

## 911 Truthers Should Thank Fox News

Laughable weekly attempts at debunking only give the movement more credibility

By [Steve Watson](#)

Global Research, May 11, 2007

[Infowars.net](#) 11 May 2007

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

✘ In their typical style of reporting news two weeks later than the rest of us, the mainstream media, in the shape of Fox news, has finally caught up with the alternative media in reporting the story [we first broke here on April 23rd](#) that John Kerry recently referred to the collapse of WTC building 7 on 9/11 as having been “done in a controlled fashion”.

In another “fair and balanced” piece Alan Colmes and Sean Hannity again weakly attempted to debunk the inside job evidence while at the same time making themselves look like the playground bullies everyone else has outgrown and now points to and laughs at.

Colmes began by stating “The 9/11 conspiracy wingnuts are it again”. So let us be as equally fair and balanced by beginning this analysis with the following...

The corporate hack establishment government lapdog media whores are at it again.

Colmes and Hannity attempted to spin what John Kerry had said to hoodwink their doped up viewers into thinking that Kerry was not referring to building 7 and that his words had been taken completely out of context.

The dynamic duo then went on to falsely claim that “9/11 conspiracy crazies” had fallen in ‘love” with Kerry, stating “This time, they are spinning the words of Senator John Kerry to suggest that the former presidential nominee in some way endorses those conspiracy theories.

First of all it is beyond question that Kerry, speaking at a book launch in Austin two weeks ago, was specifically referring to building 7.

Kerry was asked about an investigation into WTC7 and the connection with leasehold Larry Silverstein who publicly stated that the “decision was made to pull it,” a term that refers to controlled demolition. In response Kerry said:

“I don’t believe there’s been a formal investigation. I haven’t heard that; I don’t know that. I do know that that wall, I remember, was in danger and I think they made the decision based on the danger that it had in destroying other things- that they did it in a controlled fashion. You know he’s part of the construction- effort for the memorial and the use of the land, etc. There’s been a long tug-of-war going on in New York and I’ve not been following every aspect of it because it’s not in my jurisdiction, so to speak. But I’ll check on the

story- I'll take a look at it based on what you've said. You're the first people anywhere in the country who've brought this to my attention."

Here is the video:

Instead of showing the entire clip, Fox showed only a portion and then suggested that Kerry was not referring to 7 at all but was referring to other buildings that had to be brought down and cleared in the weeks and months AFTER 9/11.

This is clearly not what Kerry was referring to as the question he is specifically asked begins "World Trade Center 7 was brought down on 9/11 at 5.20 in the evening..." and he responds by stating that he was under the impression that the authorities brought down the building purposefully.

In the week that followed the story some attempted, in a similar fashion to Colmes, to suggest that Kerry had been misquoted and was talking about a wall that had been demolished on 9/11. This is inaccurate. When he says "that wall was in danger" he is referring to the slurry wall, the below ground level wall that was constructed to support the soils surrounding the basements of the World Trade Center buildings. The wall created a watertight environment for construction and throughout the service life of the Center, effectively preventing the Hudson river from pouring in beneath ground level. It was this wall that was in danger when the towers collapsed, not this wall that was "demolished in a controlled fashion" as some debunkers claimed Kerry was saying.

Colmes then proceeded to suggest that somehow 9/11 truthers have suggested that John Kerry supports the "conspiracy theories". At no point did anyone suggest that Kerry had done such a thing.

In our article two weeks ago, in which we tirelessly [covered the evidence for controlled demolition once again](#), we wrote "Whether Kerry is basing his response on inside knowledge or hearsay is largely irrelevant, the fact that a sitting United States Senator is openly contradicting the official 9/11 story as well as a multi-billion dollar insurance lawsuit strikes at the root of the controversy surrounding Building 7."

Bringing in 9/11 researcher Webster Tarpley, it quickly became obvious that he was there to be baited, attacked and discredited. Tarpley was afforded no chance to speak for more than a few seconds and was used as a vehicle by the anchors to once again without any debate attempt to discredit 9/11 truth as a whole and sweep the John Kerry remarks under the rug at the same time.

Colmes started off contemptuous toward Tarpley but within the first minute became downright hostile and insulting. "To claim that somehow John Kerry supports your cockamamie theories is absolutely insane," Colmes said in a raised voice.

Tarpley said he wanted nothing to do with John Kerry who, Tarpley claimed, is "a dilettante, an oligarch, he's a rich elitist, his wife with her foundations,"

Colmes interrupted and said derisively, "Stop the cheap shots. You're making cheap shots now," covering for the fact that his earlier lie about the 9/11 truth movement embracing Kerry had just been blown out of the water.

Colmes then immediately resorted to his own cheap shot and accused Tarpley (without any evidence) of “further hurting the families who have suffered enough because of 9/11, to have to sit and listen to this garbage you’re putting out.”

A tired and overused accusation that is rolled out again and again by debunkers who cannot debate the facts. In reality exactly the opposite is true as the vast majority of 9/11 victims’ families also believe they have been roundly lied to and, according to the representative of the biggest families union [Bill Doyle](#), are firmly in the 9/11 truth camp.

Colmes went on to cite the [now thoroughly debunked Popular Mechanics article](#) analyzing what caused the collapse. “That’s what caused it to come down, not some kind of crazy, government theory to hurt the American people,” he stated in a possible Freudian slip.

A frothing and frantic Colmes then proceeded trot out all manner of ludicrous claims such as “25% of the depth of the building was gone” then suggesting that it was a fifth floor fire that burnt for 7 hours that caused the collapse, then switching again and suggesting it was “the construction of the building and the weight of the columns”, another “cockamamie” theory that is actually in [direct contradiction to reality](#).

Colmes seemed utterly desperate to promulgate the official myth of how building 7 collapsed with reference a number of different claims, all of which have been thoroughly debunked.

✘ Hannity then attempted to bait Tarpley and draw him into a trap by saying “but we saw pictures of the planes hitting these buildings” knowing that Tarpley would urgently try to correct him that a plane did not hit 7. Hannity, giving himself away by being totally calm and collected and simply speaking over Tarpley, knew that this would make it seem to uninformed viewers that Tarpley was disagreeing and therefore suggesting that no planes hit any of the buildings. Hannity then seized on the moment by declaring “Webster, Webster, take a deep breath and I will educate you” making Tarpley seem like a ranting raving paranoid delusional.

Reference was then made to the NIST report which states that some of the building was hit with falling debris from the north tower. Hannity failed to mention however that this was not declared to be the catalyst for the collapse of the building and that [NIST and is currently undertaking a study](#) of WTC 7 to determine if bombs or incendiary devices were used to bring it down.

Hannity then repeated Colmes’s cheap “your hurting the families” jibe and declared that there is no evidence that building 7 was brought down in a controlled demolition.

Colmes then ended the segment with an attempt to make Tarpley look even more idiotic by asking him if he thinks there is more than one Bin Laden. Tarpley was obviously previously referring to the fact that the infamous video in which Bin Laden “confesses” to 9/11 has [been certified as a complete fake](#), and stars someone who is clearly not Bin Laden. In Bin Laden’s first video release after 9/11 he [categorically denied having anything to do with the attacks](#), not something you’d expect from a man who it was reported had previously declared war on America.

Despite their bait and attack tactics, any rational neutral who happened to see the piece can

only have gone away with the impression that it was Colmes who was the paranoid frothing delusional on this issue. We should thank Fox news for lavishing the 9/11 truth movement with attention every week and being the catalyst for many to go away, do their own research on the issue and wake up to the 9/11 fraud while simultaneously discovering that once again the government mouthpiece corporate media is providing its audience with nothing but bare faced lies it is then forced to bolster with endless pathetic spin and cockamamie smear.

The original source of this article is [Infowars.net](http://Infowars.net)  
Copyright © [Steve Watson](http://Steve Watson), [Infowars.net](http://Infowars.net), 2007

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Steve Watson](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)