

Memorandum

Large
and
ASSOCIATES

Consulting Engineers The Gatehouse 1-2 Repository Road Ha Ha Rd London SE18 4BQ ☎ 44[0]20 8317 2860 fax [0]20 8317 2859
largeassociates@aol.com

To: J Coles Warship Support Agency M1016-w14
From: John H Large
Cc: M Carter IMechE 01 August 2013
Subject: **HMS TIRELESS MOD REF: JOHN LARGE/04-02-2005-101028-009**

John

Thank you for your letter of 21 February, 2005.

First, I note here that I am grateful to you for the courteous and balanced tone of your letter.

As I state quite clearly in my e-mail to David Graham, since I had put the matter before Crown Minister Ingrams that, as a matter of protocol, any further communication should be via the Minister's office and, whatever, I am not sure what you could add by way of explanation, other than to further contradict the quite clear statement of Peter Hurford that my 1st draft paper was "*generally correct*" and that "*his overall facts are correct*". Therefore, very briefly, so you understand the nature of my complaint to the Minister, referring to your letter seriatim:

3) The errors that you refer to are, as you identify, '*minor in nature*' with items c) and d) being taken from my contemporaneous notes of the first meeting with the Ministry of Defence at Whitehall in 2000, and that the status of CNNRP with Rolls Royce Marine acting as the Design Authority is made perfectly clear at several locations in the text, particularly by footnote 26. Frankly, if you cannot go into further detail because of your undefined '*security reasons*' then, with respect, you should not engage in any claim that you cannot elaborate upon or substantiate.

5-8) On your analysis, again you refer to substantiation of your claim on '*the facts presented*' but you choose not to go into these and, anyway, these are matters of engineering judgement and opinion which, like you, I am entitled and sufficiently experienced to hold.

9) Rather than separate these two incidents by their differences, I suggest it is the strength of their commonality that makes it appropriate to describe and compare them in my Forensics paper - the commonalities are i) both vessels suffered an engineered component failure (on Tireless a weldment in the reactor plant and for Kursk the failure of a weapons system); both were nuclear powered submarines and the forensic work for both centred on nuclear safety of their respective nuclear plants; and, of course, I and my involvement in both projects was a common link and, to a certain extent, the paper recounts my approach to and experience of this.

10) Your opinion that my paper is unsound is exactly that, it is your opinion and, like my opinion, it is for what it is worth.

11) I am awaiting an explanation of these issues and the status of the Independent Expert Panel advising the Government of Gibraltar from the Crown Minister.

12) I am genuinely surprised that you dismiss the quite incorrect and defamatory statements made about me personally by certain of your colleagues, saying that these do not represent the MoD's official position or policy which has only been communicated through written external correspondence. I disagree because these individuals were in the employ of the MoD and responding on a matter of MoD business.

So far as certain of the statements made in the MoD internal communications copied to me, there is authority to say that for the MoD to maintain and/or disseminate incorrect personal data and badmouthing me personally is in breach of my right to respect in my private and family life under the Human Rights Act. Moreover, I take certain of the comments to be libellous and that these were made with malicious intent and/or with improper motive. Also, the MoD has breached a confidence with the Kursk information that I passed to it, particularly in that someone in the employ of the MoD without my consent misused this confidence.

13) I, like you, look forward to the IMechE seminar where opinions might be freely debated, but I wonder if certain of your colleagues, without the anonymity they enjoyed in the copied communications, will care to espouse the same scurrilous claims about me, my integrity and my engineering judgement in an open public forum ?

All of that said and so as not to finish on a sour note, I am pleased that my forensics paper has promoted some debate because not only does it illustrate our common interests in engineered systems, it disseminates this knowledge to our professional contemporaries and, by the examples of the solution engineered for Tireless and the all-UK team that I selected for the Kursk venture, it shows that we in the UK are able to competently step into and solve very demanding, high technology problems.