ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS for 9/11 TRUTH

August 1, 2012

Members of Parliament
Culture, Media and Sport Committee
House of Commons
London, SW1A OAA
United Kingdom

Dear Members of the Culture, Media and Sport Committee,

I am the Founder and CEO of the organization Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth (AE911Truth) which is composed of more than 1,700 technical and building professionals and 14,000 other individuals who have signed their names in demand of a new and truly independent investigation, with subpoena power, into the collapse of the World Trade Center Twin Towers and Building 7 on September 11, 2001 ("9/11"). We base this request on the extensive scientific and forensic evidence we have gathered over the past six years.

The Culture, Media and Sport Committee monitors the policy and administration of the British Broadcasting Corporation ("BBC") on behalf of the House of Commons and the electorate. The electorate deserves to know certain information that the BBC has withheld about the 9/11 attacks. It is literally a matter of life and death.

Publicly available information, much of it over 10 years old and confirmed by architects, engineers and physicists, contradicts the official account of the 9/11 attacks that has blamed Arab hijackers and upholds the view that the World Trade Center Twin Towers and Building 7 were brought down by explosive controlled demolition.

The BBC has withheld this information and instead provided biased, inaccurate and misleading coverage of the 9/11 attacks as recently as September, 2011 in 2 documentaries, ('Conspiracy Files: 9/11 ten years on' and '9/11: Conspiracy Road Trip') and a 2008 program 'The Conspiracy Files: 9/11 - The Third Tower' in breach of the Royal Charter, Agreement, Editorial Guidelines and Editorial Values.

Britain has been taken into two wars on the basis of the official story of 9/11 that we have been told by the BBC and the rest of mainstream media. The BBC has so misrepresented the facts of 9/11 to the British public that we have basically gone to war on a lie. The net effect of the mainstream media's ongoing cover up of the 9/11 attacks has been to mislead the British public and foster support for the wars based on misinformation and lack of good information.

Over one million innocent people have died as a result, including over 400 British service men and women, and thousands more seriously injured. To this day British Soldiers are still dying as

a result of that lie. The BBC and the rest of British mainstream media have willfully supported this version of events despite having all the evidence which proves it to be false.

This matter goes beyond party politics. MPs are expected to lead the country with honour and integrity especially when war is the issue. It is clearly within your remit to investigate this and you have a moral duty not to send further soldiers and civilians to their deaths based on a lie.

The current Leveson Inquiry has demonstrated just how underhand and corrupt the mainstream media can be, and consequently this has become the biggest news story in Britain over the past year. The House Media Committee at the House of Commons should be truly commended for its role in the Leveson Inquiry. However, the willful cover up by the BBC, and the rest of the British media, of the true facts of 9/11 will dwarf the Leveson Inquiry in the level of political controversy. With this in mind, surely the House Media Committee should be interested in looking into this matter further.

The BBC has provided cover for murderers and must share in the responsibility for the deaths of those 400 soldiers and uncounted victims in the Middle East. Unless the Committee steps in to take swift, effective action you must also share in that blame. British soldiers are dying at the rate of 1 a week in Afghanistan. With a draw-down of military operations by December 2014 that means you can expect a death toll of a further 130 soldiers. You can save those deaths in Parliament by simply alerting the British public to both sides of the 9/11 account and see what effect that has on public opinion for our continued presence in Afghanistan.

The BBC Editorial Guidelines "apply to all of our content whoever creates or makes it and wherever and however it is received. They set out the standards expected of everyone making or presenting the BBC's output." The BBC's Editorial Values promise truth, accuracy, and impartiality in all of its programs. By committing to these Editorial Values the BBC has set a high standard which, if followed, would enable the BBC to earn credibility worldwide as a trusted news source. No American news organization sets such a high standard for the quality and integrity of its news.

The BBC has not adhered to these requirements in the various documentaries that the BBC has aired about 9/11. In fact, the BBC has presented information that is scientifically inaccurate in support of the official version of the events at the World Trade Center that day while failing to include scientifically accurate information which validates the conclusion of these experts that explosive controlled demolitions brought down the Twin Towers and Building 7.

Although BBC has a detailed editorial complaints procedure, complaints and appeals filed by 3 UK residents - namely Paul Warburton, Adrian Mallett, and Peter Drew (collectively, the "complainants") - in connection with BBC's 9/11 coverage have been improperly rejected by the BBC Executive Board. Over 600 letters in support of these complaints were sent last month to the BBC Trust and to MP Tom Watson but the Executive Board has probably not allowed the Trustees to see them. The BBC Trust is supposed to hear certain appeals and ought to hear this one but 1 or 2 individuals on the Executive Board can prevent that, making the entire Editorial

Guidelines inapplicable. The truth of 9/11 is too important a subject to be derailed and finally settled by ill-intentioned insiders in the Executive Board.

I support the positions that the complainants have taken with regard to the following:

1. When discussing the collapse of the Twin Towers in "9/11: Conspiracy Road Trip" a Lego model is used in an unscientific attempt to demonstrate how the top of the tower was allegedly able to drive down through the structure underneath it at close to free fall acceleration simply because the top piece of the tower had tilted to one side. If the producers of the documentary had provided a fair and impartial assessment of this situation and put this theory to a qualified architect or engineer to discuss, then they would have certainly received a scientific response demonstrating how this is impossible. The top 30 floors of the tower, which broke off as a single block and began to rotate as it fell, would have fallen through the path of least resistance, namely off the side of the building, not through the path of greatest resistance through the building structure directly below. I submit that for the BBC to not allow comment about this theory from an expert constitutes a failure to be fair, accurate, and impartial. If the documentary was actually seeking to take a fair and impartial view when discussing how the Twin Towers may have collapsed as a result of the impact of the planes and the subsequent fires, where was the counterbalancing discussion and evidence for the alternative explanation regarding the use of explosive controlled demolition, for which there is abundant scientific evidence? Since there was no discussion about the scientific evidence supporting this alternative explanation, the five participants on the show did not have an opportunity to weigh the evidence appropriately or make an informed and fair judgment. Nor did the BBC viewers. I fail to see how such an approach can be considered fair, accurate, and impartial.

2. Neither documentary makes any mention of the absolutely critical point that in November, 2008 in its final report NIST (the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which was authorized by the U.S. government to determine "why and how WTC 7 collapsed") admitted that the collapse of WTC Building 7 did in fact occur at free fall acceleration for at least some of the collapse. (See the Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7, NIST NCSTAR 1A, page 48, which states: "A more detailed analysis of the descent of the north face found . . . (2) a freefall descent over approximately eight stories at gravitational acceleration for approximately 2.25 s. . . . .")

This was a reversal of the original position taken by NIST on this issue in the August, 2008 draft of its report. This is an extremely important point that would have to be included in any fair and accurate discussion about the collapse of Building 7. For a symmetrical free fall collapse to occur means that all of the supporting columns of the building must have failed at almost exactly the same time, and this can only occur through carefully controlled demolition using well timed explosives. Why was this crucial point not even mentioned by either of the documentaries?

Also, why has the BBC failed to correct the error that was in a previous BBC documentary in 2007 "The Conspiracy Files – The Truth Behind the Third Tower"? In that documentary the BBC attempted to demonstrate that the pace of collapse of Building 7 was not at free fall

acceleration. It has since been proven that free fall did in fact occur for at least 100 feet and this was admitted by NIST as described above. This is a point of huge importance to the discussion because free fall of a tower can only occur through controlled demolition using explosives. Why was this error not corrected and why was this extremely important point not discussed in subsequent BBC documentaries, including the two documentaries that have been highlighted in the complaints?

3. Niels Harrit, Ph.D. was treated in a most inappropriate and unfair manner by the BBC's Michael Rudin in their May 2011 interview where Dr. Harrit discussed the finding of traces of nanothermitic energetic materials in the dust of the WTC towers. Dr. Harrit teaches Chemistry at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark. He is the primary author of a peer reviewed paper concluding that an energetic material called "nanothermite" was present in dust from the World Trade Center ["Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe" (*The Open Chemical Physics Journal*, 2009, 2, 7-31), http://www.benthamscience.com/open/tocpj/articles/V002/7TOCPJ.htm].

In this interview Mr. Rudin obviously had an agenda to discredit Dr. Harrit right from the start and to support the official 9/11 story, as opposed to using the interview in a fair and impartial way to hear the scientific evidence that Dr. Harrit had on this subject. In anticipation of this Dr. Harrit took the precautionary approach of requesting to have his own independent filming of the interview in addition to the BBC filming. This request was initially vigorously declined by Mr. Rudin who later relented only when it was clear that Dr. Harrit would not agree to do the interview without the independent filming. That independent filming clearly showed Dr. Harrit being harassed throughout the interview. His statements about the scientific evidence were ridiculed by Mr. Rudin despite Dr. Harrit's evidence having been properly independently verified and published in a peer reviewed scientific journal. Tellingly, the BBC chose not to include Dr. Harrit's assessment of the official story regarding the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building 7. It is not too late to air Dr. Harrit's assessment and doing so would be an appropriate remedy.

On these specific issues I give my full support to the complaints that have been lodged with the BBC by Mr. Warburton, Mr. Mallett, and Mr. Drew.

In addition, I would point out that the BBC has failed to present to the public a huge amount of other evidence which clearly contradicts the official story of the collapse of the three WTC towers. The official story that the public has been given about what happened on 9/11 is not based on hard evidence, as Dr. Harrit pointed out in his interview with the BBC. AE911Truth has meticulously pieced together a step-by-step process for scientifically and logically analyzing the collapse of the Twin Towers.

Here are a few of the crucial scientific facts and eye witness accounts which contradict the official story and support the contention that (1) it is physically impossible for the Twin Towers and Building 7 to have come down as alleged in the official story, and that (2) the three buildings

were instead brought down by explosive controlled demolition:

- Symmetrical free fall acceleration (confirmed by NIST) which is only possible through explosive controlled demolition
- Temperatures far too low to weaken a steel structure (no high rise building has ever collapsed from fire)
- Incendiary/explosive material – nanothermite – found throughout numerous WTC dust samples from all three buildings
- The 180,000 of tons of concrete and 220 acres of metal floor decking from the Twin Towers was pulverized to fine dust and small pieces. A gravitational collapse could not have released anywhere near sufficient energy to achieve this result, especially while also bringing down the collapsing portions at or near free-fall acceleration. Indeed, this result could only have been achieved by adding huge amounts of additional energy, for example, through the use of explosives.
- 118 documented eye witness accounts either seeing or hearing explosives in the Twin Towers at the onset of destruction of the Twin Towers.
- Pools of molten iron and/or steel were found in the piles of all three buildings. It requires temperatures of over 2,700 degrees Fahrenheit to melt iron or steel, whereas jet fuel and office fires burning without enough oxygen for complete combustion – as evidenced by the copious smoke coming from the towers – do not produce temperatures even close to that.

AE911Truth has provided abundant hard scientific evidence which contradicts the official story that has been told to the public with regards the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building 7. According to this scientific evidence the official story of 9/11 is nothing short of an impossibility. What the BBC has shown with its documentaries about 9/11 has not provided scientific accuracy and impartiality. Instead, the BBC has supported the official account of 9/11 with untenable "evidence" while taking pains to omit scientifically accurate information that contradicts the official account. For all these reasons, I fully support the complainants' request to meet with the Committee to present their arguments and evidence and answer your questions.

In sum, there is an enormous amount of information available about the destruction at the World Trade Center on 9/11 that the public has not been shown by the BBC.

The BBC could fulfill its commitments in the Charter, Agreement and Editorial Guidelines to truth, accuracy and impartiality on the subject of the 9/11 attacks by airing one or more of the excellent documentaries that AE911Truth has produced: "9/11: Blueprint for Truth – The Architecture of Destruction" and "Architects & Engineers - Solving the Mystery of WTC 7"

These documentaries fairly examine all of the scientific evidence that has been gathered and include my presentation demonstrating the step-by-step scientific methodology that has been implemented in analyzing the cause of the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building 7.

If the BBC is deliberately withholding evidence that proves that Britain has been taken into two wars on the basis of substantially false information, then surely that is an issue of extremely high importance for the issue of media ethics, and for the maintenance of freedom and democracy.

It has come down to this: Mr. Drew, Mr. Warburton and Mr. Mallett have been trying for months to get the BBC to acknowledge the obvious — that the BBC's 9/11 documentaries were biased, inaccurate and misleading. Yet the Executive Board has improperly rejected those complaints at every turn. It is up to the Culture, Media and Sport Committee to step in and take decisive action because the BBC has failed to uphold its very important responsibilities and commitments to the public through their Royal Charter, Agreement and Editorial Guidelines.

On behalf of Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth I respectfully request:

#1) Will the Committee meet with Mr. Drew, Mr. Warburton and Mr. Mallett so that they can present their arguments and evidence and answer your questions?

#2) Will the Committee conduct its own inquiry into the BBC's reporting and lack of reporting on the 9/11 attacks to determine how well BBC has complied with its Royal Charter, Agreement, Editorial Guidelines and Editorial Values?

Will you reply so that I know you received this letter?

My email address is RGage@AE911Truth.org

Yours sincerely,

Richard Gage, AIA
Member, American Institute of Architects
Founder and CEO
Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth
AE911Truth.org