

Oslo Tingsrett.  
C.J Hambros plass 4  
0164 Oslo  
[oslo.tingsrett@domstol.no](mailto:oslo.tingsrett@domstol.no)

Det Norske Storting  
Stortinget  
0026 Oslo  
[kontroll-konstitusjon@stortinget.no](mailto:kontroll-konstitusjon@stortinget.no)

Retsudvalget  
Folketinget, Christiansborg  
1240 København K  
[folketinget@ft.dk](mailto:folketinget@ft.dk)

Oslo Politi  
Spesialenheten  
[post@spesialenheten.no](mailto:post@spesialenheten.no)

The fire on board Scandinavian Star 7-8<sup>th</sup> of April 1990 –  
Questions regarding the report “Brannsakkyndig uttalelse  
til Oslo Tingrett vedrørende brannen ombord på  
Scandinavian Star 7. april 1990” daterad 150114  
(Referanse 14-157832ENE-OTIR/01 med påtegningsark  
1302785849427 /14-1 /BSK013) and the ongoing  
investigation

In the following we are directing numerous and relevant questions about  
the abovementioned report as well as the ongoing investigation.

#### **The report**

- › Why haven't the investigators analyzed the actual "travelling" fire with a model of the entire ship? In what way does this very narrow investigation provide facts for and support any relevant conclusions regarding if a natural spread of fire, concerning the whole course of time and encompassing a large part of the ship, is possible or not?
- › Why haven't the investigators taken into account the total mass of steel, which is approx. 22 000 tons, in their energy balance calculations ("lumped heat capacity") instead of the stated 300 tons of steel? Doesn't this have a great impact on the time dependent steel temperature and the pyrolysis of flammable materials, which in turn has a great influence on whether a natural fire spread after fire no. 2 was at all possible or not?

- › Why isn't it stated in the so-called global temperature analysis to what extent the investigators have included the cooling boundary effects from the entire surrounding steel structures, internal water tanks (ballast and fresh water) and contact surfaces with seawater both internally and externally etc.?
- › Why haven't the investigators clearly reported which RHR (time dependent rate of heat release) has been used in the calculations?
- › In what way has the investigators verified the value of 0.5 in connection with calculations of the energy quantities transferred to the steel? Isn't it a well-known and scientifically based fact that heat transfer occurs in three ways: conduction, convection and thermal radiation? Isn't it also a well-known and scientifically based fact that for each of these, just a fraction of the energy is transferred to the steel, and the rest disappears through ventilation, heating of other materials (and the air), as well as heat loss to the outside?
- › Why haven't the investigators taken into account the actual and fluctuating positions of the fire doors, as stated by the fire ground commander and his crew, during the calculated fire scenario?
- › If the "travelling" fire is a result of a natural fire spread, as the report states, how come there are areas, through which the heat in the steel structure must pass to get to another and later fire affected area, which clearly are not affected by or involved in any stages of the fire (fire no. 1 through 6)? Did these areas not contain any combustible material?
- › Isn't it possible that the traces of hydraulic oil found on the hydraulic pipe is due to the fact that the actual evidence is a picture taken after the salvage operation is completed, hence a temporary hydraulic hose could have been connected to enable the salvation crew to lower and lift the mezzanine car deck, after the hydraulic fire and before the picture was taken? If the answer to the previous question is yes, isn't it then possible that the hydraulic pipe was manually sabotaged (bent open) resulting in the actual pipe being bent parallel to the deck and with the exact same damage to the coupling as a thermally induced expansion/retraction would result in? If the answers to the previous questions are yes, isn't it then possible that the hydraulic oil was intentionally used to accelerate the fire in this area?

## The ongoing investigation

- › Why is the ongoing investigation continuously derailed by attempts to focus on the fire scenarios? Both fire no. 1 and fire no. 2 were indisputably arson. Shouldn't, for this reason, it be extremely important to focus the investigation on *who* did start these fires and *why*, in order to have them held responsible for killing 159 human beings of which 27 were children?
- › Why was liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) stored under unsafe conditions when it should have been stored in the designated and locked storage area? There were about 20-25 bottles of LPG located very close to the start of the main fire, who put them there and why?
- › Why and by who was the ventilation system, supplying car deck, started during the fire? Isn't it a fact that this system has the sole purpose of extracting exhaust fumes from the vehicles during embarkation and debarkation and that it can only be manually activated from a control panel located in a locked control room on car deck?
- › Why isn't the possibility of committed insurance fraud carefully investigated? Isn't it a proven fact that the ship had a complex ownership history and very unclear ownership conditions when the fire took place? Isn't it also a fact that the relevant company/owners have had several suspicious fires in the past? Shouldn't all of the involved and concerned countries authorities be involved in this matter to turn every stone concerning this catastrophic fire? Isn't it also a fact that the ship was insured for 24 million USD when the actual worth of the ship was in fact approx. 5 million USD? Isn't it a matter of simple logic reasoning that this last fact alone arouses some justified suspicion?
- › Why haven't you included the presence of huge amounts of water (approx. 14 000 m<sup>3</sup>) in the engine room in the investigation, and especially, wherefrom this water came, given that there had not yet been any firefighting operations initiated which could lead to the water having entered the engine room, when the first response team from Gothenburg FD arrived?
- › Who tried to obstruct the firefighting operations and why? Isn't that something that must be closely investigated to clarify whether it was part of an elaborate insurance fraud or not?
- › The main fire did start in a long corridor at the bottom of a stair, this door was kept open with a 4 x 4 inch wooden beam with an approx. length of one meter, according to the witness Major Johan T Nordset, who shortly before the fire had been in the car to retrieve things. Who did place this wooden beam in this position?

The questions raised are in our opinion very relevant and important in the process of bringing some light onto this tragic event. As of today, there is only one known and established fact and that is the fact that both fire no. 1 and fire no. 2 were indisputably arson killing 159 people.

Based on this it is our clear opinion that a full and objective investigation is the only way for any democratically oriented nation to handle this in the best interest of their citizens.

Malmoe, Sweden, 18th of May 2015



Pierre Palmberg  
Fire Protection Engineer



Henrik Georgsson  
Fire Protection Engineer



Lars Schjøtt Sørensen  
Fire researcher, M.Sc., Ph.D.