
Subject: List of 9/11 physical impossibilities
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Tue, 21 Aug 2012 17:16:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

We list in red colour issues that can not be implemented physically and in blue colour issues, that are known to be wrong, but may be possible to implement.

To run the Boeing 767-200ER through the steel lattice facade of the Twin Towers. (Link: [911_physics_1.pdf](#))

The steel perimeter columns would bend and stretch, with a resistance of minimum 440N/mm², that with a thickness of 1/2" produce a cross section area of 17.400mm²*440N/mm²/(9.82m/s²)= 800 tons; and of this will 500 tons of force be directed against the plane when the column is bent. If you apply 500 tons of force against a wing of the plane, using a 33 cm wide object, the plane wing will be destroyed instantly on any plane, under any conditions. The WTC tower has one of these columns for each meter of the tower width (grid: 40"=1.016m). There is also a steel belt, that run around the tower. I'll guarantee it will add to the resistance! Inside the tower, behind the 1.32m belt, there is an on-site cast concrete floor, 100mm thick, that will surely have a say, if you hit the tower from the side.

I have made an approximate calculation, how large the total retardation force would be if you push in the towers a meter with a ring of 5m diameter (to match the fuselage of a plane. Wings are much larger). The force come out to 10.000 tons. The retardation is then 71g, and this corresponds the the retardation of a crash-dummy in a small car, that is run directly into a concrete block in approx 110km/h.

To hit the steel lattice facade, of the Towers, without having an explosion of plane parts all over the place. This show that all crash-videos are fake; not a single one show a plane that crash against the tower.

That there is no retardation observed on the "Plane" in any crash video. This show that all crash-videos are fake.

To crash the plane on the facade without the fuel, in the plane, to instantly ignite. Or, to put it in another way: the "explosion" that comes out from the tower, it is on the wrong side! Understand now, that the video is fake?

That there is no impulse transferred from the plane to the Tower. This show that all such crash-videos are fake. Note that there is no witness, that remembers that when the plane hit, the Tower will move rather violently sideways. These "witness" reports are simply fake, sometimes presented by an actor.

To run the stabiliser wing, of the Plane, through the same "hole" that was just made by the main wing. To see this, look on a plane from the back. Any plane will do. A NIST animation (ref R39) exist where first the main wing, and then the and stabiliser wing, go through the facade, through the same hole.

That the Twin Towers went missing due to a "Plane crash" as it is impossible for an air plane to destroy the core columns of the Towers. If the Twin Towers is missing in N.Y., then there cannot have been "Planes"; "Planes" cannot do this.

The "Hole" in the WTC-I-Tower don't match the silhouette of the Boeing 767-200ER. (Pictures of this). The conclusion is that the "hole" is a work of art. (9-11 Hole Science by Dr. Stefan

Grossmann in September11_DVDv4_Tufavideo_911_2010/Computer/Webb.)

The "Hole" in the WTC-II-Tower don't match the silhouette of the Boeing 767-200ER. (Pictures of this). The conclusion is that the "hole" is a work of art.(9-11 Hole Science by Dr. Stefan Grossmann in September11_DVDv4_Tufavideo_911_2010/Computer/Webb.)

The "Explosion" on the other side of the Tower; the amount of fuel inside. A fuel calculation based upon that one m3 fuel produce 10.000m3 of hot smoke (experiment needed!) produce an estimation of 180m3 of fuel in the "Explosion". (You can only fill 90 m3 in the "Plane". Who cares?). This is based upon a side-length of the Tower of 63m. The actual explosion on the fake-videos was likely a small explosion using a scale-model (ref: FULLSPEED 911 on the slow-motion assumption of the fake video). Fuel estimation of the Plane (in case it would be real) is 34m3.

That the flight recorder data is missing from the Twin Tower planes. You see, the flight recorders are built to specification, and the crash isn't that brutal, as the flight recorder box is at the back of the plane. It is difficult to fake the flight recorder data, so we understand that it is missing.

File Attachments

- 1) [911_physics_1.pdf](#), downloaded 21399 times
 - 2) [image015.jpg](#), downloaded 19557 times
 - 3) [image019.jpg](#), downloaded 20191 times
-

Subject: Re: List of 9/11 physical impossibilities
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Sun, 02 Sep 2012 09:34:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That the Twin Towers can "fall down", straight down. This can only occur in a controlled demolition. To see that the "fall of the Towers" is not possible to implement in physics, check this source by Heiwa: The Heiwa Challenge. This imply that the video (all of them) "that show" how the Towers "fall down" are fake.

That the Twin Towers fell down due to some kind of fire. An office fire do not really get that very hot. The concrete floors stop a fire from spreading upwards in the Towers.

That the Twin Towers fell down due to the use of some kind of bomb. You can not destroy a steel lattice structure by putting a bomb inside (spherical pressure wave). This is a classic military problem. Before the high-precision missiles, the only way is to move a demolition team to the object, mount explosives on the structure.

Subject: Re: List of 9/11 physical impossibilities
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2012 13:00:05 GMT

Hi-jacking of an aeroplane, without producing any alert on the ground, by a fist-fight with the pilots in the cockpit. There are approx two "hijack" buttons, in the cockpit, and you can scream for help on the radio. Besides the contact on the ear-phones, you can also use a transmit button on the radio. More: Hijack, without alert, on four air planes. This go physically impossible if it was possible to change the transponder code from within the cabin. I have no information on this, please check it and write a response! Note: The "official story" requires that the "hijack" of the "air planes" go unnoticed by the air traffic controllers. Note how easy this is to fix if you simply lie about that there where planes.

To run the planes, at low level, with high speed, and aim for the Towers/Pentagon. Planes can run at high speed only at high altitude. At low altitude, the wings will try to lift the planes upward. You must compensate with control surfaces. If the speed is too high, the stability is lost, so the panes nose-direction no longer correspond exactly with the flight path of the plane. You must also aim accurately from long distance, as a turn will take some seconds to execute. It is very difficult to tell the exact aim point by looking out through the front window of the plane; compare to the front window on any ordinary city bus. Go to the back of the bus and compare. The accuracy displayed on the TV video (they are complete fake) would also require a compensation from the local wind speed.

To aim for the bottom floor of the Pentagon. Here we have also problems with light posts, that rather obviously cannot be uprooted like flowers, simply due to that there are in the way of a political development. The "aiming" itself is also rather absurd; the grass is completely untouched by any plane, and the hit is directly above. The Pentagon "hole" is also to small for the Boeing 757 to run through.

(to be continued and further expanded!)

EDIT: this is being processed ..

Subject: Re: List of 9/11 physical impossibilities
Posted by [Tufa](#) on Sat, 09 May 2015 17:03:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Compare with Simon's version on www.cluesforum.info. We differ in that I don't believe in "Electronic Jamming". Electronic Jamming don't work, and it is not needed, so I have not included it into my presentation.
