

How Did They Know? Examining 9/11 Foreknowledge of WTC Building 7's Destruction

By [Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#)

Global Research, March 22, 2015

Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth

Region: [USA](#)

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

by **Dennis McMahon, J.D., L.L.M. Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth**

WTC Building 7, also known as the Salomon Brothers Building or WTC 7, was a 47-story skyscraper that was part of the World Trade Center complex. Built in 1984, Building 7 would have been the tallest high-rise in thirty-three of our United States. Building 7 housed several intelligence and law enforcement agencies, and the NYC Office of Emergency Management's Emergency Operations Center, more commonly known as "Giuliani's Bunker," along with several major financial institutions.



BBC correspondent Jane Standley reported the destruction of WTC 7 before it collapsed - even though the building was still standing behind her.

Building 7, which was 100 yards from the Twin Towers, was not hit by an airplane on September 11, 2001, and suffered only minimal damage from debris falling from the North Tower. Several fires began burning on a few floors, and the entire building completely collapsed - almost into its own footprint - at 5:20 p.m. Numerous eyewitnesses, including members of the Fire Department of New York (FDNY) and other first responders, and multiple news sources, made statements that indicate that there was foreknowledge that

WTC 7 was going to come down, despite the fact that no skyscraper in history had ever completely collapsed due to fire. (Much of this evidence of foreknowledge is detailed on the website of the [Remember Building 7 campaign](#) and other related sites.)

Where foreknowledge of an extremely unusual event is demonstrated, the possibility must be considered that the foreknowledge derived directly or indirectly from those who had inside information about, and/or control over, the event itself. Thus, if foreknowledge of the collapse of Building 7 can be shown, this would be a strong indication that Building 7 was subjected to controlled demolition, and that advance warning of Building 7's demise derived ultimately from those who intended to bring the building down. Thus, foreknowledge of the collapse of Building 7 is not only consistent with, but supportive of, the controlled demolition hypothesis.

Certainty of impending collapse

To worry that a damaged building might collapse in some fashion is one thing. But to be certain that it will collapse is another. A detailed study of the FDNY accounts by 9/11 researcher Graeme MacQueen shows that more than half of those who received warnings of WTC 7's collapse (where a degree of certainty can be determined from the reports) were certain or were told with certainty that Building 7 was coming down. (The figures calculate to 31 out of 58. See MacQueen's report ["Waiting for Seven..." at page 4.](#))

Early FDNY announcements of collapse

If someone were observing the fires in WTC 7 and able to determine, in the last few moments of the building's existence, that a peculiar set of circumstances was beginning to threaten the building, that would be one thing. But to receive warnings of the building's collapse well before this set of circumstances arose raises suspicion. Yet, a detailed study of the FDNY reports shows that of the thirty-three cases where the time of warning can be determined, in ten cases warnings were received two or more hours in advance, and in six cases warnings were apparently received four or more hours in advance. (See MacQueen's ["Waiting for Seven..." at page 4.](#)) In other words, the warnings came long before the unique set of circumstances had allegedly come together to cause the building's collapse.

Precise warnings of collapse

If the collapse warnings were derived from vague worries and concerns, as claimed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the warnings would not have been precise. A complete collapse, such as happened to WTC 1, WTC 2, and WTC 7 on 9/11, was unknown - unless the building was being brought down by controlled demolition. That is why FDNY member James McGlynn could say on 9/11, in reference to one of the Towers, "Any time I've heard of a collapse, it was never an entire building like this turned out to be." (See MacQueen's ["Waiting for Seven," at page 21.](#)) Nevertheless, somehow, many people knew in advance that WTC 7 would suffer an unprecedented collapse. Which begs the question, "How did they know?" Consider the following exchange from the FDNY oral histories:

- Q. "Were you there when building 7 came down in the afternoon?"
- A: "Yes"
- Q. "You were still there?"
- A. "Yes, so basically they measured out how far the building was going to come, so we knew exactly where we could stand."

- Q. “So they just put you in a safe area, safe enough for when that building came down?”
- A. “Five blocks. Five blocks away. We still could see. Exactly right on point, the cloud stopped right there.”(See MacQueen’s [“Waiting for Seven...”](#) at page 8.)



How did construction workers and police on the scene of WTC 7 that afternoon know that “The building is about to blow up”?

It is quite remarkable that a debris cloud estimate could be so precise for a collapse that was supposedly caused by unforeseen and unplanned events. Had Building 7 “tipped over,” which would have been more realistic, given the structural damage that was supposed to be the reason for its collapse, the building could actually have ended up crushing several other tall buildings, creating a destruction zone much farther away from the building.

Building 7’s collapse reported *in advance* by CNN and the BBC



Click on the image above to play the video clip...

[In this BBC video](#), correspondent Jane Standley reports that Building 7 has collapsed; meanwhile (at the 1:17 mark), a fully intact Building 7 can actually be seen — still standing — behind her. Who fed this information to Standley? Apparently, someone who had inside information about, and/or control over, the event itself, released that information to the media prematurely.



CNN's Aaron Brown searches for WTC 7 in the New York skyline after reporting that it had collapsed an hour early. The arrow points to WTC 7 - Click on the image above to play the video clip...

[In another news clip](#), while Building 7 is seen standing fully erect and showing no signs of impending trauma, CNN's Aaron Brown gives the following report: "We are getting information now that one of the other buildings, Building 7, in the World Trade Center complex, is on fire and has either collapsed or is collapsing..." Who is he "getting information" from? Again, it appears to be from someone who had inside information about, and/or control over, the event itself, and who released that information to the media prematurely. Only such an individual could have expected Building 7 to come down.

In sum, both CNN and BBC did not merely report that WTC 7 was damaged or that it might collapse. Instead, they prematurely announced the actual collapse of Building 7. No satisfactory explanation has been given about these premature announcements, which were obviously based on data fed to the announcers, apparently by an unknown person or persons who had inside information about, and/or control over, the event itself, and who bungled matters by releasing that information to the media prematurely.



Click on the image above to play the video clip...

More evidence of foreknowledge of the collapse of Building 7 [is preserved in this video](#) where an eyewitnesses can be heard saying: "Keep your eye on that building. It'll be coming down soon." And "The building is about to blow up. Move it back." And also, "We are walking back. The building is about to blow up."

These reports were later corroborated by first responder Indira Singh, who, in a radio interview about Building 7, revealed that the FDNY had stated that "We're going to have to bring it down."

Countdown...



First responder Kevin McPadden has provided key eyewitness evidence regarding the foreknowledge of WTC 7's destruction. - Click on the image above to play the video clip ...

The testimony of Kevin McPadden, an emergency medical technician and 9/11 first responder, is even more shocking. In a [taped interview](#), McPadden indicated that there was an actual countdown preceding Building 7's collapse:

"The Red Cross rep was like, he goes over and he says [to us], 'You gotta stay behind this line because they're thinking about bringing the building down.'...He goes over and he asks one of the...firefighters what was going on...He came back over with his hand over the radio and [you could hear] what sounded like a countdown. And, at the last few seconds, he took his hand off [the radio] and you heard 'three-two-one,' and he was just saying, 'Just run for your life! Just run for your life!' And then it was like another two, three seconds, you heard explosions. Like, BA-BOOOOOM! And it's like a distinct sound...BA-BOOOOOM! And you felt a rumble in the ground, like, almost like you wanted to grab onto something. That, to me, I knew that was an explosion. There was no doubt in my mind..."

NIST's Response to WTC 7 foreknowledge

NIST has tried to evade the issue of foreknowledge of WTC 7's collapse in its report on the building's destruction by implying:

- (a) that the FDNY, on the scene, saw the damage to the building caused by the collapse of WTC 1 and rationally concluded that WTC 7 might collapse; and
- (b) that an engineer, early in the day, saw the damage to the building and concluded it might collapse passing on this assessment to others (as per NIST Lead Investigator Shyam Sunder, in a discussion with Graeme MacQueen on CKNX Radio, Wingham, Ontario, on Aug. 25, 2008).

It is true that damage to WTC 7 was directly witnessed by some firefighters and, apparently, led a few (about seven) of them to worry that the building might collapse. However, the great majority (approximately fifty) who were worried about collapse did not base this worry on the physical damage but on what they were told. (See MacQueen's ["Waiting for Seven..." at page 5](#).) Moreover, while an engineer may have communicated his opinion, early in the day, that the building might collapse, neither this communication nor communications from the FDNY is sufficient to explain all of the collective evidence indicating foreknowledge of Building 7's collapse.

Individually, each of the factors discussed above indicates the possibility of foreknowledge of Building 7's collapse: the certainty of Building 7's impending collapse as expressed and memorialized in the FDNY oral histories, the early announcements made by the FDNY, the precise nature of the early announcements, CNN's and the BBC's premature reporting of Building 7's collapse, and the actual countdown to Building 7's demise. Collectively, these factors provide evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that this foreknowledge is most readily explained by the fact that Building 7 was brought down in an explosive controlled demolition carefully planned months in advance.

The BBC's Response

Part of the conspiracy?

[There was foreknowledge of the attack. The BBC to this date has failed to provide an explanation. How is it that they knew that building 7 would collapse prior to the actual event. Read carefully their response.]

[Richard Porter](#) | 17:12 UK time, Tuesday, 27 February 2007

The 9/11 conspiracy theories are pretty well known by now. The BBC addressed them earlier this month with a documentary, [The Conspiracy Files](#), shown within the UK.



Until now, I don't think we've been accused of being part of the conspiracy. But now some websites are using news footage from BBC World on September 11th 2001 to suggest we were actively participating in some sort of attempt to manipulate the audience. As a result, we're now getting lots of emails asking us to clarify our position. So here goes:

1. We're not part of a conspiracy. Nobody told us what to say or do on September 11th. We didn't get told in advance that buildings were going to fall down. We didn't receive press releases or scripts in advance of events happening.

[if they did not have advanced knowledge, how come they announced the collapse 20 minutes before its occurrence]

2. In the chaos and confusion of the day, I'm quite sure we said things which turned out to be untrue or inaccurate – but at the time were based on the best information we had. We did what we always did – sourced our reports, used qualifying words like “apparently” or “it's reported” or “we're hearing” and constantly tried to check and double check the information we were receiving.



3. Our reporter Jane Standley was in New York on the day of the attacks, and like everyone who was there, has the events seared on her mind. I've spoken to her today and unsurprisingly, she doesn't remember minute-by-minute what she said or did – like everybody else that day she was trying to make sense of what she was seeing; what she was being told; and what was being told to her by colleagues in London who were monitoring feeds and wires services.

4. We no longer have the original tapes of our 9/11 coverage (for reasons of cock-up, not conspiracy). So if someone has got a recording of our output, I'd love to get hold of it. We do

have the tapes for our sister channel News 24, but they don't help clear up the issue one way or another. [the video of the BBC report is available on the internet, the BBC says it no longer has it, how absurd]

5. If we reported the building had collapsed before it had done so, it would have been an error - no more than that. As one of the comments on You Tube says today "so the guy in the studio didn't quite know what was going on? Woah, that totally proves conspiracy..."

http://www.bbc.co.uk/blogs/legacy/theeditors/2007/02/part_of_the_conspiracy.html

The original source of this article is Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth
Copyright © [Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#), Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth, 2015

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#)

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