Subject: The WTC crash site
Posted by Tufa on Thu, 09 Dec 2010 03:08:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is clearly a real picture from the 911 event:

To see why the picture is real, and understand what it tell us, we look at the cross section of the WTC perimeter
beam at the yellow arrow.

The WTC beams was thicker at the base and thinner as we move upwards the tower.
This drawing show the details at an intermediate position:

We calculate the steel cross section by:
(Length)x(Thickness) =(368.3 + 342.9 + 342.9 + 317.5)mm x(12.7mm) = 1371.6*12.7 mm2 = 17419.32 mm2

The joint between the perimeter beams consisted of four one inch bolts, or a cross section of 4x506.7mm2=2027m2.
The beams where also welded. The welding of the beams is argued as follows:

1) On a windy day, if the beams (using only bolts) move due to wind force, the chief engineer will go to history as the man who built the screaming towers of N.Y.
2) Comparing the steel cross sections, it makes sense.
3) The additional construction costs are approx two full-time welders on each tower. This is not very expensive.
4) Archive photo exists that show welding in progress; see "Building the WTC".

On these grounds we add (342.9 + 342.9 + 368.3)x(12.7) = 13387m2 for a total of 15413mm2.

We now look carefully at the end of the beam, shown by a green arrow:

At the green arrow, at the joint, we have 15413mm2 of steel and the beam itself is 17419mm2. We conclude the
the joint is approximately as strong as the beam, so if a force of some kind twist or rip apart the beam,
we would see serious structural failure at the joint (Green arrow). The beam at the green arrow looks straight
and undamaged; then should also the adjacent beam still be attached. Cutting the beam with a shape-charge,
during demolition or afterwards, cannot produce an unconnected beam and is never done in straight angle
relative to the beam. In passing we also add that the strength of the bolts usually is a bit higher

for each square mm
compared to the ordinary steel.

The conclusion is that the beam on the picture was never bolted and welded with any other beam
when the tower was demolished. It has been put on the rubble pile afterwards.

The main point is that this hold true independent of demolition mechanism. The most probable (in my personal opinion the
only possible) scenario is an intentional controlled demolition by shape-charges. If you fancy the official
licorice-steel-and-fire scenario (completely impossible and also absurd) the picture is still in error.
Look at the picture, at the green arrow, and see how idiotic it really is! If you fancy some UFO style directed energy weapons
demolition (ha!), the picture is still wrong. It still don't go.

So we can conclude that the picture is not from the WTC crash site,
so it was taken at some other site! This hold for all possible,
impossible, or your own favourite demolition scenario!

This is also why the "Planes" simply don't go. If you wish to stretch the entire beam as required to make a dent
into the tower, the stress in the steel during a plastic deformation would be approx 550N/mm2. The trick is that
17419mm2*550N/mm2 = 9.5MN or 976 tons. Approx 10% of this force (the force vector) would be directed against the
"plane". The beam is only 36 cm wide, and the fuselage, or a wing, cannot concentrate 100 tons of force to only 36 cm
width to cut the beam. (Only the engine of the "plane" can do this.)

The WTC towers had a perimeter beam (36cm) for each meter of the tower wall (36cm/100cm). Whenever you see a picture
(video, photo) of the "hole" in the WTC tower, you know the picture is a fake. A plane cannot go through.
Aluminium is a much softer metal compared to steel.

* * * * *

We now apply what we have learned on the WTC crash-site photos. Here is a typical photo:

We first check the beams, that we see clearly on the photo. We then proceed with an association technique: We learn to recognise the appearance
of the orange beams with a white border, and from now on, when we see them we KNOW that it is not the WTC crash site that we look at.
It is some other site set up for photography and video.

It is easy to see that we have the orange beams, or orange/brown beams, also on this picture.

The steel thickness of the beams also look
peculiar, they look very thin, and possibly the beams are made of board/wood!?

This picture might be a bit more tricky, but you see the orange beams in the back. There is also
a beam of the typical flat-end type, if you enlarge a hi-resolution version of the picture.
The man on the right; see his brand new helmet :), looks like he only need a price tag to go on display as a dummy in a shop window.

Some objects are very characteristic. Look carefully at the house or some debris, or the "remaining" WTC faÃ§ade.
Learn what these items looks like, so you can spot the duplicate crash side from a distance.

We recognise the orange beams; you can also check the minute details and see that the ends of the beams
are like on the fake crash site. Note that there is also "documentary film" taken from the fake site.

The picture of N.Y. is of course a real picture! The crash site; we now know that THIS crash site was
not the real one. It has been glued into the picture. My personal thought is that the WTC towers was present
when this N.Y. picture was taken, and the towers have been washed away, but I can find no clear evidence for
this. Another alternative would be that only the crash site has been replaced.

File Attachments

1) photo_381_0.jpg, downloaded 6911 times
2) photo_381a.jpg, downloaded 6693 times
3) photo_381b.jpg, downloaded 7290 times
4) photo_ 353.jpg, downloaded 6305 times
5) photo_ 297.jpg, downloaded 6530 times
6) photo_ 002.jpg, downloaded 6039 times
7) Beam_550_415.jpg, downloaded 5996 times
8) photo_187.jpg, downloaded 6008 times
9) photo_215.jpg, downloaded 6622 times
10) public_images_WTC Photos.zip.torrent, downloaded 3532 times

---

Subject: Re: The WTC crash site
Posted by Tufa on Fri, 24 Jun 2011 13:26:11 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hewa made this important post on the September Clues Forum:

Heiwa
Whatever the rubble looked like after the WTC-towers destructions, one thing is certain. It didn't look like the rubble shown on published footage! One reason is that structures of any kind, incl. WTC, cannot globally collapse due to gravity from top down as explained by FEMA/NIST/Bazant, i.e. the weak top part getting loose due to local failures crushes down the stronger bottom part or that floors get loose and drop down - pancake - from top. Sorry, the bottom 1/10th of the structure is 10 times stronger the top 1/10th! The weak 1/10th top cannot possibly damage the 10 times stronger 1/10th bottom.
WTC was certainly destroyed from bottom up and the real rubble looked quite differently so it could not be shown. Thus all footage of rubble is faked. This is in line with the conclusion that all footage shown 'live on TV' on 911, incl. the plane (sic) hitting WTC2 and WTC1/2 top down collapses, was just one prefabricated animation broadcasted on all big US TV channels. Also the Naudet video was a prefab animation. A little plane of aluminium cannot punch a plane-like hole in the wall of steel columns of a skyscraper. Only the engines may punch holes and fly straight through. The weak alu wings will shear off and bounce back against the much stronger steel columns, etc, etc. That the fuel tanks stop inside the building and then explode - fire balls style - was just ridiculous. But it impressed stupid Americans that believe anything on TV and film.

Subject: Re: The WTC crash site
Posted by Tufa on Fri, 24 Jun 2011 13:59:28 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Another epic picture of Simon Shack:

File Attachments
1) LUNAR_SPADE.jpg, downloaded 5857 times

Subject: Re: The WTC crash site
Posted by Tufa on Sun, 15 Jul 2012 21:34:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

911_clips_collection_to_tufavideo_net.torrent:
TV\The_Famous_CocaCola_truck_DR1_B35.flv
The Coca-Cola truck that appears in still pictures of the rubble pile -- here on Video before the WTC1 go down.

File Attachments

1) The_Famous_CoocaCola_truck_DR1_B35.jpg, downloaded 5237 times

---

Subject: Re: The WTC crash site
Posted by Tufa on Mon, 16 Jul 2012 07:33:25 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Overview picture with sun shade analysis (Simon Shack):

File Attachments

1) US_Navy_010917-N-7479T-508_World_Trade_Center_collapse.jpg, downloaded 4204 times

---

Subject: Re: The WTC crash site
Posted by Tufa on Mon, 16 Jul 2012 07:40:54 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

File Attachments

1) FAKING_DISASTERS1.gif, downloaded 497 times
