

9/11 and the Collapse of WTC Building 7: The BBC's Role in Distorting the Evidence and Misleading the Public

By [Peter Drew](#)

Global Research, November 22, 2013

Region: [Europe](#)

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

On September 11th, 2001, the world changed and the endless war on terror was unleashed across the globe. First Afghanistan was invaded, and then Saddam Hussein and Iraq were also mysteriously implicated in 9/11 as the public were sold the case for the invasion of another oil rich nation.

Twelve years on from 9/11, more than one million innocent lives have been claimed, and the so called global war on terror has reached into every corner of the planet.

The NSA has taken 9/11 as a necessity to implement a global communications vacuum cleaner, attempting to Hoover up and analyse every single piece of human electronic communication on the planet, using this data to identify human rights activists and trying to put in jail anyone who attempts to expose this. President Bush rolled out the Patriot Act within days of 9/11 which allows the US government to do just about anything it likes, all in the name of counter terrorism and National Security.

This has since been followed by President Obama quietly sneaking through the NDAA (National Defence Authorisation Act) on New Year's Eve 2011 which allows him to legally assassinate or imprison for life anyone he wants to without any evidence required at all, a power that he has already exercised. Add to this also the fact that we now have hundreds of human-less military drones criss-crossing our skies killing innocent women and children in their hundreds, with no accountability, as the US military supposedly tries to nullify individuals who the NSA, through their communications hoovering activities, have deemed to be potential terrorist suspects. All of this is justified by our authorities on the back of 9/11 because it is needed to keep us all safe.

But have we been given a true picture about the global war on terror, and in particular, have we been given the true picture and the true facts about the key event that was the catalyst for the war on terror, namely 9/11? The public relies heavily on the mainstream media as its means of finding out information about the world and for forming its opinions about global political events. So are we getting the information that we should be from these corporate media networks? Or are these media networks being overly influenced in their content and political messaging by powerful corporate agendas which may be profiting heavily from the very same military activities that are being justified by those corporate media networks? This is certainly a very worthy point of discussion in its own right, but surely one media network in particular would be immune from these kinds of potential

corporate or political influences .

The BBC is a long standing bastion of truth, honesty, and integrity of British society. Unlike other mainstream corporate media networks, the BBC is funded by the British public through the TV licensing fees, and is accountable to the British public through its unique Royal Charter, which requires it to be impartial and accurate in its reporting. If it does happen to make an accidental error in its reporting, then it is required to publicly correct that error. As such, it is seen by the public as a much loved and trusted part of British society, so much so that the public have given it the nickname of 'Auntie'.

How can it be then, that on the vital issue of the on-going global war on terror, and the event that sparked this war, namely 9/11, the BBC is guilty beyond question of deliberately and actively supporting the cover up of irrefutable evidence which would help bring the true perpetrators of 9/11 to justice and most likely bring an immediate end to the global war on terror as we know it.

So overwhelming is the evidence against the BBC on this issue that it has recently been challenged in a British court of law. It lost, and yet the vast majority of the public would have absolutely no idea about this. It has also been demonstrated conclusively and repeatedly all around the world that if the BBC would simply show the public the damning evidence that it is deliberately withholding, the vast majority of the public would instantly understand and believe that they have been lied to about 9/11 on a truly grand scale and that what really happened on that day is in fact very different to what we have been told, as the judge in the courtroom in Sussex, South-East England, quickly realised when he saw this evidence in February 2013.

However uncomfortable it may be, the unpalatable facts of the matter are that the BBC has been very deliberately complicit in the cover up of one of the greatest crimes in history, and that this cover up has allowed the deaths of more than one million innocent people to occur. This includes over 600 needless deaths of British service men and women in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The BBC has the blood of these people on their hands because it could and should have ended the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, and it could have ended the global war on terror overnight if it had just done its job and presented the now officially acknowledged facts and evidence of 9/11 to the public. But instead of doing this it has chosen to bury the evidence, wage a campaign of twisted and distorted information, and to actively smear and discredit the thousands of professional experts from all around the world who have tried to bring this evidence forward, not to mention hundreds of the BBC's fee paying public who have tried in vain to get the BBC to show this evidence so that the public can simply make up their own minds.

To begin looking at the key points of evidence that are so damning against the BBC, a good place to start is back in 2007. An organisation called 'Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth' (AE911Truth) www.ae911truth.org had formed the year before. This organisation has now swelled to more than 2,000 professional architects and engineers from all over the world, as well as more than 17,000 other members of the public.

The professional experts within AE911Truth, including leading experts in the demolition of high rise towers, were claiming that they had substantial scientific evidence proving that it was physically impossible for the three towers which collapsed on September 11 to have

collapsed in the manner told to us in the official story of 9/11 ie. that the burning jet fuel from the airliners caused the Twin Towers to be weakened and to eventually collapse, and for office fires in WTC Building 7 to have caused it to weaken and collapse. No high rise building in history has ever collapsed as a result of fire, either before 9/11 or since, but we are told that on that day, three towers all defied the basic laws of physics and collapsed totally, and in highly dramatic fashion, as a result of fire. For those who are not aware of the collapse of WTC Building 7, the third tower to collapse on 9/11, it was a 47 story skyscraper next to the Twin Towers which housed the IRS, NSA, CIA, and was the emergency response centre for New York City. It was not hit by a plane, but at 5.20pm on September 11th it collapsed totally, in perfect symmetry, into its own footprint in less than seven seconds.

While AE911Truth provided a lengthy list of powerful scientific evidence about the collapse of the three towers, http://911expertsspeakout.org/the_trailer.html the one issue that was absolutely central to their claims was that WTC Building 7 had collapsed at free fall acceleration, and the Twin Towers had collapsed at very close to free fall acceleration. It is well understood by professional architects, engineers, and demolition experts that the only way a building can collapse at free fall acceleration is through controlled demolition.

There is no other rational possibility. Free fall acceleration means that the building is falling at the same rate as a block of concrete dropped off the top of the building which falls unimpeded through thin air. If that same block of concrete had been sitting on the roof of WTC Building 7 when it collapsed, then it would have fallen at exactly the same speed as the block of concrete dropped off the side of the building. Not only were AE911Truth claiming that WTC Building 7 collapsed at free fall acceleration, but the building also clearly fell in absolutely perfect symmetry, neatly into its own footprint, as can be seen in the various angles of video footage of the collapse. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Nvx904dAw0o>

This means that when the building collapsed, there was absolutely zero resistance from the massive steel framework throughout the entire building. Therefore every single one of the 84 huge vertical steel columns throughout the building, as well as all the thousands of cross connections of the horizontal steel beams, all would have had to have been completely severed within approximately one tenth of a second of each other. According to the thousands of technical experts, this can only occur through well-timed explosives placed at key points throughout the building, as is seen in a standard controlled demolition of a building. It is physically impossible for office fires to have achieved this.

So with this evidence, and much more, the scientists and technical experts at AE911Truth began presenting this information to as many people as they possibly could from 2006 onwards. What then was the response of the BBC? In 2007, in response to this growing tide of information coming forwards about controlled demolition and free fall of WTC Building 7, the BBC ran a documentary called 'The Truth Behind the Third Tower' (WTC Building 7). In that documentary the BBC specifically addressed the claims of these so called 'conspiracy theorists' that WTC Building 7 had collapsed at free fall acceleration.

Clearly the BBC understood very well what the implications were of these claims of free fall acceleration, namely that free fall equates to controlled demolition, and that therefore this was an issue of critical importance that needed to be covered. In their documentary, the BBC went to great lengths to attempt to demonstrate through their own analysis that WTC Building 7 had not actually achieved free fall acceleration, as claimed by the professional

experts, and that therefore this was not evidence that could be used to contradict the official version of events on 9/11. The message from the BBC was very clear. The conspiracy theorists (thousands of professional architects, engineers, and demolition experts) were wrong, and there was nothing of any substance there to cast any doubt on the official story that WTC Building 7 collapsed from office fires.

If we then move the clock forward one year to 2008, this is where the BBC's deliberate deceit of the public about 9/11 becomes very clearly exposed. NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) were the official investigators into the collapse of the three towers. Like the BBC, NIST had been strongly rejecting the claims of AE911Truth about WTC Building 7 collapsing at free fall acceleration. However, in 2008, through the tireless and irrefutably scientific efforts of these individuals in AE911Truth, NIST was finally required to officially acknowledge that free fall had in fact occurred in WTC Building 7 for at least 2.25 seconds, or approximately one third of its descent.

See the Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7, NIST

NCSTAR 1A, page 48, which states: "A more detailed analysis of the descent of the north face found . . . (2) a freefall descent over approximately eight stories at gravitational acceleration for approximately 2.25 s. . . ."

This was an absolute bombshell admission by NIST, and it should have been the biggest media story of the century. Even though NIST only conceded free fall for one third of the collapse of WTC Building 7, any amount of free fall can only occur through expertly executed controlled demolition using carefully placed and perfectly timed explosives. Without saying the actual words, NIST's announcement was essentially an announcement of controlled demolition of WTC Building 7, and therefore an announcement that there must have been some level of inside involvement with at least some of the events of 9/11.

With this incredible announcement by NIST, the BBC not only had a moral and legal obligation to inform the public, but through its own Royal Charter, and section 3.4.26 of its own Editorial Guidelines, the BBC had an absolutely clear obligation to correct the error that it had made about free fall in its 2007 documentary.

That error in 2007 was on an issue of monumental political importance. To refuse to correct that error was a blatant breach of public trust and a blatant breach of its Royal Charter and its contract with the British public on an issue of huge global importance. Five years later the BBC has still refused to correct that error and has still not informed the public that it has now been acknowledged by the official investigators themselves that WTC Building 7 collapsed at free fall acceleration for at least a significant part of its descent.

In 2011, a group of UK citizens officially challenged the BBC on its refusal to correct its error in 2007 about free fall and its refusal to inform the public about the true evidence that was available. The response from the BBC's ECU (Editorial Complaints Unit) was;

'I appreciate the concerns you have raised about the programme which was broadcast in 2007. However, I regret to say that your point of concern is not one which I am able to investigate. The remit of the ECU is confined to considering whether there was a serious breach of editorial standards in content published or broadcast by the BBC'.

So the BBC'S Editorial Complaints Unit did not consider that the potential cover up by the

BBC of evidence proving controlled demolition of WTC Building 7 was an issue serious enough to warrant investigation.

As a continuation of this formal challenge to the BBC by the public, the support of professional experts was sought. Four individuals of the highest possible level of professional expertise and credibility in the world were sought to provide evidence to the BBC challenging its coverage of 9/11 evidence. These four experts included Richard Gage, founder and CEO of AE911Truth, Dwain Deets, former NASA Director of Aerospace Projects and a NASA award winner, Erik Lawyer, founder of 'Fire Fighters for 9/11 Truth', an organisation made up of numerous fire fighters on the front-line of 9/11 who dispute the official version of events of 9/11, and Jake Jacobs, a 30 year US veteran pilot of Boeing airliners.

These individuals all submitted extensive and detailed information and evidence that showed the official version of events of 9/11 to be impossible, including evidence strongly supporting the vitally important issue of free fall of WTC Building 7. They all asked that the BBC do its job and show this evidence to the public. In addition to these four experts, more than 500 members of the public wrote to every member of the BBC Trust and asked that the BBC show this evidence to the public. The only response that the BBC provided was to ask the coordinators of this public action to ask the public to stop e-mailing these letters to the BBC Trustees because the high number of e-mails was blocking up the inboxes of the trustees.

So the evidence of a deliberate cover up by the BBC on the critical issue of the free fall of WTC Building 7 is quite clear. However, the BBC's cover up is far more extensive and damning than just the issue of free fall of WTC Building 7. As stated earlier, according to the thousands of architects, engineers, and demolition experts, the basic laws of physics mean that for WTC Building 7 to collapse in perfect symmetry, and at free fall acceleration, then the entire steel framework of the building had to have been taken out simultaneously within one tenth of a second.

This would require that some kind of well-placed and well-timed explosives being used throughout the building, as is done in a standard controlled demolition of a large building. So, is there any evidence available to support the possible use of explosives throughout the building, and if so, what has been the BBC's approach to that evidence?

Once again the facts are devastating for the BBC. Over the course of the last 5 years since NIST's bombshell announcement of free fall, the BBC has run a number of additional documentaries looking at the so called 'conspiracy theories' about 9/11. While continuing to ignore the issue of confirmed free fall of WTC Building 7, the BBC has repeatedly reported to the public that there is no evidence to support the claims of the so called 'conspiracy theorists' that there were explosives used to bring down the three towers. This is exactly the same line that NIST has also tried to maintain. Why then is there a lengthy list of absolutely incontrovertible evidence and eye-witness accounts which clearly shows that what the BBC and NIST are saying about this is complete nonsense and that explosions were clearly going off throughout all three towers?

Firstly, there are 118 documented eye-witness accounts from first responder fire fighters and police officers stating that they either saw or heard explosions going off in all three towers. Some of these eye-witness accounts state that the explosions were occurring deep in the basement levels and ground floor levels, not just high up near where the fires were

burning. Some of these eye-witness accounts even had explosions occurring in the basement levels before the first plane struck the tower.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_detailpage&v=tH1Xdcsw4A.

In addition, in the BBC documentary 'The Conspiracy Files: 9/11 - The Third Tower', about the collapse of WTC Building 7, the BBC edits out the sound of explosions just as the tower is about to collapse, and edits out the piece where the emergency response workers are clearly heard to say "move it back, the building is about to blow up". Why would the BBC edit out those critical pieces of information when running a documentary that is trying to determine if there is any legitimacy to the claims that WTC Building 7 was brought down with explosives?

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n5UzMjzk8bo> (forward to 54.35 minutes).

These 118 eye-witness accounts were initially suppressed by the government, however in 2009 they were forced to be released through the freedom of information act. These eye-witness accounts are the most reliable and credible sources that could possibly be referred to. Why has the BBC not made any reference to these in their documentaries dealing with this issue? Instead, the BBC has ridiculed and discredited those people attempting to bring this evidence forwards?

Secondly, there are numerous eye-witness accounts and video footage showing that there was liquid molten steel all through the towers, including deep in the basements. The temperatures required to turn steel beams into molten liquid are massive. Approximately 2500 degrees centigrade. The maximum temperature that jet fuel fires can reach is only around 350 degrees centigrade, and in normal office fires the atmospheric temperature will reach around 1000 degrees centigrade and the actual steel beams will only reach around 650 degrees centigrade.

<http://911research.wtc7.net/mirrors/guardian2/fire/cardington.htm> .

This is precisely why no high rise tower has ever collapsed from fire in history, other than supposedly occurring three times on September 11th. The temperatures from fire cannot come even close to seriously compromising the steel framework of a high rise tower, let alone turning it into molten liquid. Thermal imaging of the three collapsed towers by NASA using satellites showed that these impossibly high temperatures of thousands of degrees centigrade were indeed present deep underground in the basement levels of the collapsed towers for fully three months after 9/11, which severely hampered the clean-up efforts of the fire fighters.

NIST meanwhile has point blank stated that there is absolutely no evidence of molten steel or these very high temperatures, and has stated that there is no evidence whatsoever for explosives being used. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n5UzMjzk8bo> (forward to 49.07 min). However, when asked by AE911Truth what steps they had taken to investigate for explosives, they admitted that they had not even investigated for this. According to Erik Lawyer, founder of 'Fire Fighters for 9/11 Truth', there are very clear legal procedures which required NIST to investigate for evidence of explosives.

NFPA (National Fire Protection Association) 921 states very clearly that the possibility of explosives should have been thoroughly investigated. According to Mr Lawyer, WTC

Building 7 met all the definitions for 'High Order Damage' which legally requires NIST to test for the use 'exotic accelerants', and in this particular case should have required investigation into the possible use of 'thermite mixtures'. NIST's approach to the issue of evidence of explosives and evidence of molten steel can only be described as outright lying in the face of all the abundant and obvious evidence to the contrary.

At best, NIST's approach has been gross negligence, and at worst, has been a deliberate criminal cover up. So once again, why has the BBC not provided this incredible information to the public in its documentary programmes, and why has it not asked some very searching questions about NIST's clearly fraudulent approach to investigating and reporting these events. Instead of this, the BBC has ridiculed and discredited those experts bringing this incontrovertible evidence forwards.

If the molten steel described here required temperatures of 2500 degrees, then where did this kind of extreme heat energy come from if the fires could not produce this? According to the experts at AE911Truth, there had to have been some kind of high tech 'incendiary' involved. One substance which could potentially do this to steel beams is military grade nano-thermite, a substance produced at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. So, once again we ask the question, is there any evidence of nano-thermite in the three towers, and if so, what has been the BBC's approach to this evidence? Once again the facts are damning for the BBC. A team of scientists, led by Niels Harrit, Professor of Chemistry at Copenhagen University, analysed dust samples from the three towers. What they found was evidence that was precisely consistent with that of military grade nano-thermite. The results of their studies were published in the peer reviewed scientific journal 'The Open Chemical Physics Journal'.

"Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe- {The Open Chemical Physics Journal, 2009, 2, 7-31)

<http://www.benthamscience.com/open/tocpj/articles/V002/7TOCPJ.htm>

What was the approach of the BBC to these amazing and very disturbing findings? Rather than ignore the evidence as they had done with the issue of free fall, they conducted a lengthy interview with Professor Harrit as part of one of their 9/11 documentaries. The only reasonable way to describe that interview by the BBC's Michael Rudin was that it was a deliberate and pre-meditated effort to publicly discredit Professor Harrit and his evidence, rather than to impartially explore and discuss the range of compelling scientific evidence which he and his team of scientists were attempting to bring forward. Remember, the BBC's own Editorial Guidelines requires the BBC to take an impartial and accurate approach to these issues. Clearly this did not happen in this interview with Professor Harrit, which can be cross verified through Professor Harrit taking the unusual precaution of videoing Mr Rudin during the entire time he was present for the interview.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XF334x-xWz8>

All the various points of evidence described here have been presented to the BBC in detail by the four experts described earlier, by Professor Harrit and his team of scientists, by the experts at AE911Truth, and by hundreds of members of the public. The BBC's response to this has been to either ignore these requests and withhold the evidence from the public entirely, or to attempt to twist and discredit those individuals attempting to highlight this evidence. To demonstrate just how brazenly biased the BBC's approach has been with

regards the issue of 9/11, here are several quotes from the host of one of the BBC's documentaries about 9/11 shown in 2011, '9/11: Conspiracy Road Show'. When reading these quotes, it must be remembered that the BBC's Royal Charter and Editorial Guidelines requires the BBC to take an approach which is impartial and does not support one side of an issue over another:

"Unbelievably there are many people who doubt the conclusions of the original investigation"

"I'm taking five of them to America on an extraordinary journey to see if I can change their minds."

"Personally I'm as certain as certain can be that the attacks were ordered by Osama bin Laden."

The participants on the documentary are "nice people but incredibly cynical, child-like, and gullible"

"you would think that a science graduate would be more rational".

Compare these statements above, made by the host of a BBC documentary about 9/11, with all the clearly laid out, officially acknowledged, overwhelming and obvious contradictory evidence, as presented by world experts and eye-witness fire fighters who were on the front-line of 9/11. When we do this, then the approach that the BBC has taken to actively hide and discredit this evidence, and to discredit those bringing it forward, is not only a massive breach of its operating requirements, it is nothing short of deliberate criminal complicity with the true perpetrators of 9/11.

This is why in February 2013, British documentary maker Tony Rooke went to court with the BBC over its refusal to show this evidence in what he deemed to be a criminal act by the BBC. He felt that the BBC's cover up of this evidence was supporting the true terrorists of 9/11 to get away with their crime. He refused to pay his TV licence fee on the basis of Section 15, Article 3 of the UK Terrorism Act.

This states that it is a crime to provide monetary support to any organisation that engages in or supports terrorist activity. In the opinion of Mr Rooke, by the BBC covering up the evidence described here about 9/11, they have been aiding and supporting the true perpetrators of 9/11 to escape justice, and that this is allowing a false version of 9/11 to continue to be used to justify further terrorist activity that is still ongoing today. Therefore, in Mr Rooke's opinion, to provide funds to the BBC through his TV licence fees would in effect be funding an organisation that is supporting terrorist activity, and under Section 15, Article 3 of the Terrorism Act, he would be committing a serious crime if he did this.

Mr Rooke was charged with the crime of withholding his TV licence fees, and in February 2013 the BBC took Mr Rooke to court. However, once the judge saw the evidence presented by Mr Rooke and his team of experts against the BBC, he had no option but to discharge the conviction. That decision in effect meant that the judge felt that Mr Rooke had reasonable cause to withhold his TV licence fees from the BBC on the basis of the evidence shown about 9/11 and the BBC's role in covering up that evidence. A quite monumental legal outcome.

That particular court case received virtually no coverage in the mainstream media, despite

the fact that the courtroom was packed beyond capacity, with another 100 people from across the UK standing outside the courtroom in support of Mr Rooke. In addition, there were numerous independent journalists present from all across the UK and from across Europe such was the understanding of the level of importance that this court case represented by those who were aware of the true facts.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=bHQPaAkII0I

The BBC is certainly not the only guilty media network here. All other mainstream media networks have played a part in this cover up. But the trusted BBC's selling out of its own people in such a blatantly criminal manner is a particularly disturbing realisation. The evidence about 9/11 presented here has been extremely widely covered around the world by independent and alternative media outlets on the internet, which has helped greatly to raise awareness by a rapidly growing number of people.

French and Italian mainstream news networks have begun giving this evidence some quite significant coverage in recent times, and in September 2013, the very large global news network 'Russia Today' provided what is probably the most hard hitting and most widely seen mainstream media report on the evidence. This is the first time that a major news network has openly stated that the available evidence contradicts the official story of 9/11, and that other acts of terrorism and the war on terror are being orchestrated by the US government.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-ugCljzHptA&feature=player_detailpage

As one final point of evidence of the BBC's complicit role with the events of 9/11, the BBC reported the collapse of WTC Building 7 on live TV more than 20 minutes before the building actually collapsed. As BBC reporter Jane Standley reported that WTC Building 7 had collapsed, the actual building could still be seen standing intact over her left shoulder.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ltP2t9nq9fl>.

Obviously the timing of this report by the BBC went badly astray somewhere. Someone clearly knew that WTC Building 7 was planned to be taken down and that information was passed on to the BBC, albeit with some rather serious timing errors. This means that the BBC had advance knowledge of a terrorist crime. Has it ever attempted to investigate who gave them that advanced information, and have they reported that to the authorities or to the public? Once again the BBC's total complicity with maintaining the façade of the official story of 9/11 is clear to see.

So the final question that must be asked is, what would be the potential impact on the public if the BBC did in fact do its job and provide the public masses with all this evidence? To help us to answer this important question, we can look at what the audience reaction has been when AE911Truth has presented this evidence in dozens of presentations across nearly every state of the US, as well as in dozens of other countries around the world. At each presentation, before the evidence is presented, AE911Truth will canvass the audience to see how many believe the official story of 9/11, how many don't believe it, and how many are uncertain.

They then repeat this exercise after the evidence has been presented. At most presentations there will be at least a significant number in the audience who either believe

the official story or are not certain. However, once the evidence has been presented, virtually 100% of the audience at every presentation no longer believes the official story of 9/11, and a large majority believe that the three towers came down through controlled, explosive demolition.

This is a very important point. It strongly suggests that if the BBC actually did its job and showed this evidence to the public, then the vast majority of the population would instantly no longer believe the official story of 9/11. There would very likely be a huge public outcry, and calls for an investigation to look into the potential that 9/11 was in fact a 'false flag' inside operation.

There also would very likely be huge public scepticism about the legitimacy of the global war on terror that has killed so many innocent people, has allowed the extreme changes to our legislation, and given our government officials and intelligence agencies extreme levels of legal power that are unprecedented in human history. It should be noted here that the NSA and government response to the recent massive NSA leaks provided by Edward Snowden, has been to repeatedly warn the public of the great danger that these leaks pose in potentially allowing another 9/11 to be committed. The point here is that the official version of 9/11 is allowing governments and their agencies the ongoing power to do just about anything they like, including spying on every single person on the planet, and legally killing innocent people, all in the name of supposedly keeping us all safe from another 9/11.

As Benjamin Franklin once famously said, "They who can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety". Or perhaps an even more poignant quote from Thomas Jefferson, "The exact level of tyranny that you're going to live under, is the level of tyranny you put up with."

So with those wise words from the founding fathers ringing in our ears, have we reached a point where the public is no longer prepared to accept this level of tyranny and deceit? The BBC, affectionately referred to by the public as 'Auntie', has had its true nature brutally exposed by 9/11. It has been exposed by the heroic, brilliant, and fiercely determined people who have refused to have the truth of these crimes covered up, despite the genuine threat to their well-being and to their professional careers.

How many people in Britain would still refer to the BBC as 'Auntie' and continue to hand over their money to her if they knew that 'Auntie' had deliberately helped to cover up the crime of the century, and had been deliberately complicit with the criminal events that have led to the bloodshed and deaths of more than a million innocent people over the last 12 years? It is very difficult for the true perpetrators of 9/11 to be held to account until the BBC and other mainstream media networks are prepared to report the true facts to the public, because public opinion is so strongly influenced by the information that they receive from the mainstream media.

So, is it time that 'Auntie' was held to account for her complicit role with these crimes against humanity and held to account for the blood that she has on her hands?

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

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Peter Drew](#)

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