
Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 08:56:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Zeratul wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 21:58saberhawk wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 22:44explain how you believe it defied the third law of motion.

The buildings top should have been completely demolished before it made it all the way down. The rest of the building may have still fell but not to the devastating effect that was. The top acted as if it didn't hit anything at all, only effected by gravity and not the building below. That isnt possible according to the third law of motion. Its force of hitting the building should have been equal to the force hitting it back. It obviously wasn't. Which because it is a natural law it cannot be broken without an external force applied to the bottom before the top hit it IE explosives, and thermite.

You underestimate how effective gravity is as a multiplier. Once the supports failed, the upper half of the building started accelerating downwards at 9.81m/s^2 . The second law of motion tells us that force is equal to mass times acceleration. Using that, you can estimate that the upper half suddenly started applying roughly 10x the force that it used to. There are very few buildings that are built to withstand such a difference in force; skyscrapers usually aren't.
