

---

Subject: 9/11

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 20:11:34 GMT

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

---

It's about that time of year again, anyone still think that the 9/11 was fake?

Also, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_FVAzn1Yuz8](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_FVAzn1Yuz8)

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 20:19:42 GMT

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

---

Ofcourse it wasn't fake, we have video proof of the buildings falling down...

...whether or not it is a government conspiracy is another matter. In anycase, however you look at it, people died. What's done is done, get over yourself.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 20:43:58 GMT

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

---

BlueThen wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:11

Also, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_FVAzn1Yuz8](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_FVAzn1Yuz8)

This video is not available in your country due to copyright restrictions. lol

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 21:05:24 GMT

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

---

9/11 WAS FAKE GUVMENT JORGE BUSH IS DEVUL HURP DERP

(no)

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 21:09:58 GMT

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

---

jnz wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:19...whether or not it is a government conspiracy is another matter.

Not really, it's kind of the matter I'm trying to address in this topic.

---

Seriously, if the government were to do this, it'd be a pretty big deal here. You're pretty much telling us to "get over it, and forget about it"

I'm not saying that I think the government did it. I just find it ridiculous that people would assume that someone were to plant bombs in the buildings.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 21:28:18 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Oh yea, I almost forgot about that.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 22:03:49 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thing i find funny is for years we heard how stupid bush is but yet in his first few months in office he was able to pull off 9/11. Of course Clinton who was just in office he in now way had anything to do with it

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [dr3w2](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 22:12:30 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

or.. JUST MAYBE there were some extreme islamic people sourced from afganistan and saudi arabia that disagreed with western culture. I know it's a long shot but it is possible!

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [jnz](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 22:19:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

BlueThen wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 22:09jnz wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:19...whether or not it is a government conspiracy is another matter.  
Not really, it's kind of the matter I'm trying to address in this topic.

Something being a conspiracy and something being fake are 2 different topics.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 22:23:45 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Shall I get out my tin-foil hat? Any minute now we'll be hearing from the "we never went to the moon" crowd that think the gub'mint used missiles and C4 that were somehow altered to look like commercial airliners and jet fuel explosions instead. Oh, and we mustn't forget how they evacuated all the jews from the towers, or how nobody \*really\* died at the Pentagon (they're at Area 51 with the alien bodies and the mind control rays).

Or we could wait a few more days, have a moment of silence, and get on with our lives.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [ChewML](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 22:23:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

andr3w282 wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 17:12or.. JUST MAYBE there were some extreme islamic people sourced from afganistan and saudi arabia that disagreed with western culture. I know it's a long shot but it is possible!

Lies, Osama Bin Laden is a nice guy IRL.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 23:35:34 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:03he was able to pull off 9/11.

What does this mean? Have you seen the footage of him being told the nation is under attack? He sat there like a kid who can't find his mom at a playground.

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:03Of course Clinton who was just in office he in now way had anything to do with it

What?

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [tactic356](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 23:41:23 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IT WAS THE ALIENS

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 31 Aug 2009 23:56:44 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:35DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:03he was able to pull off 9/11.

What does this mean? Have you seen the footage of him being told the nation is under attack? He sat there like a kid who can't find his mom at a playground.

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:03Of course Clinton who was just in office he in now way had anything to do with it

What?

I see what he was going for, he just said it wrong.

He was sarcastically implying that there's no way Bush could have pulled off such an "intricate" plan (that middle school dropouts could apparently "uncover"), especially when most of the same people say he's dumb as a load of bricks and what have you.

His second "point" was that any involvement Bush had, Clinton probably had just as much, all things considered.

But that's a hypothetical argument to an already retarded theory, so...

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 00:14:28 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 16:56

I see what he was going for, he just said it wrong.

He was sarcastically implying that there's no way Bush could have pulled off such an "intricate" plan (that middle school dropouts could apparently "uncover"), especially when most of the same people say he's dumb as a load of bricks and what have you.

That's really the debate amongst Bush-haters. Is he evil or is he stupid? Those are two distinct camps which you shouldn't confuse. Although, if they're still discussing it, they're hopeless cases and you can confuse them all you want.

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 16:56His second "point" was that any involvement Bush had, Clinton probably had just as much, all things considered.

Uh, no. Not even close. It's not the about the actual events of 9/11 -- After all, who could've predicted it? (Although there are quite a few intelligence reports that have come out since then that point to a bit of negligence on the federal governments part). It's mostly the misguided actions Bush took because of the events of 9/11 that would be his big mistake. Clinton had no part in that,

now did he?

And I have to ask, what the hell is it with blaming everything on the Clintons? Can't Republicans grow a pair and own up to their mistakes?

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 00:36:07 GMT

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

---

Quote:Uh, no. Not even close. It's not the about the actual events of 9/11 -- After all, who could've predicted it? (Although there are quite a few intelligence reports that have come out since then that point to a bit of negligence on the federal governments part). It's mostly the misguided actions Bush took because of the events of 9/11 that would be his big mistake. Clinton had no part in that, now did he?

And I have to ask, what the hell is it with blaming everything on the Clintons? Can't Republicans grow a pair and own up to their mistakes?

I'm saying that's what DarkKnight's hypothetical argument to the "LAWL GOVERNMENT DID 9/11 JEWS ETC" bullshit. If Bush was involved, Clinton had just as much involvement. Although I don't see why that's relevant, considering it's all bullshit anyway...

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 00:56:38 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 17:36I'm saying that's what DarkKnight's hypothetical argument to the "LAWL GOVERNMENT DID 9/11 JEWS ETC" bullshit. If Bush was involved, Clinton had just as much involvement. Although I don't see why that's relevant, considering it's all bullshit anyway...

While I get what you're trying to do, I don't get why you're dragging Clinton into this. Why not blame it on Carter while you're at it?

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [IAmFenix](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:13:20 GMT

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

---

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 17:03Thing i find funny is for years we heard how stupid bush is but yet in his first few months in office he was able to pull off 9/11. Of course Clinton who was just in office he in now way had anything to do with it (no response that should be posted on the forums is available, as it would turn into a flamefest.We will instead post something that has been posted on this forum before.) I dislike you.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:17:18 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:56Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:35DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:03he was able to pull off 9/11.

What does this mean? Have you seen the footage of him being told the nation is under attack? He sat there like a kid who can't find his mom at a playground.

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 15:03Of course Clinton who was just in office he in now way had anything to do with it

What?

I see what he was going for, he just said it wrong.

He was sarcastically implying that there's no way Bush could have pulled off such an "intricate" plan (that middle school dropouts could apparently "uncover"), especially when most of the same people say he's dumb as a load of bricks and what have you.

His second "point" was that any involvement Bush had, Clinton probably had just as much, all things considered.

But that's a hypothetical argument to an already retarded theory, so...

btw your hired as my new editor. yes that's what i was trying to say lol

No I don't believe for one second Bush or Clinton had anything to do with it. I'm going with the wild conspiracy theory that andr3w282 posted about. What I was trying to say is if your going to blame Bush who was only in office for a few months then blame the president before him as well. Don't see why he would be excluded.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:22:00 GMT

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

---

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:17What I was trying to say is if your going to blame Bush who was only in office for a few months then blame the president before him as well. Don't see why he would be excluded.

Hey, good thinking! But why stop there? Let's blame the two presidents before that, too! This is all Reagan's fault!!!

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

---

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:22:09 GMT

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

---

If there WERE any kind of conspiracy, almost every single president would have to have been in on it.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:25:42 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:22If there WERE any kind of conspiracy, almost every single president would have to have been in on it.

Because all presidents share the same ideologies and goals, right?

By this same logic, everything Obama has done these first few months in his presidency that you Republicans hate so much can be directly placed at Bush's feet.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:29:16 GMT

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

---

ok let me ask it a different way.

bush had just come into office when 9/11 hit. then the conspiracies fly about how it was bush behind the scenes doing it all. why does Clinton get a pass?

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:32:11 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:25GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:22If there WERE any kind of conspiracy, almost every single president would have to have been in on it.

Because all presidents share the same ideologies and goals, right?

By this same logic, everything Obama has done these first few months in his presidency that you Republicans hate so much can be directly placed at Bush's feet.

I didnt hit edit cause i figured Dover was ready to pounce on my latest comment.

Like that isnt happening??? Just recently Obama said he was still trying to clean up the mess the previous president left behind. I'd like to know when it becomes Obama's mess.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:33:22 GMT

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

---

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:29ok let me ask it a different way.

bush had just come into office when 9/11 hit. then the conspiracies fly about how it was bush behind the scenes doing it all. why does Clinton get a pass?

You make it sound as if it was days after his inauguration. Bush was already in power for almost a year by September 11th, 2001. That's enough time for any Clinton-era staff (Which you Republicans HAET so much) to be removed and replaced by Bush staff.

Clinton gets a "pass" because he had nothing to do with anything. He isn't involved at all and the only reason his name is being brought up is because conservatives like yourself, Mr. ZIMMER, and Rush Limbawwww have a pathological need to paint the Clinton family as the root of all evil. It's fucking pathetic.

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:32I didnt hit edit cause i figured Dover was ready to pounce on my latest comment.

lol.

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:32Like that isnt happening??? Just recently Obama said he was still trying to clean up the mess the previous president left behind. I'd like to know when it becomes Obama's mess.

It becomes his mess when he does something retarded to cause a mess, like say taking a budget surplus and pissing it away on a pointless war or tax cuts to the wealthy.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:34:29 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:33DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:29ok let me ask it a different way.

bush had just come into office when 9/11 hit. then the conspiracies fly about how it was bush behind the scenes doing it all. why does Clinton get a pass?

You make it sound as if it was days after his inauguration. Bush was already in power for almost a year by September 11th, 2001. That's enough time for any Clinton-era staff (Which you Republicans HAET so much) to be removed and replaced by Bush staff.

Clinton gets a "pass" because he had nothing to do with anything. He isn't involved at all and the only reason his name is being brought up is because conservatives like yourself, Mr. ZIMMER, and Rush Limbawwww have a pathological need to paint the Clinton family as the root of all evil.



It's fucking pathetic.

news flash Einstein, Bush wasn't involved either

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:36:27 GMT

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

---

ok well I just got home and I dont care to spend my whole night arguing with conspiracy nut jobs. have a nice night.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:38:06 GMT

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

---

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:34news flash Einstein, Bush wasn't involved either

It was on his watch. He was the Commander-In-Chief at the time. It was his responsibility (Or at least, the responsibility of the people he hired) to prevent that sort of thing from happening. While he probably didn't cause 9/11 directly, he's certainly guilty through inaction.

DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:36ok well I just got home and I dont care to spend my whole night arguing with conspiracy nut jobs. have a nice night.

Conspiracy nut job? Lol.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [dr3w2](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 01:49:14 GMT

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

---

Tupac planned 9/11, him and Osama are home boys now living it up with MJ down in Latin America... Elvis wasn't invited.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 02:10:14 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:33Clinton gets a "pass" because he had nothing to do with anything. He isn't involved at all and the only reason his name is being brought up is because conservatives like yourself, Mr. ZIMMER, and Rush Limbawwww have a pathological need to paint the Clinton family as the root of all evil. It's fucking pathetic.

---

I... wait, what? I was, again, making a hypothetical argument, assuming that conspiracy theories were true.

Hence my earlier comment, that every President would HAVE to have been involved. Yes, I know their goals and such are vastly different- hence WHY they would have to all be in on it, and all their goals/ideals/etc would have had to have been fake.

Which, of course, is even more bullshit, proving that 9/11 conspiracy theorists are ridiculous.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 02:26:50 GMT

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

---

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 19:10Hence my earlier comment, that every President would HAVE to have been involved. Yes, I know their goals and such are vastly different- hence WHY they would have to all be in on it, and all their goals/ideals/etc would have had to have been fake.

...What?

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 02:34:54 GMT

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

---

Nobody actually died, I just needed more for my plantation

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [appshot](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 02:41:01 GMT

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

---

Nice Fallacy usage Mr. DarkKnight. Also, you think that conspirators are idiots. Way to be ignorant, there.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 05:16:04 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 19:56While I get what you're trying to do, I don't get why you're dragging Clinton into this. Why not blame it on Carter while you're at it?

Actually, the threat was festering for quite some time before George Bush's presidency. If you

---

read 'Against all Enemies' by Richard Clarke, you'll see that both the Clinton and Bush administrations had failed in a number of ways in curbing the attack.

However, the blame lies less with the indicisiveness of either president, and more with the various agencies like the military and CIA being incredibly incompetent. It's shameful to see that the government had been tracking Osama bin Laden and were on the verge of using an unmanned drone to drop a small payload onto him between his daily rounds, only to have the idea aborted because those agencies are idiots and won't let the other do shit-all without bitchin'.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [DarkKnight](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 09:33:59 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:38DarkKnight wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:34news flash Einstein, Bush wasn't involved either

It was on his watch. He was the Commander-In-Chief at the time. It was his responsibility (Or at least, the responsibility of the people he hired) to prevent that sort of thing from happening. While he probably didn't cause 9/11 directly, he's certainly guilty through inaction.

How would you suggest a president might have prevented 9-11 or even prevent something similar from happening today? Just curious since you seem to know all the answers.

appshot wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:41Nice Fallacy usage Mr. DarkKnight. Also, you think that conspirators are idiots. Way to be ignorant, there.

no i think that the conspiracy theory of 9/11 is stupid.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [hazmat68](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 14:38:32 GMT

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

---

To pin the blame on any one president is short sighted in my opinion.

Bill Clinton was elected to reduce the deficit and cut the size of government. Intelligence was not a priority at the time and was cut.

George Bush was just coming off the American spy plane landing in China mess when the attacks occurred.

It was never concieved that someone or an organization would go to such extremes to attack the USA.

We got caught with our pants down and it hurt.

The signs were there but missed, as for the theories, well, I personally dont believe them, but someone will always try to sell a bill of goods if it meets their agenda.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 15:51:06 GMT

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

---

Dover wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 21:26GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 19:10Hence my earlier comment, that every President would HAVE to have been involved. Yes, I know their goals and such are vastly different- hence WHY they would have to all be in on it, and all their goals/ideals/etc would have had to have been fake.

...What?

To put it in another way, 9/11 Conspiracy theories are bullshit because of the fact that in order for it to have worked the way people claimed, almost every single President would have had to be super evil and devious and whatnot.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 16:28:57 GMT

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

---

hazmat68 wrote on Tue, 01 September 2009 09:38

It was never conceived that someone or an organization would go to such extremes to attack the USA.

BIN LADIN DETERMINED TO STRIKE IN US

-President's Daily Brief (PDB), August 6th, 2001.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [infusi0n](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 18:28:04 GMT

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

---

andr3w282 wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:12or.. JUST MAYBE there were some extreme islamic people sourced from afganistan and saudi arabia that disagreed with western culture. I know it's a long shot but it is possible!

I hope you aren't serious in believing that?

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Prulez](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 19:53:10 GMT

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

---

infusi0n wrote on Tue, 01 September 2009 20:28andr3w282 wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 18:12or.. JUST MAYBE there were some extreme islamic people sourced from afganistan and saudi arabia that disagreed with western culture. I know it's a long shot but it is possible!

---

I hope you aren't serious in believing that?  
Why wouldn't he be? For all I know, for all I care, andr3w is right.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [appshot](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 22:44:54 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i am not sure if i am correct or not... but the world trade center shouldn't have fallen straight down. The laws of physics don't permit it to fall down straight... unless there was a systematical dynamite. And also.. how was it that the building right next to it fell down, way after the original building collapse, and it also fell down straight...WITH NO FIRE OR ANYTHING.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Tue, 01 Sep 2009 22:57:59 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

appshot wrote on Tue, 01 September 2009 17:44i am not sure if i am correct or not... but the world trade center shouldn't have fallen straight down. The laws of physics don't permit it to fall down straight... unless there was a systematical dynamite. And also.. how was it that the building right next to it fell down, way after the original building collapse, and it also fell down straight...WITH NO FIRE OR ANYTHING.  
What the FUCK.

Ok, imagine you have a house of cards. You pull one card out, what happens? The entire thing collapses. It doesn't fall sideways.  
The point is, the towers weren't completely rigid. If you've ever been in a skyscraper before, you'll find that it twists and swings about slightly in the wind. If it were completely rigid, then it would fall sideways, but this isn't the case.

The surrounding buildings being damaged was pretty obvious and self-explanatory as well. For god's sakes, a SKYSCRAPER collapsed RIGHT next to it! You expected them to stay standing after that?!

Your logic makes me cringe.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 01:42:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I love that argument. It's funny to look at, because it means the person writing it hasn't got a clue how buildings are constructed. Specifically, it means that they haven't got a clue how skyscrapers are constructed. The possibility of a catastrophic failure is part of any architect's design if they're worth two shits; those towers fell more or less straight down because they were designed to do

exactly that in the event that they were so compromised.

Actually, they were quite an inspired design for the time they were built; the outer structure (the steel beams running down the sides of the buildings that gave them their iconic look) actually supported a fairly large percentage of the total weight of the building while remaining flexible enough to deal with high winds. Had the planes been low on fuel, the towers would likely still stand today; collisions were a consideration in the design... it's just that nobody in the 1960s thought anyone would plow a fully-fueled airliner into a building deliberately.

Also, do you have any notion of just how much something that big weighs? Once the structural members were weakened by heat, the kinetic energy of the falling upper levels even across an extremely short distance (say a single story) would have been (and was) sufficient to cause cascading failures all the way down. It wouldn't have toppled in any case; toppling requires that the building retain structural integrity in at least one place- but the fire from the jet fuel weakened the steel all the way around the buildings (and in case you were wondering, steel loses much of its strength well below its melting point). Buildings don't just arbitrarily fall over; more often than not they have to be made to fall over by the conditions of the collapse (as when the foundation is knocked out on one side but not on the other).

Anybody who's had basic high school physics should be able to work that much out; look up the overall mass of each tower (which is likely public record on a trivia page somewhere) and work out a rough estimate on how heavy the portions above the impact sites were (1/3? 1/4?). With that, you can work out more or less how much force was exerted on the lower floors when the impact sites gave way. Momentum = Mass \* Velocity. Here's a hint: it's gonna be a really, really big number. Then think about whether or not you can really imagine those buildings falling in any other direction than straight down.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [slosha](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 02:31:18 GMT

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

---

All I have to say is, we need to find that mother fucker and the rest of those fucks and put them out of their fucking misery. Nice and slow, so they feel every single man, woman and child they fucking helped kill.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 03:51:06 GMT

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

---

to me, the only weird thing about 9/11 was that the wtc7 building collapsed. i never really understood how or why that happened, but then again, i haven't looked into it very much.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 05:28:16 GMT

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

---

Ryan3k wrote on Tue, 01 September 2009 22:51 to me, the only weird thing about 9/11 was that the wtc7 building collapsed. i never really understood how or why that happened, but then again, i haven't looked into it very much.

Same here. Other than that, the rest of the shit's pretty self explanatory.

Then again, for the most part, New York itself isn't exactly a stable city to begin with. It's practically built right on the water- the fact that the whole city didn't go under kinda surprised me.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 05:48:40 GMT

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

---

Glock~ wrote on Tue, 01 September 2009 19:31 All I have to say is, we need to find that mother fucker and the rest of those fucks and put them out of their fucking misery. Nice and slow, so they feel every single man, woman and child they fucking helped kill.

Revenge!

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [EaZiE](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 06:25:12 GMT

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

---

andr3w282 wrote on Mon, 31 August 2009 20:49 Tupac planned 9/11, him and Osama are home boys now living it up with MJ down in Latin America... Elvis wasn't invited.

diZ man speakZ TRUFAX!!!111!!!111!!

Seriously though who gives a fuck? Shit happens. It's noones fault other than the turban wearing mother fucker that flew that plane, and the guy that told him god wanted him to do it. Saying it was someone elses thought is like saying it would be my fault if my daughter got raped. Yes it's horrible, yes I would feel a failure, but theres really nothing I could of done to prevent it.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [slosha](#) on Wed, 02 Sep 2009 20:21:51 GMT

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

---

I bet if we put as much effort into finding Osama as we are into Iraq, I bet we would have found him years ago.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [infusi0n](#) on Thu, 03 Sep 2009 04:14:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ok, would the uneducated people please stop posting in this thread. Read up on the concept of gravity and paths of least resistance and maybe come back to it?

The US spent MILLIONS on the 9/11 commission and I can say 2 words that proves 500+ pages completely wrong. What are they? Building 7.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [renalpha](#) on Thu, 03 Sep 2009 11:22:36 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

9/11 killed my causin, the war killed my causin dont talk about shit you dont know.  
There is no conspiracy.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Thu, 03 Sep 2009 20:49:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

infusi0n wrote on Wed, 02 September 2009 23:14Ok, would the uneducated people please stop posting in this thread. Read up on the concept of gravity and paths of least resistance and maybe come back to it?

The US spent MILLIONS on the 9/11 commission and I can say 2 words that proves 500+ pages completely wrong. What are they? Building 7.  
Can you at least TRY with your arguments?

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Thu, 03 Sep 2009 21:18:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I'm not inclined to believe it was an 'inside job' by the US government because they've proven to be quite inefficient when it comes to these sorts of things.

If the terms 'Bay of Pigs' and 'Vietnam' aren't a good enough indication of how well the intelligence agencies and the government are at screwing things up, then the CIA's overthrow of Mohammad Mossaddeq in Iran, the supplying of arms to the Afghan mujahadeen and other botched forays into foreign powers should be aequate.

What these all have in common are that they involved US government agencies like the CIA, and they didn't stay secret all too long. If 9/11 was an 'inside job,' it would have been exposed in a



short time, much like those other operations. If there's one thing people are good at, it's not keeping their mouths shut.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [appshot](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 01:46:00 GMT

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

---

Quote:I love that argument. It's funny to look at, because it means the person writing it hasn't got a clue how buildings are constructed. Specifically, it means that they haven't got a clue how skyscrapers are constructed. The possibility of a catastrophic failure is part of any architect's design if they're worth two shits; those towers fell more or less straight down because they were designed to do exactly that in the event that they were so compromised.

Actually, they were quite an inspired design for the time they were built; the outer structure (the steel beams running down the sides of the buildings that gave them their iconic look) actually supported a fairly large percentage of the total weight of the building while remaining flexible enough to deal with high winds. Had the planes been low on fuel, the towers would likely still stand today; collisions were a consideration in the design... it's just that nobody in the 1960s thought anyone would plow a fully-fueled airliner into a building deliberately.

Also, do you have any notion of just how much something that big weighs? Once the structural members were weakened by heat, the kinetic energy of the falling upper levels even across an extremely short distance (say a single story) would have been (and was) sufficient to cause cascading failures all the way down. It wouldn't have toppled in any case; toppling requires that the building retain structural integrity in at least one place- but the fire from the jet fuel weakened the steel all the way around the buildings (and in case you were wondering, steel loses much of its strength well below its melting point). Buildings don't just arbitrarily fall over; more often than not they have to be made to fall over by the conditions of the collapse (as when the foundation is knocked out on one side but not on the other).

Anybody who's had basic high school physics should be able to work that much out; look up the overall mass of each tower (which is likely public record on a trivia page somewhere) and work out a rough estimate on how heavy the portions above the impact sites were (1/3? 1/4?). With that, you can work out more or less how much force was exerted on the lower floors when the impact sites gave way. Momentum = Mass \* Velocity. Here's a hint: it's gonna be a really, really big number. Then think about whether or not you can really imagine those buildings falling in any other direction than straight down.

Erm.. you are missing the point that momentum and energy are also conserved. Also, look closely when the buildings are falling, they go at somewhat of an angle, which indicates even less of a force. And also notice the dust and the steel frames and their position. The jet fuel fire did weaken the material but not to such an extent as to the failure of the beams. The main steel frames never got higher than 300C, which does NOTHING. Plus, if your reasoning is indeed true, then why need demolition teams. Just put a few floors who have enough "force"--Not that difficult to calculate by engineers and physicists-- on jet fuel and bam the building will collapse. The fire was also non-uniform and didn't constrict to an entire floor, because, as you said, it was built that way. Also, uhhh free-fall acceleration much?

And BlueThen, i was referring to WTC 7 as people are referring to. Sorry i didn't make it clear enough. I assumed you were smart enough.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 02:58:13 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

appshot wrote on Tue, 01 September 2009 17:44i am not sure if i am correct or not... but the world trade center shouldn't have fallen straight down. The laws of physics don't permit it to fall down straight... unless there was a systematical dynamite. And also.. how was it that the building right next to it fell down, way after the original building collapse, and it also fell down straight...WITH NO FIRE OR ANYTHING.

Quote:And BlueThen, i was referring to WTC 7 as people are referring to. Sorry i didn't make it clear enough. I assumed you were smart enough. I was referring to your first statement, which I can assume was focused around the main towers, because of your context. If you were referring to WTC 7, sorry then. I can't read minds, I'm too "stupid".

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [infusi0n](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 03:28:17 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anyone wanna explain WTC 7 and why theres not 1 mention of it in the commission report? And how it stated the main theory behind the 2 towers collapes goes against all laws of physics and logic known to man?

---

Subject: Re: 9/11  
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 04:39:09 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I recall hearing about that they had solved the mystery. The best reason why Tower 7 likely didn't make the report was because investigating structures takes time, and is filled with variables and all sorts of scenarios. However, I believe the commission was flawed, so I'm not putting too much stock in it anyways.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/7485331.stm>

Quote:Steel structure weakened

It says Tower Seven had an unusual design, built over an electricity substation and a subway; there were many fires that burnt for hours; and crucially, fire fighters could not fight the fires in Tower 7, because they didn't have enough water and focused on saving lives.

Investigators have focused on the east side where the long floor spans were under most stress.

They think fires burnt long enough to weaken and break many of the connections that held the steel structure together.

Most susceptible were the thinner floor beams which required less fireproofing, and the connections between the beams and the columns. As they heated up the connections failed and the beams sagged and failed, investigators say.

The collapse of the first of the Twin Towers does not seem to have caused any serious damage to Tower Seven, but the second collapse of the 1,368ft (417m) North Tower threw debris at Tower Seven, just 350ft (106m) away.

Tower Seven came down at 5.21pm. Until now most of the photographs have been of the three sides of the building that did not show much obvious physical damage. Now new photos of the south side of the building, which crucially faced the North Tower, show that whole side damaged and engulfed in smoke.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [nope.avi](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 13:05:23 GMT

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

---

infusi0n wrote on Thu, 03 September 2009 23:28 Anyone wanna explain WTC 7 and why theres not 1 mention of it in the commission report? And how it stated the main theory behind the 2 towers collapes goes against all laws of physics and logic known to man? not everything you watch on youtube is true btw

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Dover](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 14:03:02 GMT

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

---

ITT: Pissing in the wind.

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [appshot](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 21:17:44 GMT

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

---

Quote:I was referring to your first statement, which I can assume was focused around the main towers, because of your context. If you were referring to WTC 7, sorry then. I can't read minds, I'm

too "stupid".

No, as you the initiator of the topic, i thought you would atleast have some extent of knowledge. And you were not indeed referring to my first sentence. Go back and read what you said.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [BlueThen](#) on Fri, 04 Sep 2009 21:19:22 GMT

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

---

appshot wrote on Fri, 04 September 2009 16:17Quote:I was referring to your first statement, which I can assume was focused around the main towers, because of your context. If you were referring to WTC 7, sorry then. I can't read minds, I'm too "stupid".

No, as you the initiator of the topic, i thought you would atleast have some extent of knowledge. And you were not indeed referring to my first sentence. Go back and read what you said. You're not accomplishing anything by accusing me of lacking knowledge. Elaborate, I don't see anything wrong.

---

---

Subject: Re: 9/11

Posted by [Ethenal](#) on Sat, 05 Sep 2009 01:21:20 GMT

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

---

Nobody cares about physics, they threw a god damn airplane at an office building. What the fuck do you think is going to happen?

---