

Annex 2

		Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
SECTION 3: ACCURACY	GENERAL				
	The programme makers knowingly misled the audience, contrary to Guideline 3.2.3			✓	
	The programme said the official version of events was "unequivocal", but the official explanation has changed, with each version contradicting the previous one.		✓		
	COLLAPSE OF WTC TOWERS				
	The explanation of what caused the collapse of the Twin Towers was inaccurate. It included a theory put forward by Prof Abolhassan Astaneh which was incorrect.		✓		
	Prof Astaneh's hypothesis about the structural integrity of the Twin Towers being dependent on thin load bearing walls has been discredited by <i>Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth</i> and others.				✓
	Why did the BBC not examine the official National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) report and inform the viewer that the report only refers to the "collapse" of the floors immediately involved with the aircraft impacts, not the disintegration of the whole building down to below ground level?				✓
	The programme did not explain that the Twin Towers contained 47 uprights intermeshed with steel beams accredited to withstand 2,000 degrees. This was misleading.				✓
	The BBC News channel reported the collapse of WTC7 20 minutes before it happened.	✓			
	How does the BBC explain that it is broadcasting an analysis that the official investigators have refuted - i.e. the pancake theory?				✓
	110/47-floor towers cannot disintegrated into microscopic dust within seconds due to small fires. This contradicts the laws of physics.				✓
	The programme misrepresented the findings of the RJ Lee Group in its report on the WTC Dust Signature.				✓
	PRESENCE OF THERMITIC MATERIAL IN WTC DUST				
	Prof Niels Harrit's views were not linked to the readily available chain of evidence: Prof Harrit's team shows evidence of explosive residues, which could confirm architect Richard Gage's theory of controlled demolitions, which echoes firefighters' testimony of explosions before towers disintegrated, which accords with seismic "proof" of one explosion in WTC prior to air strike [Furlong and Ross, <i>Journal of 9/11 Studies</i>], which confirms caretaker William Rodriguez's evidence. This presented an inaccurate view of the significance of Prof Harrit's findings. [NB same argument is raised under Impartiality]			✓	
	Prof Chris Pistorius's evidence was not backed by a scientific paper or any tests: his evidence was not as strong as Prof Harrit's.			✓	
	COMPUTER SIMULATIONS				
	The programme used computer simulations which were not based on peer-reviewed data.				✓
	UNCORRECTED ERRORS				
	The previous (2007) edition of <i>The Conspiracy Files</i> had incorrectly claimed that WTC7 did not collapse in free fall. Since then, the scientific analysis of 'Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth' had forced NIST to agree that WTC7 did come down at free fall speed for at least 2.25 seconds. The programme failed to make this "absolutely critical correction".	✓			

Annex 2

		Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
	How does the BBC explain that in the 2007 <i>9/11 Conspiracy File</i> , the narrator introduced and signed off Prof Christoph Hoffman (Purdue University) extremely inaccurately? Why has this not been corrected?				✓
	PRIOR WARNINGS				
	It was incorrect to say the FBI and CIA "insist they had no specific warnings of the hijackings on 9/11". Using the word "specific" obscured the known situation that this information was known to the various agencies.				✓
	Richard Clarke, the then US Head of Counter Terrorism, has since stated that the CIA knew that the hijackers were in the US and planning something, and that the CIA had deliberately withheld this information.	✓			
	DISPOSAL OF WTC DEBRIS				
	It was inaccurate to say that all that remains of 9/11 is consigned to a hangar in New York state. Steel girders have been recycled and much of the building was pulverised.				✓
	OTHER ISSUES				
	Five of the alleged hijackers were alive and well, according to the BBC's own news reports. If this is correct, who hijacked the planes?			✓	
	The inclusion of a CIA agent swearing allegiance at the start of the programme gave the misleading impression that the CIA is above reproach when it is accepted that the agency's activities are "absolutely anchored in immorality and unethical behaviour".				✓
	It was inaccurate to say that "When air traffic control tried to find the hijacked planes, there were like 4,500 blips that looked identical across the United States". All four planes should have been identifiable.				✓
SECTION 4: IMPARTIALITY	The programme was misleading when it said military equipment and procedure "was designed and their procedures were designed to look out over the ocean, their equipment wasn't designed to look inside the United States"				✓
	The programme misled viewers by failing to disclose evidence of the US government's involvement in previous conspiracies.				✓
	The programme acknowledged other US Government conspiracies (Watergate, Monica Lewinsky, WMD/Iraq) but said questioning of the official version of events in relation to 9/11 was "out of bounds". It had therefore failed to weigh all relevant facts.				✓
	GENERAL BIAS				
	In general, the BBC's coverage of 9/11 is biased in favour of the official version of events and against the alternative version(s).	✓	✓	✓	✓
	The BBC had broadcast a number of items specifically aimed at debunking the views of so-called 'conspiracy theorists'.	✓			
	The nature and content of various news items grossly misrepresented various critical issues regarding problems with the official story.	✓			
	To commission just an hour-long programme about this "pivotal" event indicates an intention to confuse the issues and "engineer acquiescence" on key questions. The BBC should have conducted an investigative series.				✓
	BIAS BY INACCURACY				
	The <i>Conspiracy Files</i> programmes were all biased, in that they deliberately misrepresented the matters raised under Accuracy (see above).			✓	
	BIASED DEPICTION OF COMPETING THEORIES				✓

Annex 2

		Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
	The programme consistently stated the official version of events as fact. This was evidence of lack of balance.				
	The programme included contributions (eg from Frank Spotnitz) which were designed to discredit and undermine alternative theorists' views.		✓		
	The programme was designed to discredit those who question authority.				✓
	The programme repeatedly denigrated those who are critical of the official version of events as "conspiracy theorists".				✓
	The frequent repetition of the phrase "conspiracy theory" was used subliminally to condition the audience to support UK and US government policy.				✓
	The programme excluded writing and thinking in answering the question "what makes conspiracy theories so persist and so powerful". It was dishonest to ignore the fact that the behaviour of the human animal in political history, in literature etc. is shown to be team, group, tribe, clan, family-orientated.				✓
	The programme included a contribution from Jean O'Connor of the FBI in which she denigrated those who question the official version of events. This was evidence of a lack of due impartiality.				✓
	BIAS BY OMISSION: (1) SELECTION OF CONTRIBUTORS & PERSPECTIVES				✓
	There were 15 supporters of the official theory against four dissidents. This was evidence of an imbalance of views.				✓
	The programme cherry-picked information and hypotheses which supported the official version of events, and included contributors "tied to the establishment by money, career and contract".				✓
	The programme failed to interview, or restricted the broadcast of the views of, those offering an alternative perspective to the official account, namely:				
	WTC witnesses / experts				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> William Rodriguez (janitor, WTC North Tower; "world famous and decorated hero"; heard a massive explosion before plane strike; his "[s]tunning testimony" was broadcast only on BBC Radio Devon, rather than across the network 			✓	✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 50+ Firefighters/118 First Responders who heard explosions in twin towers (they were either not called to give evidence to Official Commission, or their evidence was ignored) 			✓	✓
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eric Lawyer (firefighter, founder of <i>Firefighters for 911 Truth</i>, not called before 9/11 commission) late Barry Jennings (NYC Housing Authority official; experienced an explosion inside WTC7 before it collapsed) Explosives experts who hold dissenting view (eg late Danny Jowenko; stated WTC7 was controlled demolition) 			✓	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIST (re collapse of WTC7 at free-fall speed) one the 1,500 professional architects and engineers from 'Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth' (re collapse of WTC7 at free-fall speed) 	✓			

Annex 2

	Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
<p>Pentagon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April Gallop (Pentagon employee; saw no plane wreckage as she stepped through the hole with her child; contradicted FBI agent Jean O'Connor) Bob Pugh (news photographer) Lt Col Karen Kwiatkowski (worked at Pentagon; said dearth of wreckage) Lt Robert Medairos (Arlington County Police; couldn't believe a plane had struck Pentagon) CNN reporter (stated no sign of jet) Russ Wittenberg (pilot; "actually flew the 9/11 jets prior to 9/11"; contradicted pilot Steve O'Brien; on record as stating that Pentagon flight manoeuvre could not have been accomplished by any pilot, let alone a novice) Pilots from <i>Pilots for 9/11 Truth</i> (who believe that Hani Hanjour, a "poor" Cessna pilot, could not have executed Flight 77 manoeuvre) 			✓	
<p>Relatives/ campaigners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family members of victims who are calling for an independent investigation Bob McIlvane (<i>Building What?</i> campaign, lost son at WTC) 			✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9/11 Consensus Panel (citizens & experts from a wide variety of fields, working blind to each other), who selected best evidence by the "Delphi method" 			✓	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sibel Edmonds (former FBI translator & whistleblower): subject to 'gagging orders'. 				✓
<p>If witnesses offering an alternative perspective were unavailable for interview, their views should nevertheless have been reported.</p>			✓	
<p>BIAS BY OMISSION: (2) COLLAPSE OF WTC</p> <p>The programme did not reflect the opinion of experts who question the official version of what caused the Twin Towers to collapse or report the available evidence which supports the theory of controlled explosions.</p>		✓		
<p>The programme did not report that there were explosions in the basements of the twin towers prior to the planes hitting and afterwards while fire crews were on site.</p>				✓
<p>The explanation provided by the programme as to why the WTC towers collapsed was presented as fact, but the cause is disputed and this was not reflected. Why is the BBC presenting a theory about the disintegration that is not supported by NIST or any other authority?</p>				✓
<p>The programme did not include any of the various theories about the collapse of the towers which questioned the original NIST evaluation.</p>				✓
<p>The BBC did not report that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIST had initially stated that WTC7 did not come down at free fall speed, but was eventually forced by independent scientists to accept that this had occurred for at least 2.25 seconds; or according to experts, the only way a building can come down at free fall speed is by controlled demolition. 	✓			
<p>The BBC has not shown any of the video footage of the collapse of WTC7, as a consequence of which the majority of the public are still unaware that a third tower collapsed.</p>	✓			

Annex 2

	Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
The BBC failed to report that the official 9/11 report did not mention the collapse of WTC7.	✓			
The explanation and analysis of the collapse of WTC7 failed to report that it collapsed in free fall, and that this could only have occurred if the tower was brought down in a controlled demolition using explosives.		✓		
The programme did not question why evidence from the Twin Towers was not preserved and why standard investigation procedure was not followed.		✓		
BIAS BY OMISSION: (3) PRESENCE OF THERMITIC MATERIAL IN WTC DUST				
Why isn't the BBC seeking written scientific evidence to rebut the claims of architect Richard Gage and chemistry Prof Niels Harrit? The BBC should have investigated the discovery of explosive material within dust, as alluded to by Prof Harrit, which supports Mr Gage (who was interviewed in an earlier edition of <i>Conspiracy Files</i>) & 118 First Responders, who heard explosions before collapse of twin towers. This evidence was not called by the Official Commission of Enquiry, and was not referenced in <i>Conspiracy Files</i> .			✓	
Prof Harrit's views were not linked to readily available chain of evidence: Prof Harrit's team shows evidence of explosive residues, which could confirm Richard Gage's theory of controlled demolitions, which echoes firefighters' testimony of explosions before towers disintegrated, which accords with seismic "proof" of one explosion in WTC prior to air strike [Furlong and Ross, <i>Journal of 911 Studies</i>], which confirms caretaker William Rodriguez's evidence. [NB same argument is raised under Accuracy]			✓	
The programme makers had edited Prof Harrit's interview so as to present a biased view thereof, and then tried to further discredit his work using testimony from experts who admitted they had not looked at his work.		✓		
The programme dismissed a published scientific paper by Prof Harrit because it was "irrelevant" and had not been challenged in peer review.				✓
Prof Harrit was discredited as a witness and he was not given an opportunity to respond to criticism of his paper on the collapse of WTC7. This was evidence of lack of balance.				✓
BIAS BY OMISSION: (4) PENTAGON / FLIGHT 77				
Where is the footage of the aircraft striking the Pentagon? Why haven't BBC journalists asked US authorities (FBI) to see it? Why is it secret?			✓	
The programme did not question why the authorities had failed to release all the video of the attack on the Pentagon.		✓		
The programme did not mention the failure of the missile batteries protecting the Pentagon or the fact no CCTV footage from the area was released by the Pentagon and other footage was confiscated by the FBI.				✓
The programme did not mention that data from the black box of Flight 77 has been analysed by independent experts and it does not match the official explanation.				✓
The BBC did not report 9/11 Commissioner Timothy Roemer's televised comment that a "missile ... plane" had been involved in the attack on the Pentagon.			✓	

Annex 2

	Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
The BBC did not report that the wings of the plane that supposedly hit the Pentagon were 120 feet wide and travelling at 500mph, and yet they did not crack or scratch a single window on the front face of the Pentagon. If the nose of the plane that supposedly hit the Pentagon did in fact strike the Pentagon where the small, perfectly round, 15-foot-wide hole was, then the engines of the plane would have been underground, and yet the lawn directly in front of the Pentagon was unscathed.	✓			
The BBC did not report that, according to expert pilots, it is impossible to fly an airliner at such speed at virtually ground level.	✓			
The BBC did not broadcast initial photos of Pentagon, which show windows in place around small impact hole & no aircraft engines embedded in wall.			✓	
The programme did not question how a plane hit the Pentagon without damaging walls and windows surrounding the initial 5m diameter hole in the front wall.		✓		
The programme said "If a large passenger jet crashed into the Pentagon why was the hole in the exterior wall apparently so small?" The word "apparently" was designed to cast doubt on the claim, and was evidence of bias.		✓		
The programme did not make it clear that the Pentagon was a crime scene in US criminal law, and so no wreckage should have been touched or removed.				✓
The programme omitted to mention that the Pentagon had received no warning of attack.				✓
BIAS BY OMISSION: (5) FLIGHT 93				
The programme did not report that mobile phone calls were said to have been made from Flight 93, but it was impossible to make such a call in 2001.		✓		
Why hasn't the BBC shown substantial wreckage at Shanksville?			✓	
BIAS BY OMISSION: (6) VESTED INTERESTS				
How does the BBC explain its failure to inform the audience that the US government funded the Purdue University computer animations for both the WTC and the Pentagon?				✓
Carnegie Mellon University is reliant on government grants. How does the BBC explain its failure to inform the audience that Richard Fruehan and Chris Pistorius, both of Carnegie Mellon University, benefit indirectly from such grants?				✓
The programme included contributions from persons who were "deeply enmeshed in the intelligence gathering and propaganda organisations of the US military".				✓
Richard Fruehan and Chris Pistorius were included in the programme but had a vested interest in the official version of events. This was not made clear.				✓
The programme included a contribution from Prof Astaneh, who was paid by the US government to draw up a report on the structural failures of the Twin Towers. How does the BBC explain its failure to inform the audience that the US government funded Prof Abolhassan Astaneh's research?				✓
The programme included a contribution from structural engineer Allyn Kilsheimer without making it clear that he had had a close relationship with the Pentagon and Dept of Defense (especially under the then comptroller of finance Dom Zakheim) from which he had "made a good living". Why is the BBC deliberately concealing Kilsheimer's extensive vested interest in the official theory and his long term involvement with the Pentagon, FBI etc?				✓

Annex 2

	Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
<p>BIAS BY OMISSION: (7) COMMISSION MEMBERS AND NIST RECONSIDER INITIAL FINDINGS</p> <p>The BBC failed to report that the official account has been largely discredited by many of the panel members themselves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Farmer, senior legal counsel to 9/11 Commission stated: "The public had been seriously misled ..." [<i>The Ground Truth: The Story Behind America's Defense on 9/11</i>] 9/11 Commission Chair & Vice-chair, Thomas Kean & Lee Hamilton, criticised the investigative process in <i>Without Precedent</i> <p>Six out of 10 members of the original 9/11 Investigation Commission have gone on record as saying the investigation was a whitewash and that they were "set up to fail".</p> <p>The programme included facts and conclusions which have been withdrawn by NIST, and as a result the programme presented information the official bodies no longer support.</p> <p>The programme did not include contributions from relevant informed experts (such as Thomas Kean [9/11 Commission Chair], Bob Kerrey [9/11 Commission member] <i>et al</i>) who have questioned the findings of official investigations and inquiries. How does the BBC explain its failure to inform the viewer of the statements of the majority of the 9/11 Commission members condemning various failures of the 9/11 Commission Report due to conflicting evidence from FAA, NORAD, White House etc.?</p>			✓	
<p>BIAS BY OMISSION: (8) SUSPICIOUS DEATHS</p> <p>The BBC failed to report suspicious deaths connected with 9/11 investigations, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senator Paul Wellstone (had been investigating suspicious stock movements ["Put options"] before 9/11; died in plane crash) Paul Smith (helicopter pilot; would have witnessed evidence of use of super explosive from aftermath; died in car crash) Danny Jowenko (stated 9/11 was a controlled demolition; died in car crash) Barry Jennings (NYC Housing Authority official; experienced an explosion inside WTC7 before twin towers collapsed; cause of death not stated) 			✓	
<p>BIAS BY OMISSION: (9) OTHER MATTERS THAT SHOULD HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED</p> <p>The programme referred to a "routine military exercise", but the authorities now admit there was an unprecedented number of manoeuvres and exercises underway. How does the BBC explain its failure to inform the viewer of the unprecedented list of military and emergency service exercises on the very day of 9/11?</p> <p>The programme did not report that the procedure for the interception of hijacked aircraft was changed just before 9/11, and was changed back again shortly afterwards.</p> <p>The programme did not question why evidence from the Twin Towers was not preserved and why standard investigation procedure was not followed.</p> <p>The programme did not include facts about terrorist funding such as the \$100,000 supplied by the Pakistani Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) and reported in the <i>Wall Street Journal</i> and <i>Times of India</i>.</p>		✓		✓
	✓			
		✓		
		✓		
		✓		

Annex 2

		Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
	<p>The following lines of inquiry were not pursued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the whereabouts of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld the testimony of Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta [concerning the order to shoot down commercial aircraft] direct funding of simulations "ridiculous" evidence, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> hijacker passports found singed, etc "challengeable" evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> war games etc. "conflicting" evidence "circumstantial" evidence 				✓
SECTION 5: HARM AND OFFENCE	The programme contained an image of very brief duration, namely a "horse's ass" [<i>sic</i>]. This was intended to mock alternative theorists' views.				✓
SECTION 6: FAIRNESS	It appears from the rushes [available on YouTube] that the "[b]rutal interviewing" of Prof Niels Harrit "was like a cruel cross-examination".			✓	
	The allegedly aggressive interviewing of Prof Harrit is speculatively contrasted with that of FBI agent Jean O'Connor: "Did you grill [FBI agent] Jean O'Connor for 3 hours ...?"			✓	
	The rushes reveal an attempt to hassle Prof Harrit into an angry response to the repetetive accusations made by interviewer Mike Rudin, who attempted to put words into Prof Harrit's mouth and would have been able to pick whatever clip he wanted to fit his preconceived editorial line.				✓
	It would have been "editorially fairer" to have included eyewitness accounts rather than secondary sources (namely, Alex Jones, Jim Fetzer & Dylan Avery) in support of the 9/11 Truth movement.			✓	
	The conclusion of the programme was intentionally designed to make members of the truth movement look like "heartless individuals".		✓		
	The programme portrayed the makers of the <i>Loose Change</i> documentary as "typical conspiracy theorists" seeking commercial gain. This was an attempt to discredit their work.		✓		
SECTION 11: WAR, TERROR AND EMERGENCIES	Breach of Introduction to Section 11 of the Editorial Guidelines: "At such times ... we need to be scrupulous in applying our principles of accuracy and impartiality."			✓	
SECTION 14: EDITORIAL INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE FROM EXTERNAL INTERESTS	The BBC is not truly independent: see clause 81 of the BBC Agreement.	✓			
	The BBC is not truly independent. Complainant cited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clauses 4 & 81 of the BBC Agreement, and BBC's alleged receipt of money from the US State Department. 			✓	
	By "engineering acquiescence" with the official version of events, the BBC is effectively carrying out the US government's <i>Full Spectrum Dominance</i> strategy to propagandise its position on 9/11.				✓
SECTION 19: ACCOUNTABILITY	Why did the ECU restrict its investigation to issues of impartiality?			✓	

Annex 2

		Complainant 1	Complainant 2	Complainant 3	Complainant 4
	The ECU considered my complaint against the accuracy and impartiality Guidelines, whereas my complaint actually concerned clause 46(2)(a)(v) of the BBC Agreement. ¹				✓
	It would be dishonourable for the Trust to consider this complaint solely within the restrictions of the Editorial Guidelines: the issues are far too important and the programme so outrageous in its selection of available evidence.				✓
REGULATORY ISSUES	The BBC is in breach of its obligation to support "informed democracy", as referred to in the BBC Trust's former Chairman's preface to Editorial Guidelines			✓	
	Complainant queried whether the BBC knowingly kept the public misinformed in order to gain support for a war that the US was already planning, pre-9/11, to wage in Afghanistan.			✓	
	The events of 9/11 were the basis for widespread restrictions on civil liberties and for the "War on Terror" which has led directly to two major wars, namely Afghanistan and Iraq.				✓
	Complainant cited report by the BBC's George Arney of 18/09/01 and BBC documentary <i>Timewatch – Operation Gladio</i> (1992, which concerned "false flag" activities). The BBC's failure to re-broadcast the latter was "highly relevant and suspicious" and not to include it in 9/11 documentary was "grossly misleading".			✓	

¹ This concerns refraining from use of techniques which exploit the possibility of conveying a message to viewers or listeners, or of otherwise influencing their minds, without their being aware of what has occurred. The clause refers to Communications Act 2003 s 319(l).