

---

Subject: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 00:32:58 GMT

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

---

I want someone to explain to me how the twin towers falling defied the third law of motion naturally.

Third law of motion When one body exerts a force on a second body, the second body simultaneously exerts a force equal in magnitude and opposite in direction to that of the first body.

By this logic the top should have slowed down, if not stopping completely and falling off to the side. In what way is it possible they fell from weakened steel and then plowed through layer after layer of concrete and unweakened steel as if there was nothing even there?

And i want an actual answer not some vague counter argument that doesn't answer anything, insults, or news articles. I want an exact answer as to how it could have broken the third law of motion naturally.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 02:06:58 GMT

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

---

Why are you asking people here and not an engineering forum or place full of qualified individuals that will refute your already made-up beliefs that it was all HURR DURR BUSH CHENEY BARACK HUSSEIN OBOMBER?

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 02:32:20 GMT

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

---

This guy is trolling

He can't really be this stupid

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 02:33:33 GMT

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

---

Can you answer the question?

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 02:46:32 GMT

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

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 03:06:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 19:33Can you answer the question?

No we can't because it won't align with your preconceived notions that it was an inside job by the fluoride lobby.

Good luck blowing the conspiracy open! It'd be like Watergate!! You can call it COLGATE.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 03:14:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 23:06Zeratul wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 19:33You can call it COLGATE.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 03:26:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Explain to me how it defies the third law of motion im not asking anything about the government, this is about physics.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 03:31:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Guys explain to me how babby is formed also how is lightbulb working

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [saberhawk](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 04:44:37 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 20:26 Explain to me how it defies the third law of motion im not asking anything about the government, this is about physics.

The same question goes for you; explain how you believe it defied the third law of motion.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 04:58:58 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

saberhawk wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 22:44 explain 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.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 05:16:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Probably because the force hitting the building GRAVITY was stronger than the force of the melting metal UNDERNEATH the top.

As the top came down the lower falling portion of it has already cleared the way, any weak points have broken allowing the top to keep its form, because its easier to break at the weakest points rather than insta-crumble mid air...

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-w9q864a7E&feature=player\\_detailpage#t=58s](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-w9q864a7E&feature=player_detailpage#t=58s)

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 05:53:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Weight does not effect the natural law the top should have been demolished before it got to the bottom. There is no other way it can happen without something else weakening the bottom of the building before the top even hit it.

How does fire at the top weaken the entire lower half building and not the top as well? impossible if anything the top was weaker than the bottom because of the fact that heat rises.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [FlaminGunz](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 07:05:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

renegade physics

---

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  $9.81\text{m/s}^2$ . 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.

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 16:17:26 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You dont seem to understand that exact same amount of force is the same amount of force sent back to the top, therefore it should have been completely destroyed before it reached the bottom. Gravity does not effect the transfer of energy.

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 17:06:27 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Zeratul wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 12:17Hurrdurr I'm an idiot

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

---

Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 17:22:45 GMT

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

---

Instead of insulting me could you actually show your counter argument. None of you have explained what way this is wrong. In fact you cant, you said it yourself, but it is you that live in the fantasy world of "the government actually cares about the people."

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 17:51:25 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 13:22lolspiracies

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 19:35:25 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 10:17You dont seem to understand that exact same amount of force is the same amount of force sent back to the top, therefore it should have been completely destroyed before it reached the bottom. Gravity does not effect the transfer of energy. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-w9q864a7E&feature=player\\_detailpage#t=58s](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-w9q864a7E&feature=player_detailpage#t=58s)

Take it you didn't watch this otherwise you'd see that even in this planned demolition the top of the collapsing structure fell apart before reaching the ground TWO OUT OF THREE times. Notice that even under a demolition that was planned that the 3 structures that are shaped the same still manage not to collapse the same. The second tower's top stays together on the way to the ground even though the other two fell apart before reaching the ground.

There are many factors at play, maybe you just don't completely understand how the universe works? I know I don't, but I do know I don't hear the sound of detonating explosives once the tower begins to fall, and if what you're saying was the case it'd take a lot of explosives to keep blowing the lower section away as the top of the tower came down to keep it all intact.

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 21:34:11 GMT

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

---

Zeratul wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 10:22Instead of insulting me could you actually show your counter argument. None of you have explained what way this is wrong. In fact you cant, you said it yourself, but it is you that live in the fantasy world of "the government actually cares about the people."

---

We're not counter-arguing because you've already made up your mind that it was the evil vaccine makers co-conspiring with the fluoride lobby to release mountains of fluoride emissions from the melted steel within the twin towers. Then, Pfizer can ride a Crest of paranoia and convince people to inject their children with Mercury-laced Aspergers.

We're also not arguing because your talking points are formulated by other people, likely on infowars or a similar website. People create these talking points, so you and other individuals can roll into forums that are totally unqualified to discuss the subject.

If you went to a proper forum for engineering or even dialled up your friendly neighbourhood civil engineers, you'd have your ass handed to you because your pre-made talking points would be obliterated, and you would have nothing at all to come back with, because you won't be spoon-fed information from your cozy, conspiracy-theorist aluminium-bubble-forum.

So you come here. Because you are armed with the talking points, you make yourself out to be the expert. Infowars has likely also told you what answers to expect from the 'brainwashed sheep masses' and you can respond accordingly with more pre-packaged BS.

Also, you've made the debate one-sided because you've said:

Zeratul wrote on Fri, 07 June 2013 17:32

And i want an actual answer not some vague counter argument that doesn't answer anything, insults, or news articles.

You don't want those things because they are conduits of rationality. There are plenty of news articles, magazines and investigative, long-form journalism features that show the proper facts.

BUT OH NOEZ TEH MEDIA IS ALL CONTROL BY TEH JOOZ

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [BAGUETTE](#) on Sat, 08 Jun 2013 23:09:22 GMT

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

---

nikki6ixx wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 14:34

BUT OH NOEZ TEH MEDIA IS ALL CONTROL BY TEH JOOZ

LOL!

Im not an expert in this at all, but when someone comes to a forum and only has one point to argue for their entire conspiracy :/

TEH TURD LOOR OF PHYSEEKS

Damn typing that like is contagious.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sun, 09 Jun 2013 02:55:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

FlaminGunz wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 02:05renegade physics  
Imao  
with Renegade physics, the buildings would still be alive somewhere in blue hell

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [zeratul](#) on Sun, 09 Jun 2013 11:14:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:

BUT OH NOEZ TEH MEDIA IS ALL CONTROL BY TEH JOOZ

You brought the media into this, not me.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_assets\\_owned\\_by\\_General\\_Electric](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_assets_owned_by_General_Electric)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_assets\\_owned\\_by\\_News\\_Corporation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_assets_owned_by_News_Corporation)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_assets\\_owned\\_by\\_Disney](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_assets_owned_by_Disney)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_assets\\_owned\\_by\\_Viacom](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_assets_owned_by_Viacom)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_assets\\_owned\\_by\\_Time\\_Warner](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_assets_owned_by_Time_Warner)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_assets\\_owned\\_by\\_CBS](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_assets_owned_by_CBS)

Before 1996, the national cap was set at 40 stations for a single owner by the FCC. This was changed for reasons i can't seem to find.

Theres no control of our media (that jews part was completely unnecessary) but someone like clear channel can own 1200 radio stations when the legal limit, set by the FCC mind you, was 40? But if you were to even attempt to gain half that many you would be sent to prison and shut down for attempting to create a monopoly.

Edit:When it comes to media control i cannot speak for outside the U.S.

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11  
Posted by [shaitan](#) on Sun, 09 Jun 2013 12:01:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

liquidv2 wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 22:55FlaminGunz wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013  
02:05renegade physics

Imao

with Renegade physics, the buildings would still be alive somewhere in blue hell

!fds revivebar

Speaking of Blue Hell, how many times have you guys seen that since 4.0 came out? Once for me, a few weeks ago. At the time it was too funny/memorable to even be mad over losing my arty.

---

---

Subject: Re: Curiosity about 9/11

Posted by [Jerad2142](#) on Sun, 09 Jun 2013 17:35:23 GMT

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

---

liquidv2 wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013 20:55FlaminGunz wrote on Sat, 08 June 2013

02:05renegade physics

Imao

with Renegade physics, the buildings would still be alive somewhere in blue hell

Just be glad we aren't using Havok physics, otherwise pieces of the build would be stuck in the wall banging around right now, it'd be really annoying.

---