

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation

September 17, 2010



(http://www.goldworth.com/henry_makow.html)

(<http://this.content.served.by.adshuffie.com/p/kl/46/799/r/12/4/8/ru/d3d3LmhbnJ5bWFrb3cuY29t/1074792636/v/576462396944238745/ac/770891/b/262407/c/389571/click.html>)

Look HOT NAKED!
See these 5 surprising foods that help to burn abdominal fat.

3 Foods to NEVER Eat
Beware of some foods that you think are "healthy" that can actually increase your abdominal fat.

BestFoodSecrets.com



There are only two events known to cause ground-hugging pyroclastic flows (pictured above).

1. **A volcanic eruption**
2. **A thermo nuclear detonation**

by "Dennis"

All research provided by:

www.drjudywood.com (<http://www.drjudywood.com/>) and <http://911u.org/>

On the morning of September 11th, 2001, we were told a fairy tale. That wide body jets flew into the twin towers and completely destroyed them. Let me repeat that: Passenger planes (large hollow aluminum tubes) flew into industrial steel, marble and concrete sky scrapers, and caused them to turn into a pile of dust. And the worst part about this fairy tale is that we, the American people believed it. Now, nine years later, it's time to wake up from your slumber and take a good hard look at what did and did not happen on that fateful day. The conventional explanation we were provided, by government and media, for a top-down highly destructive gravitational collapse, in near-free-fall times, is physically impossible, and is thus about as worthy of discussion as is the belief that the Earth is flat.

FICTION: Passenger jets flew into the Twin Towers, and the burning jet fuel caused them to collapse.

FACT: The Twin Towers did not collapse. They suffered a mid-air pulverization due to an extreme unconventional energy source that caused the initial upward trajectory of so much of the towers' mass during the 'collapses' as (supposedly only) gravity was pulling them down.

FICTION: The burning jet fuel melted all of the steel beams causing the buildings to collapse directly onto their own footprint.

FACT: 80% of each of the towers 50 million ton mass NEVER hit the ground. The steel did not melt, but turned into nano-dust. Pulverization + Molecular Dissociation = Ground Zero Evidence. When matter is elevated to temperatures hotter than the surface of the Sun, molecular dissociation results. Molecular Dissociation (MD) is easy to understand once we realize that there are four (4) states of matter: solid, liquid, gas, and plasma. Just as ice has trouble surviving in water or steam, molecules have trouble surviving in plasma, which is highly energetic (ie, extremely hot). When molecules dissociate, they leave behind loose atoms and fragments of molecules. In other words, extremely small particles. In this sense, it is correct to think of molecular dissociation as disintegration.



What do these two pictures have in common? They both represent a highly unconventional destructive release of energy, with temperatures much hotter than the sun.

So once we confirm evidence of widespread molecular dissociation (<http://ehp.niehs.nih.gov/members/2003/5930/5930.html>) having occurred at Ground Zero in New York City, we have a very strong indication that only exotic, unconventional weaponry could have released that much extremely -- unimaginably -- high intensity energy which suddenly appeared just as the towers disintegrated from top to bottom. This understanding means we cannot blame the highly unconventional Ground Zero devastation on thermite/thermate/super thermate and "controlled demolition" any more than we can blame it on "jet fuel" or "box cutters".

In a "pancake collapse" the rubble pile should be at least 1/8 of the original building height (12.5%). The actual rubble pile was no more than 2% of the original building height. Both towers went "poof."

So where did these 110 story tall 50 million ton sky scrapers go?



They were turned into nano-dust and 80% of the "dust" floated off into the atmosphere.



From left to right: A huge steel beam from the south tower falters, turns to "dust" and blows away.

Now that we've scientifically proven that only exotic, unconventional weaponry could have released that much extremely -- unimaginably -- high intensity energy to cause the pulverization and molecular dissociation of these buildings, let's look at some of the other unexplainable anomalies..

1400 VEHICLES melted NEAR WTC



All of these cars have unexplainable similar damage: Paint gone, instant rusting, and all of their door handles and engine blocks are missing!

A squad car on FDR drive with wilted doors, burned paint, instant rust and no door handles or engine block.



Strange fires appear to be attracted to the engine blocks, while the gas tanks and nearby paper are not affected.



Buildings a few blocks away, had mysterious holes in the windows, and the front marble façade is completely gone, but no other damage.



Why doesn't the paper burn?

For months we witnessed trucks coming and going from Ground Zero and the media told us they were hauling away the steel. What steel? There was very little steel left in the rubble because it had been pulverized into nano-dust. So what were these trucks really hauling back and forth? Dirt! They hauled in dirt, spread it all over Ground Zero, then scooped it up and hauled it away, and this went on for years. Didn't they do that at Chernobyl? Yes they did!

So now you know what didn't cause the buildings to "vanish." Planes, jet fuel and thermite are irrelevant. So what kind of unconventional energy could have caused the Twin Towers to turn to dust? A fissionless fusion thermo nuclear event? Direct Energy Weapons? HAARP? A scaled up weaponized version of The Hutchison Effect? The investigation continues.....

Related: Dr. Ed Ward -- [Mini Nukes Prove US Government Involvement \(http://www.rense.com/general92/pr911.htm\)](http://www.rense.com/general92/pr911.htm)


FEATURED: [Scientist built a home made 24 KW Magnetic Generator for his home](#) A Small version is only \$100 to Build

(<http://www.33energy.com/henrymakow>)

**Exclusive:
Horroric Predictions for 2012. Find Out More...**

(<http://this.content.served.by.adshuffler.com/p/kl/46/799/r/12/4/8/ru/d3d3LmhlbnJ5bWFrb3cuY29t/339434943/v/576462396944238745/ac/770891/b/262409/c/381431/click.html>)

(http://myeztracking.com/openx/www/delivery/ck.php?oaparams=2_bannerid=10_zoneid=1_OXLCA=1_cb=962ddd1c59_oadest=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.homemade-energy.com%2Freview.php%3Ftid%3Dmakow)

REVEALED: How To Make Electricity! \$200 Kit Has Electricity Company Execs Calling For Its Ban! [See Now!](#) 

Comments for "Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation "

Charles said (September 17, 2010):

Hi Henry,

Scraping the disso BS barrel today aren't we? And there was me thinking you were a smart fella. Still we all know what thought did!! LOL

<http://drjudywood.com/articles/DEW/StarWarsBeam4.html> (<http://drjudywood.com/articles/DEW/StarWarsBeam4.html>)

Andrew said (September 17, 2010):

That's bullshit. Personally, I think that the forensic scientists proved they were jets. Not nukes.

And the alloy used in planes these days are stronger than they're believed to be in that article, they have to withstand HUGE amounts of airpressure from the outside.

If they were as thin as they're made out to be in that article, the speeds they reach would cause an air pressure so strong it'd crush the entire plane into a lace killing everyone.

Furthermore, the angle the planes hit caused the building's weight to collapse upon themselves. No NUKE could cause that (besides, the blast radius would murder loads more outside), burning jet fuel could've easily caught fire to the actual fibrous insulation in the walls, weakening the structure.

Nano-particles can't be achieved in this atmosphere, they can only be caused by man in extreme lab conditions, not by nukes...

Oh, and the pictures of the NUKE and the 9/11 being compared, well, that's the typical shape of an explosion, the mushroom shape on top is where the energy pushes itself out. The fuel in the NUKE and the aeroplane would have caused that shape.

The "nano-dust" is just debris from the rock and cement... any explosion will cause shrapnel and dust and nano-dust can't be seen by naked eyes.

The 1400 cars that "melted" were crushed by the debris, they'd have melted if there were discs of metal on the ground, not crushed bonnets and roofs. Paint gone from the heat. Instant rusting because the heat would act as a catalyst to the oxidation of aluminium. Door handles melted because they're usually plastic.

Any flame next to paper would react, you can't control fire, just where it's used.

Mysterious holes in the windows of nearby buildings caused by debris, shrapnel or blast radius.

"Why doesn't the paper burn?" Maybe it's just ash blocks that are wide enough to cause the illusion of paper?

Overall... that article is complete and utter bollocks.

Dan said (September 17, 2010):

Nuclear bombs shower radioactivity into the upper atmosphere which would have been detected all the way to Russia. and all over the East Coast. Think of Chernobyl. There's more to concealing evidence of NUCLEAR detonation than hauling off dirt before somebody happens to drop by with w Geiger counter.

The steel wasn't 'pulverized' or melted away. The girders and wreckage were hauled to land fill as quickly as possible because the debris was full of asbestos laying in a toxic pile in the heart of New York City. That's why it had to be moved to a land fill. The steel was sold off quickly for scrap to get rid of the evidence of thermite, not radiation.

The dirt is still in the land fill. If it were a nuke it would still be radioactive.

MK Ghandi said (September 17, 2010):

What the real issue here is summed up by the two pictures at the top of your article of 9/17/10. One is of one of the WTC towers collapsing, and the other is the Sedan Storax nuclear test in the Nevada Desert in 1962. The Sedan test was a nuclear device of about 100 kilotons exploding 600 feet--about 200 meters below the Nevada desert. The plumes coming out of the surface are results of the shock wave of the underground blast, which pulverizes everything within a certain distance from the center of the explosion. For a short distance beyond that, the force doesn't pulverize everything, but just tears it up into pieces larger than powder.

When we watched the demolition of the WTC towers, what we saw was the instantaneous effects of a large nuclear blast placed underneath each tower. When we saw the floors blowing outwards starting around the 75th floor of each building, we were looking at the part of the nuclear blast that was outside the pulverization zone. We saw pieces of steel being ejected, while leaving a trail of powder behind them. This ejection seemed to proceed downward from the around the 75th floor until it reached maybe the 60th floor below which everything had already turned to dust.

There is nothing we know of (and not likely that there are technologies we don't know of) that can do this other than a large nuclear explosion. Khalezov describes the entire nuclear demolition of the WTC in various places on the internet. He has a long explanation, but he summarizes it well enough to fit into the attention span of the modern American at his website here: <http://www.nuclear-demolition.com/>. (<http://www.nuclear-demolition.com/>)

For many years, I looked at the videos of the WTC building collapse and asked myself 'What am I looking at?' What is this. Khalezov has convinced me that it was a 150 kiloton thermonuclear demolition device planted 50 meters below the bottom of each building in the NYC granite. The reason the trucks hauled away dirt was to clean up the radioactivity at ground zero. Interesting that in Fallujah, Iraq, in 2004, after the American assault on that city, there were trucks removing dirt there too. Gotta get rid of the evidence.