

Re: Physics of the 9/11 building collapses?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2006-04/msg03640.html>

- *From:* hetware <massless@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 23 Apr 2006 20:53:40 -0400
-

Schoenfeld wrote:

The evidence suggests that UBL and co were real terrorists and really were planning to fly airliners into WTC.

It would seem a good portion of the "evidence" used to persuade me that UBL was behind the attacks has been called into question. The "confession" videos are almost certainly fake. As it turns out, several of the alleged suicide hijackers are denying that they killed themselves on 9/11/01. Are they lying? You say "the evidence". I ask what evidence other than "expert opinion" are you talking about?

The evidence also suggests that the buildings came down in a way not consistent with official explanation, or with any_pancake_model_configuration. In place free-falling buildings are the result of demolition, and only demolition, which implies then that insiders merely preempted UBL and co and "made it happen" in a "new pearl harbour" kind of way. That's not very difficult to piece of together at all, and is perfectly consistent with the money trail and massive profits gained through abnormal put option trading and 'lucky' insurance policies taken out just prior to the event.

There are many such suspicious facts surrounding the events of 9/11/01. Some of them may simply be coincidence. I prefer to begin with the most tangible aspects.

The simple fact that academia fully endorse (bar a handful of folks) the official pancake model shows that by and large, it does not examine the evidence or is too lazy to do so.

I looked at Greening's paper, and came to the conclusion that, either he is

Re: Physics of the 9/11 building collapses?

not very good at abstraction, or he is intentionally trying to muddle the issue. What I was is a convincing formula for calculating the work required to crush one floor of a WTC Tower as a fraction of the work needed to raise the mass above it by the height of a floor. Mind you, the lower floors could withstand the force produced by the torque of strong winds pushing against the entire height of the structure, in addition to the weight of the building.

What I'm looking for is some reasonably convincing and easy to understand argument to show people that these collapses were virtually impossible without some kind of controlled demolition.

That they seriously expect people to believe that WTC 7 did an in place freefall collapse due to couple of hours of FIRE DAMAGE reveals they're a hopeless failure which can't be trusted whatsoever. This is unfortunate, but it is the way it appears to be.

How many have even looked at it carefully? I was pretty dismissive of the idea that the buildings were taken down by controlled demolition, but I wasn't aware of WTC 7 at the time.

This was a persuasive influence that really got me thinking.

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=964034652002408586&q=professor+jones>

Sometimes it's not the well-recognized authority figure who is the most persuasive.

<http://www.vho.org/GB/c/DC/gcgvcole.html>

<http://www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth/>

<http://www.germarrudolf.com/>

<http://www.ice.gov/graphics/news/newsreleases/articles/051115chicago.htm>

You are wasting your time trying to convince people of this. It doesn't work, it won't work until a high profile figure tells them what to believe (again).

I there are two issues here. The first is whether there were homicidal gaschambers at Auschwitz. The second is whether a person has a right to express an informed opinion that there were no such gaschambers. The former is a subject open to discussion. The later is a self-evident inalienable right.

This describes a serious violation of US law on the part of the DHS:

<http://www.ice.gov/pi/news/newsreleases/articles/051115chicago.htm>

Re: Physics of the 9/11 building collapses?

Regardless of what people think about Germar Rudolf's ideas and opinions, they should be outraged that he has been treated as he has. I have read much of his writing, and what he presents is morally and intellectually sound. But I really don't want to get into that here. I will just recall the phrase "E pur si muove."

—

<http://www.vho.org/GB/c/DC/gcgvcole.html>

<http://www.vho.org/GB/Books/dth/>

<http://www.germarrudolf.com/>

<http://www.ice.gov/graphics/news/newsreleases/articles/051115chicago.htm>

.