com>
Organization:
    The Progressive Liberty Party
To:
    lrawls@pbdailynews.com
CC:
    fcohen@pbdilynews.com

John W. Willmott, 224 Pershing Way, WPB, FL 33401
Dear Editor:

The hoopla about extending the runway at PBIA continues with the Shiny Sheet today reporting "PB, WPB on same side in PBIA fight." Essentially, the anti-extensionists seem to say that increased traffic in the air and on the ground will "lower their quality of life." And it seems the anti group are those with the most money and clout who live under the runway extended flight path so have no concern for the benefits the airport provides for the other 99.9 percent.

However, Palm Beach County is blessed to have the airport close in and easily accessible rather than in Ft Lauderdale or some equally distant place. It just "ain't going to happen" that the airport be moved west into growing suburban developments and the ecologically sensitive Everglades.

We should all be greatly pleased to have such a fine airport so
close-in
which could have been and still can be a good neighbor were it not for
greed and selfishness of some few who bought in line with the airport
runways at reduced prices and taxes due to the overflight of aircraft.
They now want their cake and eat it too at the expense of the mass of
population who would be even better served with more connecting flights
and commerce in an out.

The answer was and still is to commit the traffic to fly only straight
in and straight out aligned with the runway with no fanning to "spread
the wealth" of noise, soot and oil pollution which seems not to have
adversely affected the growth of grass, flowers, shrubs and trees in the
now gorgeous open park-like setting of what once was a nice residential
section, Highland Park.

The Donald is running a commercial establishment now alongside of some
of the other anti expansion complainers - all of whom benefit by having
bought cheaply and receive lower tax bills were there no overflights but
want to live in quiet grandiose splendor and then eventually sell at
super prices. Why should this greed and fanning pollution be passed on to others?

All of Palm Beach County - and adjacent counties - along with the remaining Palm Beach Islanders should be pressing their local governmental and Federal authorities to cease fanning immediately, build the expansion and open direct access to I-95 to keep heavy airport traffic out of local residential, business and commuting streets. We, the mass of the people would be better off in every way with this implemented - and it is the only fair way to do it.

Sincerely, John W. Willmott

Appropriate copies. File: newspapers\pbdnews\pbia0415

From: NDavis5003 <NDavis5003@aol.com>
Date: April 15, 1998 2:44:00 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: DC-10 Turkish Airlines plane crash 1974, trial 1976

Can you help me? I lost my aunt and uncle in a plane crash outside of Paris in 1974. The trial against McDonnell Douglas took place in 1976 and a settlement was made in the same year. I am trying to find the court transcript of the trial which took place in Los Angeles. So far I am failing
I am desperately trying to get hold of this information. Can you help? If so, please write back.

From: "Tim Exton" <tim@trickypictures.com>
Date: April 15, 1998 1:22:58 PM PDT
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: El Al Flight 1862

<html><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML//EN">
<html>  
<head>
<meta content=text/html; charset=iso-8859-1 http-equiv=Content-Type>
<meta content="MSHTML 4.71.1712.3" name=GENERATOR>

<bodybgcolor=#ffffff>
<div><font color=#000000 size=2>Dear Barry,</font></div>
<div><font color=#000000 size=2>&nbsp;</font></div>
<div><font color=#000000 size=2>I'm a freelance journalist looking into El Al Flight 1862. It has been reported in the British press that depleted uranium was used as wing ballast. It sounds unlikely to me and aircraft journalists I have spoken to. Do you have any thoughts on this or can you suggest anyone I can

miserabley! I am desperate to get hold of this information can you help? If so please write back.
Can you help me? I lost my aunt and uncle in a plane crash outside of Paris in 1974. The trial against McDonnell Douglas took place in 1976 and a settlement was made in the same year. I am trying to find the court transcript of the trial which took place in Los Angeles. So far I am failing miserably! I am desperate to get hold of this information can you help? If so please write back.

Standby,
John Barry Smith
Subject: Re: El Al Flight 1862

Dear Barry, I'm a freelance journalist looking into El Al Flight 1862. It has been reported in the British press that depleted uranium was used as wing ballast. It sounds unlikely to me and aircraft journalists I have spoken to. Do you have any thoughts on this or can you suggest anyone I can speak to? Email me at tim@trickypictures.com Many thanks. Tim

I've heard that too and supported by guys in white suits checking the wreckage. Maybe. There is a bigger story than that. The cause was fuse pin fell out and engine fell off. I have very strong circumstantial evidence, based on government AARs, that the cargo door opened in flight, engine three foddled and caught fire, vibrated and then engine fell off, as designed, and taking number four with it. Plane crashed. It's very strong.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith.

From: NDavis5003 <NDavis5003@aol.com>
Date: April 17, 1998 7:55:54 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: DC-10 Turkish Airlines plane crash 1974, trial 1976

Barry, if you can help me I'll be eternally grateful! By the way where does your interest in this subject derive from?

Thanks for your help

Nicki.
Barry, if you can help me I'll be eternally grateful! By the way where does your interest in this subject derive from?

Thanks for your help

Nicki.

Dear Nicki,

Jerry Sterns was the lawyer at the DC 10 trial, he will know all about it, especially the settlement part.

He can be reached by emails below and resides in San Francisco area for phone number.

sterns@pop.lanminds.com

sterns@trial-law.com

The below email refers to another person, not you, but shows his willingness to talk to you.

I am a survivor of a sudden night fatal fiery jet airplane crash. That is my motivation to stop it from happening again.
Good Luck.
Barry

Jerry Sterns,
Sterns, Walker & Lods
sterns@pop.lanminds.com
sterns@trial-law.com

Date: Fri, 20 Sep 1996 16:12:39 -0700
X-Sender: sterns@pop.lanminds.com
Mime-Version: 1.0
To: barry@corazon.com
From: sterns@trial-law.com (Sterns, Walker & Lods)
Subject: Re: victim family contact
Status:

I was contacted by the son whose father died in the crash. He thinks the government did it and he wants some concrete answers. What should I do?

Working on a good signature...
Email: barry@corazon.com
Page: http://www.corazon.com/

Barry: Thank you for your E message. We would be happy to talk to your correspondent. He could be right, but there are several other possibilities, that are more likely. We have done a number of cases involving the government, and are currently working for a family on the Ron
Brown Bosnia
matter vs. the US, so we are familiar with what people are up against with
our uncle. Thank you for contacting us and stay in touch. GCS
SWL

From: "P.Q.M." <princequickmix@asan.com>
Date: April 17, 1998 7:46:23 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Being worried...
Reply-To: princequickmix@asan.com

How are you,

    Well after reading some of the contents from the
page I don't
know if I should be extremely worried. I have to take a Boeing
747 to
Greece at the end of this month and don't know what me as a
passenger
could do?? Did they fix the problem. is it fixable? Well I
figured
you would know better than anyone else. Any info you can
provide will be
helpful...

    Thank You,
Manny

--

'The box label said, "Requires Windows 95 or Better"...
    so I bought a Macintosh :^)
How are you,

OK, especially after I upgraded by 604/120 to a G3/220 tweaked to 285 MZ CPU, all with a card.

Well after reading some of the contents from the page I don't know if I should be extremely worried. I have to take a Boeing 747 to Greece at the end of this month and don't know what me as a passenger could do???

The problem I have found occurs on old 747s with bad wiring that rarely turns on door motor to unlatch position.

If you fly with a reputable airline in a modern plane you will probably be all right from the aging wiring problem.
A 747-400 is new and has better wiring than the old ones. Try to fly on a 747-400.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

Did they fix the problem.

No, not yet.

is it fixable?

Yes.

From: "Walter A. Martinez" <parsec@ns1-usrs.sminter.com.ar>
Date: April 18, 1998 2:14:59 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Information

Hello:
Interests me to study the cases from disappeared planes that they found after of many years or never. It can answer me in English, but my language is the Spanish. Thanks.
parsec@sminter.com.ar
  Walter A. Martinez
parsec@sminter.com.ar
OK, especially after I upgraded by 604/120 to a G3/220 tweaked
to 285 MZ
CPU, all with a card.

DAM !!!

    Im jealous .... but not that much cause my old Power PC
will get a
boost of its own when I get enough money to do my own
Upgrade. I love
Macs ... especially when they fly for under $900  HAHA
Well I know its Olympic Airlines and thats probablly some older
one
cause its not no American Or Continental ... yaknow ...??? Well..
I
certainly cant request a certian plane so I will cross my fingers
and
hope all goes well  :(  
Glad to see another Mac Head on the net ! Later

--
'The box label said, "Requires Windows 95 or Better"...
    so I bought a Macintosh  :^)
John, thank you so much for your help. I have e-mailed Stern but have yet to receive anything back, and I have found out about another lawyer involved in the trial who I have also sent a begging letter! They might not be able to help but at least I can now bug them instead of you!

Thanks again - Nicki
recieve anything back, and I have found out about another lawyer involved in
the trial who I have also sent a begging letter! They might not be able to
help but at least I can now bug them instead of you!

Thanks again - Nicki

Stern is in the phone book in the San Francisico area and he is in
the book about the DC 10 crash, he will know what you are
trying to find out. Keep on trying. Good luck.

Cheers,
Barry

---

From: SYZC34A@prodigy.com (MRS JOHN B BOI)
Date: May 2, 1998 7:48:16 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: crash cause

could it be short circuiting in the wiring in the central fuel tank?
neither TWA nor Boieng will be held to blame as it would probably
bankrupt Boeing and many of the major airlines that are marginally
profitable (too expensive to expose complete and actual fault).

---

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: May 2, 1998 7:55:21 PM PDT
To: SYZC34A@prodigy.com (MRS JOHN B BOI)
Subject: Re: crash cause
could it be short circuiting in the wiring in the central fuel tank? neither TWA nor Boeing will be held to blame as it would probably bankrupt Boeing and many of the major airlines that are marginally profitable (too expensive to expose complete and actual fault).

Maybe, the NTSB seems to thinks so. The wiring manufacturer objects.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: SYZC34A@prodigy.com (MRS JOHN B BOI)
Date: May 3, 1998 6:17:29 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: Re: crash cause

of course the wiring manufacturer would object, but it sure sounds through the various avenues of information that the NTSB has ordered unofficialy that all 747s with similar or same manufacturer check harnesses for insulation breakdown. Remember, in the business community people are only statistics. Profits talk, losses force CEOs to walk.

____

From: Star <C.baird@gcal.ac.uk>
Date: May 4, 1998 11:56:37 PM PDT  
To: barry@corazon.com  
Subject: plane bombings  
Reply-To: C.baird@gcal.ac.uk  

i think your web-site is the rudiest, most selfish, mindless pice of trash i have ever visited. who do you think you are printing that opening paragraph on your site. how could you do that to the people that lost someone in the crash. i hope you may think twice about your future sites. i am outraged by your actions if you want to reply feel free my email is:  
S.C.S.Brown@gcal.ac.uk  

From: Lincoln Lounsbury <lounsbry@erols.com>  
Date: May 9, 1998 10:57:37 PM PDT  
To: barry@corazon.com  
Subject: need address  
Reply-To: lounsbry@erols.com  

Could you forward H.Rantors' website address to me.  

Thanks  

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>  
Date: May 9, 1998 10:15:32 PM PDT  
To: lounsbry@erols.com  
Subject: Re: need address
Could you forward H.Rantors' website address to me.

Thanks

http://web.inter.NL.net/users/H.Ranter/

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: May 9, 1998 10:38:00 PM PDT
To: public_spectator@HOTMAIL.COM
Subject: Blow up cargo door area

For appraisal,
Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: Tom Sterle <sterlet@stiusa.com>
Date: May 11, 1998 4:47:32 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: 747 History

Not sure if you're the right person to ask, but since you came up under a search of 747 History, maybe you can at least point me in the right direction:

I would like to settle a friendly dispute with my father. He claims he regularly rode a 747 from Cleveland to Chicago around 1981 (the plane then going somewhere in the Pacific). I am very skeptical that a 747 has
ever flown into Cleveland airport, think he's confused with a DC-10. I believe the airline he flew was United.

Thanks for your help

-Tom Sterle

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: May 11, 1998 1:28:51 PM PDT
To: Tom Sterle <sterlet@stiusa.com>
Subject: Cleveland

Hmmmm.....a 747 into Cleveland airport. First confirm which airport in Cleveland, there may be a new one since 1981. Then check runway lengths. A newspaper search of Cleveland newspapers around 1981 may have some 747 stories. A check of the accident archives of 1981 would give any 747 accidents/incidents that might have occurred in Cleveland. And 747 incident/accident with location as Cleveland would lend credence to yes, 747s flew in and out of Cleveland. A 1981 travel book would give type airplane and departure time and cost etc.

Become an internet detective. All that stuff is or may be on the net.

http://www.ntsb.gov/Aviation/months.htm

is a start.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

Not sure if you're the right person to ask, but since you came up under a search of 747 History, maybe you can at least point me in the right direction:

I would like to settle a friendly dispute with my father. He claims he regularly rode a 747 from Cleveland to Chicago around 1981 (the plane then going somewhere in the Pacific). I am very skeptical that a 747 has ever flown into Cleveland airport, think he's confused with a DC-10. I believe the airline he flew was United.

Thanks for your help

-Tom Sterle

From: Chat Queen <martinl0@Libris.public.lib.ga.us>
Date: May 12, 1998 9:08:11 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: aerodynamics

From: "Gregory Jacques" <g_duze@email.msn.com>
Date: May 14, 1998 11:27:45 AM PDT
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Hi, Barry

My name is greg, and i'm an engineering student at ucsb. i'm currently taking a course on engineering ethics and have a project dealing with the dc-10 crash 981. the dc-10 information you provided on the internet was helpful. but, i’m having a problem getting some good graphics for my presentation. so i was wondering if you had any graphics of the plane and/or the crash that you could send to me via e-mail. also, do you know what happened to applegate (convair), the faa and its representatives (basnight and shaffer).

any info will be helpful

thanks,

greg
My name is greg, and i'm an engineering student at ucsb. i'm currently taking a course on engineering ethics and have a project dealing with the dc-10 crash 981. the dc-10 information you provided on the internet was helpful. but, i'm having a problem getting some good graphics for my presentation.

Why no capitals when starting a sentence?

so i was wondering if you had any graphics of the plane and/or the crash that you could send to me via e-mail.

The internet will have lots of pictures of DC 10, use search engines.

also, do you know what happened to applegate (convair), No.

the faa
No,
and its representatives (basnight and shaffer).

No,

But here's the email of a key lawyer, Jerry Sterns.

sterns@pop.lanminds.com
sterns@trial-law.com

any info will be helpful
thanks,

He should answer any ethics questions, he's a lawyer.

By the way, Paris DC 10 is old news, the hot news is TWA 800. Lots more ethics questions there is the wiring/cargo door explanation is confirmed.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: "Ronald McDow" <mcdow@email.msn.com>
Date: May 20, 1998 2:11:04 AM PDT
To: <barry@corazon.com>
Subject: operating cost:

Barry:
Do You happen to know the operating cost on average of the Boeing 747? If
so, please email Me with the info. Thank You. Ron.

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: May 20, 1998 12:37:08 PM PDT
To: mcdow@email.msn.com
Subject: **12000 bucks an hour**

BArry, the last I heard, hourly operating costs for the 747 were approximately 12,000. That was for the -200 model, and costs vary with each model, and with each operator.

I asked a retired 747 pilot and he told me the above. Not cheap.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith

From: Clemens Beer <clemens@beer.priv.at>
Date: May 23, 1998 3:25:01 AM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: **diameter 747**

Hello!

I’ve heard, that the diameter of the body of the 747 changes depending on the altitude. Is that true? What’s the diameter on the ground and at travelling altitude?
Thank you for the information! There’s a bet to win!
--

--------------------------------------------------------------
Clemens Beer e-mail: Clemens@beer.priv.at
Schinnaglg. 7/18
A - 1160 Vienna Fax +43-1-4956884
AUSTRIA Phone +43-1-4956884
--------------------------------------------------------------

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: May 23, 1998 8:37:43 AM PDT
To: Clemens Beer <clemens@beer.priv.at>
Subject: Checking

Hello!

I’ve heard, that the diameter of the body of the 747 changes depending on the altitude. Is that true?
What’s the diameter on the ground and at travelling altitude?
Thank you for the information! There’s a bet to win!
--

--------------------------------------------------------------
Clemens Beer e-mail: Clemens@beer.priv.at
Schinnaglg. 7/18
A - 1160 Vienna Fax +43-1-4956884
AUSTRIA Phone +43-1-4956884
--------------------------------------------------------------

I'm checking, if I get an authoritative answer one way or the other, I'll get back to you.
Cheers,

John Barry Smith

From: Beachlooks <Beachlooks@aol.com>
Date: May 25, 1998 4:52:22 PM PDT
To: barry@corazon.com
Subject: (no subject)

I'm doing a project for school about airplanes and there are a few questions which I am investigating. It would be greatly appreciated if you could either answer my questions or direct me to a place (online site...) that would answer these questions.
1. How are planes able to fly (achieve lift-off)?
2. How does radar work for airlplanes
3. What is the layout of electrical circuiting (wiring) in a boeing 747 and what are its functions?

Thank you very much

From: John Barry Smith <barry@corazon.com>
Date: May 25, 1998 9:06:50 PM PDT
To: Beachlooks <Beachlooks@aol.com>
Subject: flying

I'm doing a project for school about airplanes and there are a few questions
which I am investigating. It would be greatly appreciated if you could either
answer my questions or direct me to a place (online site...) that would answer
these questions.
1. How are planes able to fly (achieve lift-off)?

More lift than drag, and thrust exceeds weight. Or is it more lift than weight, and more thrust than drag?

2. How does radar work for airlplanes

Sends out signal, it bounces off object far away, signal returns, time is measured and turned into distance because speed was known, the speed of light.

3. What is the layout of electrical circuiting (wiring) in a boeing 747 and what are its functions?

All over.

Good questions, Aerodynamics for Naval Aviators talks about flying. 747 manuals would give info about wiring.

All answers in depth require years of study. Good luck.

Cheers,
John Barry Smith