

Complaint: **CAS-6241179-K0Y8J5** 7/13/21

I'm disappointed with BBC's/Radio 4's response to my complaint concerning the Aug 2020 "How They Made Us Doubt Everything" Ep. 6: Reposition Global Warming as theory, not fact" because only one of my points was addressed [essentially incorrectly] at the episode's webpage, while BBC/Radio 4 doesn't dispute what I said about the three other errors in the broadcast. I'm baffled about why BBC/Radio 4 doesn't seem to comprehend the depth of those errors and their effect on what the public perceived from the podcast. At a basic level, the Episode asserted that fossil fuel companies duped the public, but the 'evidence' for that from the guest, ex-Greenpeace staffer Kert Davies, did NOT prove that assertion true.

BBC/Radio 4 admits Davies added a racially charged label into wording of an alleged 'leaked industry memo', but the online 'correction' now at Radio 4's page states, "It is in fact a paraphrase of what is said in the [ Informed Citizens for the Environment ] report." I illustrate the big problem with BBC's/Radio 4's "paraphrase" label there by asking a simple question: Is "God save the Queen" a paraphrase of "God save the WHITE Queen"? Additionally, this so-called correction is posted beyond the "Show more" hyperlink at Radio 4's page, such that few will ever see it. Worse, BBC/Radio 4 attributes the leaked memo to the "Informed Citizens for the Environment," which is a name the actual "Information Council for the Environment" public relations campaign rejected along with the rest of the strategy / audience targeting proposal memo set.

Regarding the three other basic errors: first, in the final BBC Complaints stage 1 email response, BBC/Radio 4 doesn't dispute my contention that radio show host Rush Limbaugh's long ago ad was never read in a live broadcast to his entire nationwide audience. But when any objective but otherwise uninformed listener hears what guest Kert Davies said, how would they NOT perceive that it was heard by millions, and that Limbaugh was an active participant in a disinformation effort? In his August 3, 2020 national broadcast response to Radio 4's broadcast about him, he said he didn't know Radio 4 tried to contact him, and didn't even remember the ad.

As for the other two major errors, BBC/Radio 4 does not dispute that the two 'leaked memo sets', the "reposition global warming" set and the "victory will be achieved set" were literally never implemented by anyone, and actually restated a line from the podcast that the "victory" 'plan' was never implemented. Well, why mention that particular memo set at all?? Making matters worse for the podcast's implication that proof exists of disinformation campaigns, in the final email response from BBC Complaints stage 1, BBC/Radio 4 stated, "whether they were actively implemented or not is a moot point ... The key thing is that such a strategy was even being considered, researched and put up for consideration at all."

I illustrate the giant problem with BBC's/Radio 4's 'key thing' idea there with this: if a "Disinfo strategy plan" memo set was presented to the BBC on an experiment of deliberately spreading false news to see how many ignorant people repeat it, and the BBC rejected it and/or never implemented it, but the memo set was later leaked to Fox News in the U.S. and widely touted elsewhere as 'evidence' that news outlets spread fake news, could Fox News legitimately claim the "Disinfo strategy plan" memo set they quote proves the BBC lies to the public?

The answer is, of course not. I insert my above 'new point' here in order to say how it greatly disappoints me that BBC/Radio 4 failed to consider that point as a devil's advocate thing they could have posed to themselves, to see if their defense statement about on "implemented vs. never-implemented" really is a moot point.

How does this get resolved? BBC ECU needs to objectively ask if 1) an egregiously racially-charged word insertion is no more than a paraphrase of any straight statement; 2) if it was actually perceived by listeners that Rush Limbaugh read a 'disinformation' ad to his live radio audience of millions; and 3) / 4) if ECU's own independent research into the literal reach of the "reposition global warming" / "victory will be achieved" memo sets reveals whether any information — disinformation or otherwise — was ever conveyed to any public audience, anywhere. If NONE of what I call the four egregious errors are evidence of disinformation campaigns, I suggest that BBC not only put out a nationwide broadcast announcement that it retracts all insinuations implied by that Radio 4 broadcast and by guest Kert Davies, but also that BBC should consider using this investigative journalism opportunity to mount a serious investigation into Kert Davies' long-term association with other enviro-activists who promulgated the 'crooked skeptic scientists' accusation specifically based on those two worthless never-implemented memo sets.