



Here's The Truth About 9/11!

Description

USA: We will expose the truth about 9/11, and it will shock you! We have to apologize to the people who will get offended, but our job is to share the truth under any circumstances!

Your eyes will be opened!

First, watch this [video](#):

Here's the backup:

There words not mine ? pic.twitter.com/WRVALA4IYC

— Shannon Crawford (@shae33172) [July 1, 2022](#)

Watch:

This is only the warm-up!

Did you know that it's confirmed that THERMITE was used? It's controlled demolition!

Thermite represents a mixture of aluminum powder and a metal oxide that, when ignited, evolves a great deal of heat, and it's used in welding and in incendiary bombs.

Do you know how the Twin Towers came down? It has happened with Thermite!

Here's the proof: The Open Chemical Physics Journal, 2009, 2, 7-31, here is a deep dive of highly researched scientific findings.

[Watch:](#)

Even Trump said that a plane couldn't take down these towers.

Health Nut News reported:

Donald Trump is a professional builder. He's spent much of his career in construction, building casinos and restaurants, and his opinion on the way the World Trade Centers came down is that of educated observation.

According to Rick Shaddock, Executive Director of the Association for Nine Eleven Truth Awareness, "Donald Trump was the first 9/11 Truther to speak out on TV, on the very same day, challenging the official story, and saying bombs must have been used, years before Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth was founded, from the perspective of people who know buildings are built to stand strong, even against planes."

Indeed, Donald did call out the situation, claiming the immense strength of the steel beams and that the damage done must have been caused by explosives of some sort.

He also seemed to think that something other than the plane must have penetrated the building initially (which may or may not have been the case).

Of course, since his public exclamation, Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth have laid out a convincing argument that explosives likely lined the inside of the building, enabling a controlled demolition. This, in their opinion, is the only way anyone could have gotten the buildings to fall straight down, in free-fall, like they did.

Here is the transcript from the video:

Alan Marcus: Donald you're probably the best-known builder particularly of great buildings in the city. There's a great deal of question about whether or not the damage and the ultimate destruction of the buildings was caused by the airplanes by architectural defect or possibly by bombs or more after shocks you have any thoughts on that?

Donald Trump: It wasn't architectural defect. The World Trade Center was always known as a very very strong building. Don't forget that took a big bomb in the basement (1993). Now, the basement is the most vulnerable place because that's your foundation and it withstood that and I got to see that area about three or four days after took place because one of my structural engineers actually took me for a tour because he did the building and I said "I can't believe it". The the building was standing solid and half of the columns were blown out. This was an unbelievably powerful building. If you don't know anything about structure it was one of the first buildings that was built from the outside. The steel, the reason the World Trade Center had such narrow windows is that in between all the windows, you had the steel on the outside, the steel on the outside of the building.

That's why when I first looked – and you had these big heavy i-beams. When I first looked at it, I couldn't believe it, because there was a hole in the steel and this is steel that was, you remember the width of the windows of the World Trade Center folks. I think you know if you were ever up there, they were quite narrow and in between was this heavy steel. I said how could a plane, even a plane, even a 767 or 747 or whatever it might have been, how could it possibly go through this steel? I happen to think that they had not only a plane but they had bombs that exploded almost simultaneously, because I just can't imagine anything being able to go through that wall. Most buildings are built with the steel on the inside around the elevator shaft. This one was built from the outside which is the strongest structure you can have and it was almost just like a can of soup

Rolland Smith: You know, Donald we were looking at pictures all morning long of that plane coming into building number two and when you see that approach the far side and all of a sudden within a matter of milliseconds the explosion pops out the other side.

Donald Trump: Right. I just think that there was a plane with more than just fuel. I think obviously they were very big planes. They were going very rapidly, because I was also watching where the plane seemed to be not only going fast it seems to be coming down into the building. So is getting the speed from going down hill so to speak. It just seemed to me that to do that kind of destruction is even more than a big plane because you're talking about talking about steel, the heaviest caliber steel that was used on the building. These buildings were rock-solid and you know it's just an amazing amazing thing. This country is different today and it's going to be different than it ever was for many years to come.

This is Trump in 2001, explaining what he saw and what he believes.

[Watch:](#)

Even George W. Bush confessed that explosives were used! Maybe it was just a slip of the tongue, but according to the Bible – the mouth speaks.

People thought that the Bushes were patriots, great republicans, but, noo!

This is the video where GWB admits there were explosives used in 9/11.

No, it's not as if he "comes clean" and admits the whole thing....more like he's just not smart enough to even realize when he's just accidentally "told the truth."

Watch:

[Daily Commercial News](#) reported:

Despite strong contrary arguments, a McMaster University engineering professor steadfastly maintains the collapse of three World Trade Center buildings after the infamous 9/11 attacks can only be adequately explained if "controlled demolition" is part of the equation.

Robert Korol, a civil engineering professor emeritus and a fellow of the Canadian Society of Civil Engineering, authored a report with Steven Jones, former professor of physics at Brigham Young University, Anthony Szamboti, a mechanical design engineer in the aerospace and communications industries and Ted Walter, director of strategy and development for Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth (AE911Truth). The report was titled *15 Years Later: On the Physics of High-Rise Building Collapses* published last year in the *Europhysics News* journal which is a magazine for the European physics community and owned by the European Physical Society.

In the controversial paper, the authors reflect the overarching premise of the AE911Truth, which has collected 2,936 signatures from engineers and architects. Among those petition signatories are 19 who earned their respective degrees in Canada, including 15 who live here.

AE911 Truth posits: “there is sufficient doubt about the official story and therefore the 9/11 investigation must be re-opened and must include a full inquiry into the possible use of explosives that might have been the actual cause of the destruction of the World Trade Center Twin Towers and Building 7.”

The group has long been controversial and its arguments have ignited many debates. The overwhelming consensus has favoured the official explanation which states that fires burning inside the buildings weakened the structural steel and triggered their collapse. This has consistently been reaffirmed by U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) over the last 16 years.

The *Europhysics News* editors also recognize the controversy, publishing the article with the following note: “This feature is somewhat different from our usual purely scientific articles, in that it contains some speculation. However, given the timing and the importance of the issue, we consider that this feature is sufficiently technical and interesting to merit publication for our readers. Obviously, the content of this article is the responsibility of the authors.”

Reached at his home in Dundas, Ont., Korol shrugs off the controversy.

“I’ve been scratching my head over this one since it happened on Sept. 11, 2001,” he says. “I just couldn’t understand how those buildings collapsed. It didn’t make sense.”

While the most iconic images of that fateful day are the collapse of the twin towers World Trade Center 1 (WTC 1) and World Trade Center 2 (WTC 2) within moments of each other, following the fires started by a passenger airplane crashing into each of them, there is a third building most often cited as the smoking gun in the “controlled demolition” theory. This building, World Trade Center Building 7 (WTC 7) was not hit by any aircraft and yet it too imploded like a house of cards, says Korol and his co-authors and others note it housed CIA and Secret Service offices.

“Indeed, neither before nor since 9/11 have fires caused the total collapse of a steel-framed high-rise — nor has any other natural event, with the exception of the 1985 Mexico City earthquake, which toppled a 21-storey office building,” they argue. “Otherwise, the only phenomenon capable of collapsing such buildings completely has been by way of a procedure known as controlled demolition, whereby explosives or other devices are used to bring down a structure intentionally.”

Korol, who has taken contrarian positions on other engineering-related issues, says it's important to keep challenging the status quo because we need to know how and why the buildings collapsed in order to prevent reoccurrences.

"The fires were on the upper floors, there's little chance the heat would have spread down and caused the steel columns, or the connectors or floor beams, to sufficiently weaken and collapse in the twin towers," he tells the Daily Commercial News.

"Also they were treated with a fire retardant which would have insulated them."

Further, he says, when the structures did fail they did so with such explosive force that pulverized concrete was ejected at high velocity and scattered on a debris field some 370 metres away.

The most probable explanation is a controlled explosion and mostly likely using thermite, he says, adding in the case of WTC 7 some 67 per cent of the supporting steel strength in Column 79 — pinpointed as the cause of the fatal collapse — would have to be lost before it failed and that would mean temperatures of 660C.

The paper also notes sprinkler systems would have reduced heat factors, while the overall design of the steel structure would isolate any failure and prevent a domino-effect collapse.

The NIST however maintains the heat factor triggered an expansion in floor beams, pushing them off their seats and causing the collapse when other components also failed due to thermal expansion.

Korol and other likeminded colleagues, stubbornly disagree.

Watch:

by Addison Wilson

Category

1. Crime-Justice-Terrorism-Corruption
2. Main
3. NWO-Deep State-Dictatorship-Tyrrany

Date Created

08/04/2022