

On Sun, 26 Sept 2021 at 15:04, Henk Pruis <xxxxxxx.com> wrote:

Dear Noam,

Yesterday I read on dogwoofsales a summary of the documentary under construction, and to be short: I was S H O C K E D by the bias and suggestions in that summary.

What I read felt as a contradiction in the open trustworthy atmosphere that we talked.

It looks as if the conclusions before the interviews were already crystal clear: the government(s) have lied to disadvantaged and innocent people (black colored (?) people (with and without resident permit?). They (= the government) cannot be trusted.

Tsjernobil, traces of uranium (sounds very suspicious to me.....but these were almost non-radioactive construction parts), men in white overalls.....it all sounds like a document series that wants to 'score' (again) on elements that create sensation, potentially neglecting the multidimensional aspects of 'the truth'?

Of course I agree that the truth(s) need to be listened to, but after testifying before the parliament on tv I have of course asked myself the question: 'what is the truth', or I am only telling 'my truth'? The truth is often associated and mixed with 'perceptions' and most the times an 'individual truth'. It can be a 'multidimensional truth' with many sides. And one needs to be very careful with that.

About those who suffered from illness due to the accident in the Bijlmermeer I have always asked myself the following question: how can it be that no one of the investigators and persons directly involved (that means having touched materials and being around wreckage parts) from Boeing, Pratt & Whitney, NTSB, FAA, RLD, ELAL, KLM etc. have ever had serious sicknesses or mental problems that they have brought in relation with the accident/depleted uranium/cargo? How can it be that only people that were have been shortly in contact with the crash area (they were isolated from that area almost immediately after the crash I may hope) and where all soil/earth/ground has been cleared and digged out and transported have health problems? How could this be, what are the reasons, the effects? Can we give confidence to them that the investigation was sound and the outcome trustworthy?

There is of course a story with multidimensional sociological (maybe also racial and societal) aspects behind the perception that 'government' would have lied to a part of its citizens, and I would certainly admit that there is mental and or physical damage.

(I can also tell about people who tried to 'benefit' from the accident by claiming that their health damage was solely caused by uranium.....while their health problems in reality have been caused by illegal work with dangerous chemicals in the past where I had to warn them to stop their activities in aviation: I cannot tell these things in a documentary because I would immediately be sued by lawyers).

Probably I worked in a group of well-educated university level experts, who have safe homes, stable relationships, a roof over the house and good food.....able to overcome the stress of months of work. We had information from inside and knew what we were doing. Those who are less fortunate and potentially have no residence permit, no salary to live from, illegal in NL, not having firsthand information.....it is much more difficult to overcome a catastrophe like the Bijlmer disaster.

I come to my point: if xxxxx reads this summary of Murkey Skies, there is no doubt that he will cancel the interview. I feel morally obliged to inform xxxx about this summary, so that he does not fall into the trap co-operating with a documentary where the conclusions already have been drawn.

I propose that we have a phone call about this before I inform xxxx. I hope that you understand and can see my point of view (and I am certain that xxxx would see as a form of betrayal when I would not inform him).

Best regards, Henk