PRELIMINARY SUMMARY OF THE SMOLENSK CONFERENCES. ABSTRACT

The Smolensk Catastrophe took place in Smolensk (Russia) on April 10, 2010. It represents the greatest post-war Polish national tragedy, in which the President of the Polish Republic and 95 accompanying persons, the country's political elite, were killed in mysterious circumstances. To explain the course of the Catastrophe on the basis of scarce evidence, that was accessible for investigation, represented a scientific challenge. As all official scientific institutions have chosen to refrain from participation in such an analysis, this inquiry was carried out within the framework of what is known as **academic investigation**. Three Smolensk Conferences took place: in 2012, 2013 and 2014. More than a hundred of eminent professors, from all the relevant technical as well as natural science domains, were engaged in their organization. These include mechanics and physics, aviation and aerodynamics, electrotechnics and chemistry, geodesy and archaeology, and later on also medicine, sociology and law. In 78 scientific papers presented, all essential aspects of the Smolensk Catastrophe have been analyzed by a variety of methods offered by contemporary science. The results have been published in Conference Proceedings, diffused afterwards among the libraries of all of Poland's academic institutions. The Proceedings have been also posted to the Conference website http://konferencjasmolenska.pl.

The hypothesis presented both by the Russian MAK Commission as well as by the Polish Governmental Commission (hereafter called the MAK/Miller hypothesis) was a subject of especially careful investigation. According to this hypothesis the Tu-154 plane decreased its altitude, close to the Bodin's property, down to several meters above the ground, which resulted in the collision of its left wing with a birch tree, the left wing tip being lost in this way. Due to this, the plane would rotate upside down, then hit the ground and disintegrated into thousands of fragments. The Conference related investigations have shown, that this hypothesis is wrong as contradicting both the laws of physics as well as an extensive photo and video documentation showing the fragments' distribution on the ground and their deformation. Formulation of this false hypothesis was possible exclusively when neglecting the basic evidence i.e.:

- neglecting the report of the team of Polish archaeologists that proved the plane has been crushed into roughly 60 000 pieces and showing the fragments' real distribution,
- neglecting the absence of the crater, which would result due to the plane's collision with the ground,
- neglecting the wreckage investigation,
- neglecting investigation of the airport recorders,
- and, first of all, by the shameful failing of the victims' autopsies.

The scientific investigation performed has shown undoubtedly, that:

1) the plane's altitude was larger than it is indicated in the MAK/Miller hypothesis. Thus, it could not hit the Bodin's birch tree,
2) if, however, the plane hit this birch tree, the tree would not shear off the wing tip, but instead the birch would be cut,
3) if, nevertheless, the wing tip was shear off, the airplane could not turn upside down,
4) if the airplane still hit the ground after turning upside down, the degree of disintegration as seen on photographs, could not happen.

Among many evidence that indicate the actual course of the Smolensk Catastrophe are those, which have the character of the **irrefutable** evidence. As follows from the laws of mechanics, the fuselage being torn longitudinally (documented by many photographs) is a fingerprint of an internal explosion. Another irrefutable evidence is the position of the debris that come from the inside of the airplane and are found before the plane's first contact with the ground. This proves the Catastrophe was a 2B type, i.e. the breaking of the fuselage happened in the air, before its contact with the ground.

The conclusions of the papers covering various domains of science, and presented during the Smolensk Conferences, coincide and support one another. Whatever scientific domain is taken into account, whether it is geodesy and geotechnics, archaeology, medicine, physics and chemistry, mechanics and aerodynamics, electrotechnics and acoustics, all the Conference papers point to a coherent picture and allow for drawing the following conclusions:

1. The Smolensk Catastrophe represented, what in the scientific literature is known as a controlled demolition, and has been carried out by a series of explosions, which took place in closed plane profiles, not available for pyrotechnic inspection.
2. The Russian team that controlled the Catastrophe site disturbed evidence to favor the MAK/Miller hypothesis. Transfer of some fragments to predefined locations and concealing of the evidence that would deny the hypothesis, it served this aim.
3. The overall **course** of the Smolensk Catastrophe is known. Although the course can be determined based even on the scarce evidence available to independent research, it is clear, that investigation concerning **causes** of Catastrophe cannot be completed without examining crucial evidence, such as the wreckage and the victims' bodies. Without conducting such studies it is impossible to determine some very important details, therefore the closure of the investigation at this stage would be impermissible.

The Scientific Committee of the Smolensk Conferences

Warsaw, Oct. 3, 2015