

“9/11: The Conspiracy Files,” The BBC Joins the Ranks of the Untrustworthy United States Media

Review article

By [Debbie Lewis](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

Global Research, February 24, 2013

24 February 2007

More than five years after the disaster of September 11, 2001, England’s BBC stepped into the ring of media outlets airing programs about the tragedy that is now referred to as “9/11” on February 18, 2007. The program, entitled “9/11: The Conspiracy Files,” took the time to interview some well-known Americans on both sides of the 9/11 argument. The hour-long program looked as if it might reveal something worthwhile, for about nine minutes. Guests like the outspoken Alex Jones, 911 Scholars for Truth Co-Founder Dr. Jim Fetzer, and Loose Change producer Dylan Avery actually got to make several excellent points before the real conspiracy was revealed.

At about eight minutes into the program, the narrator began to talk about the happenings of that catastrophic day. She told of that day’s United States Air Defense Command exercise and the mishaps that caused between Civil Air Traffic Control and the military getting the interceptors scrambled. The narrator went on to tell of the confusion of the interceptor pilots, not knowing in what direction they were to fly, and some flying the wrong direction. Further into the program she said “They found plenty of evidence of confusion and chaos, but no deliberate attempt to mislead the public...” You would think if the military was conducting an “exercise” and were costing the taxpayers money by using real planes, they would KNOW where their planes were, they would have alerted Civil Air Traffic Control, and there would be no confusion.

As if the BBC knew they were rubbing salt in the wounds of those seeking only the truth, they also interspersed comments by Davin Coburn, Researcher for Popular Mechanics Magazine. Coburn and Popular Mechanics, if you recall Charles Goyette’s August 23, 2006 show, claim World Trade Center Building 7, which was not hit by a plane that day and yet still “collapsed,” was “scooped out” by the falling debris of the Twin Towers. Scooped out? They made this claim, yet provided no proof. Goyette even went so far as to say that the owner of those photos let a magazine publisher view them but would not allow others searching for truth to view them, stating in his frustration, “I didn’t know they had different classes of citizens!”

The program narrator talked about the collapse of Building 7 and how “...with so much else going on that day, the event was barely reported...” Could this be the reason, nearly five years later, 43% of those polled by Zogby in May 2006 were unaware that Building 7 had collapsed? In the same pole, 48% of those polled said they did not think the government or the 9/11 Commission were “covering up” anything. Taking these two bits of information into account, would it be safe to speculate that if the 43% of people unaware of the Building 7 collapse WERE aware, would that alter the percentage of people who thought the

government and 9/11 Commission were "covering" something up?

It was clear that the tone of "9/11: The Conspiracy Files" was going against exposure of the truth when they began talking about the collapse of Building 7. Before Coburn was brought back on camera to explain the collapse, the program showed a couple of shots of other buildings being "demolished." The program narrator commented that the collapse looks very similar to the "demolitions" they aired. Coburn also showed a video of the Building 7 collapse. The cameraman shooting Coburn's interview made the comment that "it does look exactly like a controlled demolition" yet Coburn went on to say that he could see why people felt that way, but if they knew how the building was constructed and supported itself, along with the damage it sustained from the collapse of the towers, "the idea that it was a demolition holds no water." Why did Building 7 "collapse" but not the buildings closer to the towers? Why was Building 7 a "raging inferno" but not the buildings closer to the towers? There were diesel storage tanks in Building 7, but a plane didn't hit it. There was no jet fuel to ignite a fire there. How did Building 7 get "scooped out" but not the buildings closer to the towers?

The program went on to discuss the crash at the Pentagon. While the program admits the hole left by the Boeing 757 that slammed into the Pentagon was a mere 18 to 20 feet across, they claim that the building collapsed only "minutes later." In actuality, it took nearly thirty minutes later to collapse. Photographic evidence of this is very clear from the documentary "911 In Plane Site." What can also be clearly seen in this documentary, the first of it's kind providing video images and asking brutally revealing questions about all the plane crashes that day, is that there is no debris consistent with the crash of a plane of that size and weight, fully fueled, on the lawn of the Pentagon. No fuselage, no wing parts, no engines, no tail section, no luggage, no passengers; nothing of the sort. Allyn Kilsheimer, one of those who came to help that day, claims he saw "a tire and a wheel and a fuselage section...pieces of...molten metal, that came from something as it hit the building." It is very clear, from the video evidence shown in "In Plane Site" that there is NO fuselage section. View the preview for the documentary "911 In Plane Site" at www.911inplanesite.com, and you will further understand the outrageous claim that a Boeing 757 hit the Pentagon.

Lt. Col Steve O'Brien, a C-130 Pilot, was in the air that day over Washington D.C. He saw a "distinctive silver" plane roll into about "30 to 40 degrees of bank, which is considerable for a commercial airliner." Dr. Fetzer states - "...the story is inconsistent with the evidence we had. It's not even physically possible, given the laws of aerodynamics, that a Boeing 757 could have taken the trajectory attributed to it, which I assume he confirmed, which was this plane barely skimmed the ground en route to it's target. That's not even physically possible."

Near the end of the program, Senator Bob Graham is interviewed. He had quite a lot to say in just a few sentences. "I can just state that within 9/11 there are too many secrets, that is information that has not been made available to the public for which there are specific, tangible, credible answers and that withholding of those secrets has eroded public confidence in their government as it relates to their own security...embarrassment, apology, regret, those are not characteristics associated with the current White House...if, by conspiracy, you mean more than one person involved, yes, there was more than one person, and there was some collaboration of efforts among agencies and the administration to keep information out of the public's hands." The narrator of the program ended with "The other 9/11 Conspiracy theories are just that, theories. The evidence doesn't support them."

Civil Justice Foundation award winner and Transportation Safety Consultant Paul Sheridan has been an example to many Americans. Sheridan has written many people in search of answers, including then Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and former New York Attorney General, now Governor Eliot Spitzer. He wants, on behalf of all United States citizens, answers to some very simple questions. From Rumsfeld, as a witness at the Pentagon that day to confirm there is “no doubt in your mind that American Airlines Flight 77... Boeing 757 passenger aircraft” hit the Pentagon on 9/11. From Spitzer, Sheridan wants to know why Governor Spitzer will not allow the “common people...such access” to the photographs seen by Popular Mechanics. Sheridan goes on to ask how, in the light of the existence of such photograph’s that could “prove” what happened on 9/11, “The People’s Lawyer” can “allow such an outrage to go unresolved; legally, morally and in the context of compassion and respect for the 9/11 victims and their families?”

As the narrator points out in the program, “...many simply don’t accept the official conclusion, however distressing that may be for the relatives of those who died.” The relatives of those who died in the 9/11 tragedy have a right to know what really happened, as do the relatives of the service men and women being sent to Iraq to be slaughtered, daily, for this unfounded “War on Terrorism,” as do the United States Citizens, who are being asked to give up many of our freedoms, in light of these “terrorist attacks.” Dr. Fetzer proudly states that like all American Military officers, he took his oath to “protect, preserve and defend the Constitution of the United States from all enemies foreign and domestic.” President George W. Bush, as every President before him, took the same oath before stepping into office. Fetzer just didn’t think defending the Constitution “would lead in this direction.”

Early in the program, Dr. Fetzer reveals the true conspiracy, “The very idea that 19 Islamic fundamentalists...hijacked these four commercial airliners, outfoxed the most sophisticated air defense system in the world, perpetrated these atrocities, unscathed, under control of a man in a cave in Afghanistan is only the most outrageous of the conspiracy...” In the documentary “One Nation Under Siege,” Journalist and author Jim Marrs agrees with Dr. Fetzer. “Nineteen Muslim fanatics...bypassed our forty billion dollar defense system...hi-jacked four planes...were totally lost from FAA Radar... satellite radar and NORAD Radar, made their way to New York and crashed into two prominent landmarks... the World Trade Center...another one crashed into the Pentagon...another one crashed in Pennsylvania, and all of this under the direction of a Muslim Cleric hiding in a cave in Afghanistan with a computer. Now, if that isn’t about the craziest conspiracy theory I ever heard...” “911 In Plane Site” and “One Nation Under Siege” producer William Lewis says in light of this world wide war on terrorism, effecting people worldwide, “someone really needs to ask the question ‘Why haven’t we been given all the facts?’”

Link to the BBC Program:
<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8331629640228117189&q=BBC+%22Conspiracy+Files%22&hl=en>

Link to letters written to Rumsfeld and Spitzer by Paul Sheridan:

<http://www.spingola.com/Paul%20Sheridan.htm>

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Debbie Lewis](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca