

9/11: Major Italian TV network: conclusive evidence that WTC Building 7 was demolished with explosives

By [Massimo Mazzucco](#)

Global Research, May 03, 2007

911 Blog 3 May 2007

Theme: [Terrorism](#)



“Seven is exploding”

Welcome to all foreign readers. Luogocomune is a news commentary site (all in Italian, thus far) featuring a large, separate [section on 9/11](#). In a way, the whole website revolves around the idea that unless that paramount, unacceptable lie called “the 9/11 terrorist attacks” is removed and put into right perspective, the downward spiral towards this new “dark age” of humanity will never stop.

To us “9/11 victims” are not only the 3,000 people that perished on that day, but also some 650,000 civilians killed in Iraq since the invasion began, 100,000 plus Afghans who’ve met the same fate in their country, more than 3,000 US soldiers sent by “Dick & Rummy” to die under false pretense, and –sadly but truly — the ever increasing number of first responders who were knowingly sent to their death by an administration that could be defined “criminal” for this one action alone.

It’s for them all that we fight.

Now for some interesting news we wish to share with anyone interested in 9/11 worldwide.

On April 16, 2007, a major Italian network (Canale 5) has aired some conclusive evidence that Building 7 did not collapse on its own, but was deliberately taken down with the use of explosives.

The piece was part of a larger presentation we provided to the network as an update on the ongoing research on 9/11. In particular, we included a clip we had all seen many times before, but possibly never listened to with the full attention it deserved. Here is the 6 min. segment (please ignore yellow subtitles):

[More videos inside]. Yes, we all saw that last clip more than once, but each time we must have stopped at the powerful evidence the blast itself represents, while disregarding the ensuing exchange, which in our opinion represents the final nail in the coffin of the official version on WTC7. Without even the need to discuss Larry’s intentionally ambiguous “pull it”

statement.

Our presentation was broadcast as a rebuttal to a bunch of accusations leveled on the same channel ...

... by a group of Italian debunkers against the movie “Inganno Globale” (produced by this writer/website), which is possibly the “flagship” for 9/11 Italian truth seekers, being somehow the equivalent to any other major 9/11 movie in English available on the web.

THE BROADCAST

For those who are interested, this is the entire, 42 min. presentation that was aired on Apr. 16th by Italian Canale 5, divided in the following 5 segments:

- 1 - Intro + Military stand-down.
- 2 - Pentagon + UA175
- 3 - WTC7 (the segment you just saw)
- 4 - Twin Towers + UA93
- 5 - 2 touching testimonies by W. Rodriguez and David “We were also killed on 9/11” Miller.

The narration is in Italian, all the original interviews are in English. Keeping an eye on the brief summary above each segment, however, may help you grasp the whole thing anyway.

Part 1 - Intro + Military stand-down

a) After a brief intro the 9/11 Commission Report is presented as the equivalent of the infamous Warren Report, in that both Commissions openly refused to look at evidence that would compromise in any way the reconciliation of the Report with the desired, official version. b) The “Pandora’s Box” of evidence against the hijackers emerged from the crash site of UA93 — while the very plane is yet to be found — is shown as an example of likely fabricated evidence by the FBI. c) Senator Dayton [thanks Eric Hufschmid for the footage] denounces as “lies” the Norad timelines appearing in the Report. d) The very heads of the Commission, Tom Kean and Lee Hamilton, denounce in a book the Pentagon’s “untrue” statements on their failure to act on 9/11. e) Rumsfeld’s intercept procedure change order is paired with the illuminating testimony by Robin Hordon (Pilots for 911 Truth), resulting in a possible answer on how the military response could have been thwarted without necessarily involving “thousands of people” in the plot: All it took apparently was for Rummy not to pick up the phone.

Part 2 - Pentagon + UA175

a) Italian debunkers are caught in the act of resorting to the cheapest tricks in order to try and cast some doubt on the critics of the Pentagon’s official version. b) A 2002 New York Times article is shown, reporting doubts on the authenticity of Hani Hanjour’s “commercial license”, while the alleged hijacker is clearly portrayed as someone who “could not fly at all”. c) A collection of witnesses seeing a somehow smaller plane at the Pentagon is presented, while the fact that the debunkers seem unable to produce a witness speaking of a “large plane” themselves is underlined. d) Danielle O’Brien’s testimony on what looked on their screens like a fighter jet is presented. e) The idea that “all it took for the hijackers to fly those planes right into their targets was to set the auto-pilot systems” is refuted both by the

330 degrees turn by “Hany Hanjour” before hitting the Pentagon — losing sight of a target you have been so lucky to find in first place? — and by the testimony of the controller who followed UA175 all the way into New York’s harbor, executing maneuvers “you would only see in the movies”. While both alleged pilots, as we know, had never flown a jet before in their life. (Nor had the other two, for that matter.)

Part 3 – WTC7

The same segment you saw above, in which: a) Danny Jowenko’s opinion on WTC7’s collapse is presented (“a controlled demolition”). b) A short clip from “Inganno Globale” follows, showing a side-by-side comparison between controlled demolitions and the World Trade Center collapses. c) A possible solution for the apparent mishap by the BBC on the actual collapse of the “Solomon Brother’s Building” is suggested: It was CNN’s earlier announcement that might have confused them. d) However, a good explanation for such foreknowledge must be found, especially since e) A testimony from a first responder moves that foreknowledge even further up, “between noon and one o’ clock.” f) Police is heard clearing the area because “the building is about to blow up.” g) A firefighter is heard commenting “We gotta get back, seven is exploding,” his colleague responding “I know, I know,” right after a powerful blast is heard from the streets nearby.

Part 4 – Twin Towers + United 93

a) Scott Forbes’ testimony is presented as a possible answer to the ever-recurring question, “How would it have been possible to place ‘tons’ of explosives in the Towers with everybody watching?” By doing it exactly “under everyone’s eyes,” the answer seems to be. b) Debunkers are shown scrambling through the dictionary in their desperate attempt to refute the tons of testimony about “explosions” in the Towers, prior and during the collapses: If you translate “scoppio” (“pop”) into English — they maintain — you will get “explosion.” Therefore it was only “pops” what all those people really heard. [Hey, let’s cut them some slack. Someone may even fall for that!] c) The debunkers’ statement that “there is no video actually confirming the sound of explosions” is confuted by the very clip [ending with “Seven is exploding”] you saw above. d) The debunkers’ statement that “the idea of molten steel is sheer fantasy” is confuted by presenting different clips, including two reports on the “meteorite” now stored at the JFK hangar. e) How most of the crucial information about the true reasons for the Twin Towers’ collapses ended up being sealed in court proceedings is revealed. f) The fact that the debunkers avoided confronting the notion that UA93 debris was found as far as eight miles away from the crash site is underlined, while the same fact is presented as definite proof that the plane did not fall in one piece into the infamous, “empty” hole. g) An interesting comment by a former NTSB official suggesting the “Let’s Roll” story is but a nice legend — “Just like the Alamo” — ends the segment.

Part 5 – 2 Testimonies

a) William Rodriguez testimony confirms, among other things, that underground explosions took place in Tower 1 before the collapse. b) David Miller’s condition, which he shares with hundreds of first responders, that “we now live with those buildings in our bodies” confirms, among other things, that the pulverization of the buildings was too fine to be the result of sheer force of gravity (which is the only force acting in a passive, non-induced structural

collapse).

A final note: Except maybe for the “seven is exploding” sound bite, there was nothing truly exceptional in the broadcast but the broadcast itself. As the 9/11 web community at large, in fact, it seems at this point we have gathered enough evidence to make a valid case for a new investigation. We suggest researchers worldwide may want to shift some of their energies — wherever possible — towards their local media, to possibly achieve what we have luckily managed to achieve here in Italy.

As the times “are a’ changing” fast, it may turn out much easier than expected to puncture the mainstream media cover that still protects the official version. After all it’s not politics, it’s ratings that they care most about, and Rosie O’Donnell has just shown us that once you have those on your side, nothing else truly matters.

Massimo Mazzucco

Note: Luogocomune is truly open to all different political views, and when I say “we,” in the article, I refer to a vast majority of registered users, but not necessarily all of them.

The original source of this article is 911 Blog
Copyright © [Massimo Mazzucco](#), 911 Blog, 2007

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Massimo Mazzucco](#)

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