

Annex 2

	Complainant 1	Complainant 2
THE PROGRAMME'S APPROACH		
The programme did not take a balanced and impartial view in considering what happened on 9/11. The presenter said he knew what had happened and dismissed those in the programme who are sceptical of the official version of events.	✓	
The programme made it clear from the start that its approach was not open-minded and those who doubt the official version of events are delusional.		✓
CHOICE OF PARTICIPANTS		
The programme deliberately chose five young people who did not have the knowledge or experience be able to counter technical opinion put forward by the programme's experts.		✓
CHOICE OF CONTENT		
The programme did not include a contribution from Richard Clarke (then US Chief Counter Terrorism Advisor) in relation to the role of the CIA. Mr Clarke has said that the CIA took a deliberate decision to withhold intelligence from the FBI. The omission of this information led to a lack of due impartiality and gave viewers a misleading impression about the CIA's complicity in the 9/11 attacks.	✓	
The explanation of how the Twin Towers collapsed did not include a contribution from an engineer from the truth movement to offer an alternative theory.		✓
The programme did not include NIST's admission that WTC7 had in fact fallen at free fall speed for at least 2.25 seconds. The omission of this information was crucial because the only way a building can collapse at free fall speed is through controlled demolition.	✓	
The programme did not explain that WTC7 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 made no mention of molten iron found under WTC towers 1, 2 and 7 for weeks afterwards and offered no explanation for it. Office fires and jet fuel cannot reach the temperatures in ideal circumstances to melt steel. There had to be a high energy substance such as thermite present in large quantities to achieve this.		✓
VALIDITY OF DEMONSTRATIONS		
The demonstration to show that thermite could not have been used to demolish the towers was flawed and misleading. It did not draw on evidence freely available from <i>Architects and Engineers for 911 Truth</i> that proves thermite can do all the things the programme stated it could not do, when used in simple containment vessels to efficiently direct its energy.		✓
The demonstration to show that a person with no flying experience can pilot a four-engine Boeing 767-200 Airliner was flawed; it did not reflect the view of qualified airline pilots who have proved using a simulator that even an experienced pilot could not have flown a passenger plane into the Twin Towers or Pentagon in the manner described in the official story. It also did not mention the fact that, according to accurate radar tracking information the flights which hit WTC1 and WTC2 were travelling speeds well in excess of the aircraft's capabilities.		✓

Appeals

	Complainant 1	Complainant 2
The programme was intentionally produced from the point of view of the host, who strongly believed that the official version of events was correct, and his aim was to change the five participants' minds. This approach was biased.	✓	
If public scepticism were limited to a small fringe minority, this approach might have been more acceptable; as the BBC had reported, one third of the public did not believe the official story, and other evidence suggested this figure was higher.	✓	
The unbiased approach would have been to present and discuss both sides of opinion with equal emphasis.	✓	
Why has the BBC not challenged any of the flaws in the official version, rather than casting personal aspersions against those who questioned it?	✓	
The programme only presented things from one point of view (ie, that the official story was correct). Where was the balancing approach, whereby a presenter did not believe the official story and attempted to change the minds of five participants who believed it was correct?	✓	
The ECU had state that the programme was not an attempt to create an investigative documentary, but if it was not a documentary then what was it?		✓
It should have been clearly indicated at the start that the BBC did not endorse any of the views expressed. The producers should have let the presenter argue his own case, instead of providing a variety of 'experts' to give 'evidence' for his views.		✓
In its findings, the ECU had done its best to obfuscate issues of impartiality, and hardly addressed issues of accuracy at all.		✓
The programme's format was that of a documentary, and therefore any content should have been checked thoroughly to ensure the highest standards of factual accuracy and balance. The ECU's comment about viewers judging the content implied that it was unaware of the lack of accurate information in the mainstream media. How can viewers make balanced decisions if they are never made aware of the real facts?		✓
The ECU appeared to be arguing that, so long as an expert could be found to present a contrary view, it did not matter if that view was factually inaccurate. In arguing a case as sensitive and complicated as the building collapses on 9/11 by using a single 'expert', according to the guidelines on accuracy, the BBC should provide at least an additional expert to give balance to the views expressed. The statements made by the 'expert' were wrong on very basic levels. The main function of the structure of a building is to counteract the force of gravity. This is achieved by making the structural supports at least several times stronger than they need to be. The centre of the building is the path of most resistance, but, according to the expert, the top section fell directly through it at nearly free fall speed and in defiance of several laws of physics, including the law of conservation of momentum. The public relies on the BBC to select suitable experts to supply accurate programme content. Experts who promote impossible scenarios should be balanced with other experts who are qualified to question them. It is not acceptable to assume the viewer has sufficient knowledge to identify the flaws in 'expert' testimony. In this aspect, as with most of this programme, the BBC is guilty not just of gross incompetence but also of wilfully misleading the public to facilitate a political objective.		✓
The NIST report stated that WTC7 had collapsed in free fall (gravitational acceleration) for at least 2.25 seconds. Free fall is impossible for a gravitational collapse, as NIST Lead Investigator Dr Shyam Sunder has stated in August 2008 [ie before publication of the NIST report into WTC7 November 2008]. Very simple facts can be used to prove the official story for 9/11 is wrong:		✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WTC 7 fell for 2.25 seconds in free fall. • For any object to fall in free fall, all the potential energy available MUST be converted to kinetic energy. No energy is available to perform any additional work. • Therefore there must be an additional source of rapidly applicable, controllable energy 		✓

	Complaint 1	Complaint 2
<p>available to destroy thousands of welded and bolted connections, buckle and deform steel members and pulverise concrete to very fine dust.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The only possible type of additional energy source capable of providing sufficient energy in the rapid, controlled method required is explosives. • It takes months to prepare the explosives needed to destroy a 47-storey, steel-framed skyscraper. • Given the kinds of tenants in WTC7, it was very unlikely that Al-Qaeda could have had SUFFICIENT access to plant explosives, so at the very least the official story cannot be correct and at worst elements of the US government were involved. <p>The same basic laws of physics are the reason why a stone thrown into a pool falls more slowly than in air. WTC 7 is scientific proof that the official story for 9/11 cannot be true and that the UK has invaded Afghanistan on the basis of a lie. A BBC documentary carried an interview with 'Curve ball', the infamous Iraqi whose sole information formed the basis for the Iraq war, in which he freely admitted that he had lied. Do we not have an obligation to our service personnel not to send them into harms way without very good cause?</p> <p>The programme said the group were interested in all aspects of the events of 9/11. It is ridiculous for the issue of WTC 7 to be ignored, unless it was wilfully ignored by the producers for the reasons stated above. The ECU side-stepped the issue of WTC7 by stating that it had not been mentioned. For a factually accurate 9/11 programme to ignore WTC7 just proves how biased the programme was. For the ECU not to address this item reveals the objectives of its investigation far more clearly than anything else. The ECU was either freely helping, or was instructed to help, elements at the BBC whose objective was to prop up the official story, in clear breach of the BBC editorial guidelines and at the cost of UK service personnel's lives.</p>		
<p>The presence of molten iron was another smoking gun, as it is impossible for office or jet fuel fires to reach the temperatures required to melt steel. Either the group were lacking sufficient knowledge to know about the molten metal (widely known about and documented in the Truth Movement) or the programme makers chose to ignore it. Either way it shows clear bias towards a set objective, which breaches the BBC guidelines on impartiality and accuracy.</p>		✓
<p>The ECU cited Tony Szamboti's brief contribution as evidence of balance in the question of the thermite experiment. Had Mr Szamboti been asked to comment on the experiment, he could have shown the BBCs 'expert' how to use the thermite to do exactly what the BBC was trying to show could not be done. A member of <i>Architect and Engineers for 9/11 Truth</i> had already made a film showing experiments which directly contradicted a similar attempt by National Geographic to obfuscate the truth. It would have been very easy to recreate his experiment. The fact that this was not done shows at least incompetence by the programme producers in presenting information which was already out of date. If they were not incompetent, then it shows a clear objective of presenting a false argument to the viewers.</p> <p>Thermite used in small steel containers has been used for years to weld sections of railway lines together. Only the BBCs test was included in the programme, so the viewer only had one side of the argument. If the ECU, having seen the evidence both for and against the use of thermite, did not feel able to assess the information, why does the ECU keep falling back on the viewer's ability to make up their own mind up when they are only shown the BBCs fictional 'evidence'? The ECU's final comment about not being able to conclude that the evidence of one 'DIY' experiment should be given more weight than the other is redundant. The programme makers had already decided to give their DIY experiment more significance than the one conducted by a qualified engineer by including it in the programme. In doing so, they had already indicated what they wanted the public to think.</p>		✓
<p>A trial lesson in a single-engine Cessna, accompanied by an instructor, did not prove that the hijackers could have flown the four-engine Boeing 767-200s into their targets (which was</p>		✓

	Complaint 1	Complaint 2
<p>equivalent to the skill required for landing on a aircraft carrier). If the aircraft had flown slowly and in straight lines, it would have made the official story more believable, but they had been flown in complicated paths at speeds that were impossible for standard commercial jets, and numerous professional pilots had stated that they did not consider this possible for most fully qualified and experienced pilots. The ECU's statement that that viewers could draw their own conclusions would be fair comment if the programme had started with a notice that the BBC did not endorse the content. As no such notice had been given, the BBC ought to have ensured that all the arguments presented were based in fact. The programme makers could have asked a qualified airline pilot if they thought someone with a few lessons in a Cessna could fly such an aircraft. The answer would have destroyed the implied legitimacy on which the programme makers were relying in order to promote their propaganda.</p>		
<p>The ECU never even touched on the parts of the guidelines dealing with accuracy that I had cited in my complaint.</p>		✓