

After This Fiasco, How Can We Trust Anything They Told Us About 9/11?

BBC and CNN had advanced knowledge of collapse of WTC Building Seven

By [Paul Joseph Watson](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Terrorism](#)

Global Research, March 07, 2007

Prison Planet 7 March 2007



After This Fiasco, How Can We Trust Anything They Told Us About 9/11?

The BBC Building 7 farce lends about as much credibility to the official story of 9/11 as weapons of mass destruction do for justifying the invasion of Iraq

Paul Joseph Watson

[Prison Planet](#)

Tuesday, February 27, 2007

```
digg_url = 'http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/february2007/270207trustanything.htm';  
digg_title = 'After This Fiasco, How Can We Trust Anything They Told Us About 9/11?';  
digg_bodytext = 'The fiasco of a BBC journalist reporting in advance that Building 7 had collapsed as it loomed large behind her strikes at the very root of how the media were complicit in acting as facilitators for the official myth that was manufactured on 9/11. After this debacle, how can we trust anything we were told about September 11?';  
digg_topic = 'politics';
```

The fiasco of a BBC journalist reporting in advance that Building 7 had collapsed as it loomed large behind her strikes at the very root of how the media were complicit in acting as facilitators for the official myth that was manufactured on 9/11. After this debacle, how can we trust anything we were told about September 11?

Though the video was almost immediately purged by the crowned kings of censorship - Google - it has since been re-uploaded to You Tube and feverishly copied everywhere. Watch the clip below. For an extended clip where the Building 7 farce is clearly annotated, [click here](#), and skip forward to 14 minutes.

A central facet of the debate raging amongst 9/11 truthers and a charge leveled by moronic debunkers is that there is no time code or clock on the video, so how can we verify the BBC reported Building 7's collapse 20 minutes before it fell?

Does it matter? Does it matter if the BBC reported the collapse 23 minutes before it happened or 30 seconds before it happened? The fact remains that the building is there in the background behind the reporter's head as she is telling us that it has already collapsed! Don't get tangled up in this minutia, the building is still standing after she has reported its

collapse! Debates about time stamps and time zones are irrelevant.

Others charge that Building 7 was expected to collapse before it did, which is true, and the BBC merely jumped the gun – but that begs the question – how did officials know the building was going to collapse when no modern steel building in history had collapsed from fire damage alone and why were the BBC reporting its collapse in advance with the *added knowledge* of why it collapsed – a question that is still being investigated by NIST five and a half years later? Whoever the BBC’s source was for reporting the collapse of Building 7 were ahead of NIST by five and a half years and had already determined why the building had collapsed *before* it had collapsed. Is this not in the least bit suspicious?

CNN had also been told the building was about to collapse, as is made clear below.

What seems obvious is that Silverstein was getting the cover story out as quickly as possible before the building was intentionally demolished, and that’s how they were so sure it was going to collapse before it eventually did. In addition, NYPD officer Craig Bartmer [reported hearing bombs tear down the building](#) as he ran away from it.

Debunkers have scoffed at our suggestion that some kind of press release had to have been issued for the BBC to report this ahead of time. Well how else do you suggest the BBC learned of the building’s demise before it happened? A psychic premonition?

This goes to the very heart of why the mainstream media is stuttering and the alternative is burgeoning – the establishment press have become nothing more than ditto heads of the official version of events to the point where they don’t even perform a cursory investigation of what they are being told by official sources. Their role is simply to repeat what the authorities tell them with no scrutiny whatsoever.

Nowhere was this more evident than on 9/11 when the corporate media mechanically relayed the ‘Osama did it’ fraud within hours of the attack, and afforded copious air time to [highly suspicious individuals who just happened to know the intricate details of how each building collapsed within minutes of it occurring](#). This was key to solidifying the dogma of the official story, because anyone who saw the collapse of WTC 7 without having had the official propaganda drilled into them could see plain as day that it was a controlled demolition.



Indeed, [controlled demolitions expert Danny Jowenko](#), unaware that the structure had collapsed on 9/11, immediately concluded that Building 7 had been deliberately demolished when he was shown the footage by a Dutch television crew, and [maintains that position](#) to this day.

The BBC Building 7 fiasco lends about as much credibility to the official story of 9/11 as weapons of mass destruction do for the justification of invading Iraq.

Besides the advance reporting of just the collapse itself, how could the news anchor tell us the reason for the collapse before it happened?

“This was not the result of a new attack,” states the anchor, “It was because the building

had been weakened during this morning's attacks."

How else could the BBC have relayed this information unless by way of some kind of press release or official statement by Silverstein, Giuliani or the NYFD? Who told them that the building had been weakened? In effect, the BBC were working to a 9/11 script and made the error of orating their lines too early.

This damning video is also a commentary on the credibility and impartiality of the BBC as a whole, especially in light of their ludicrously [bias, slanted and error ridden Conspiracy Files hit piece](#) that aired last Sunday. Perhaps [debunker-in-chief Guy Smith can explain](#) to us how his colleague prophesied the downfall of a building that, almost mockingly, appears in full view behind her head before the live feed is conveniently interrupted.



24 hours after the video first surfaced and was then unceremoniously "pulled" from Google Video (but not before it went viral everywhere else), there is still no response from the BBC and no mainstream coverage whatsoever, not even a 'look what the silly conspiracy theorists are saying' puff piece.

It seems our noble press whores are more concerned today about Helen Mirren eating a beef burger and James Cameron's fictional Jesus tomb.

What if we had unearthed footage of a CNN anchor reporting the collapse of the twin towers as he stood below them? Would that be enough to provoke any interest? How about Dick Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld announcing a joint press conference in which they admit they ran the attack? No doubt the noisy negativists would find some harebrained reason to dismiss that also.

Where is the BBC's clarification on this? How about Industrial Risk Insurers, surely they would be interested to find out that Silverstein was rapaciously anticipating their \$861 million payout *before* Building 7 "accidentally" collapsed?

Our sense of outrage on this matter should not be quelled by time and the stubbornness of official channels, namely the BBC and whoever their source for reporting the collapse was, to answer for, in the case of the BBC, their hideous "mistake," and the source for exactly how they were able to predict that a modern steel building that had suffered limited fire damage would suddenly collapse in its own footprint without the aid of explosive demolition.

The original source of this article is Prison Planet
Copyright © [Paul Joseph Watson](#), Prison Planet, 2007

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Paul Joseph
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

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