

Re: No 757 Hit the Pentagon Re: Four More Years of Murder

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-08/0053.html>

From: lensman1955 (lensman1955_at_hotmail.com)

Date: 07/31/04

Date: 31 Jul 2004 03:43:10 -0700

Phat Albert Camus <master@mason.snuh> wrote in message
news:<Xns95366E6BAF95Espampamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17>...
> lensman1955@hotmail.com (lensman1955) wrote in
> news:633b063b.0407300207.6585066f@posting.google.com:
>
>> Phat Albert Camus <master@mason.snuh> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns9535B71BB265Fspampamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17>...
>>> lensman1955@hotmail.com (lensman1955) wrote in
>>> news:633b063b.0407290425.5f6b5288@posting.google.com:
>>>> I asked (re; Pentagon) what people expected the wings to do? Drop
>>>> off outside the building a la the James Bond movie "Live and Let
>>>> Die" or leave little wing shaped holes in reinforced granite.
>>>>
>>>> No, that is your stock reply. It is the stock reply of many Pentagon
>>>> story defenders. Almost a trademark of the debunker who has exhausted
>>>> his limited bag of tricks.
>>>>
>>>>> I never got an
>>>>> answer, I was just told I was being stupid for thinking the wings
>>>>> could crumble up and be dragged into the building.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> Can you explain the physics of these wings disappearing into this
>>>>> tiny hole? It seems to me, if they struck the wall, the last thing
>>>>> they could possibly do is "crumble up and be dragged inside the
>>>>> building".
>>>>>
>>>>>> This is my understanding, and I'll type slowly so you can follow
>>>>>> along. (Yes, that was deliberate.)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The nose of the plane punches a hole in the wall.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> The not very strong nose, which was inexplicably claimed to have been
>>>>>>>> recovered somewhat intact and in recognizable form.

Since a nose was recovered, are you suggesting it and the rest of the debris was somehow planted? If so, this conversation is over since you can claim any evidence against your theory is false and was planted.

> > *As the base of the*
> > *wings reaches the wall, there's more surface area and less structural*
> > *strength to the wings than there is to the nose so the wings are*
> > *unable to punch through the wall.*
>
>
> *The engines being massively more structurally sound than the nose. Of*
> *course, the right-side engine, if there was one, couldn't not have done*
> *this. And it certainly didn't enter the wall, as there is no entry point*
> *for it.*

The big massive engines were attached to the wings. The point where the wings were attached to the fuselage would have been less massive than the engines and would have hinged back on impact.

>
>
> > *Taking the path of least resistance,*
> > *they crumble back into the fuselage and are dragged into the hole.*
>
>
> *Ignoring the whole of physics.*
>
> *What dragged them in, by the way? Electrical cabling?*

Ignoring WHAT "whole of physics"? And the wings being folded up into the fuselage hardly cancelled out their forward momentum which would have carried them into the building through the center hole.

> > *If there's something wrong with that idea, let me know what it is and*
> > *what you think _should_ have happened to the wings.*
>
>
> *Oh, they got sucked into the too-small hole, of course.*
>
> *It's so bloody obvious. They hit a reinforced wall, and then then moved*
> *sideways a bit, and then continued to move forward. Disappearing without*
> *a trace.*

"Sideways?" Where did I say "sideways?"

> > > *In regards to the Towers. Someone said the puffs of debris shooting*
> > > *out of the floors as they collapsed was "proof" the Towers were*
> > > *brought down by "controlled demolition." I've seen quite a few*
> > > *controlled demolitions and if this is true it's the first time I've*
> > > *seen the explosions go off DURING the collapse of the building in*
> > > *question.*
> > >

> >>
> >> *How many demolitions of a building that tall have you observed, if I*
> >> *may ask?*
> >>
> >> *Did the explosions go off after the collapse or something?*
> >
> > *Quite a few actually. Controlled demolitions are fun to watch and*
> > *people like to film them. In the demolitions _I_ saw, the explosions*
> > *go off, then the building collapses. In cases of strings of*
> > *explosions, the explosions are still way ahead of the collapse. I've*
> > *_never_ seen an actual "controlled demolition" where the explosions*
> > *pace the collapse.*
>
>
> *You might need to clarify, here. Sounds like you're talking about the*
> *same thing in both cases.*
>
> *And how many WTC-size buildings did you say you've seen demolished again?*

Sorry. Missed the "buildings that tall" part. I've seen a lot of controlled demolitions. The explosions do go off in a series, but they go off well ahead of the collapse and don't "pace" it that closely.

> >> > *Also, I said I didn't believe the Towers tilted past their center*
> >> > *of gravity and was told they "continued to tilt" which "proves"*
> >> > *they moved past their center of gravity and should have toppled.*
> >> > *Well, it doesn't really matter in that incidence whether the Towers*
> >> > *fell due to the plane impact/fire or controlled demolition.*
> >>
> >>
> >> *I believe I asked you what could have possibly stopped their collapse*
> >> *to the side.*
> >>
> >> *Did you have an answer for that?*
> >
> > *Inertia. The Towers did tilt, having been slammed into by great big*
> > *planes. But not far enough to topple.*
>
>
> *So they just sort of sat there, leaning to the side?*
>
> *And you're citing inertia as the reason they didn't fall sideways?*
>
>
>
> >> > *If they Towers had*
> >> > *shifted past their center of gravity, they would have toppled over*
> >> > *no matter what caused the collapse. The simple fact that they*
> >> > *DIDN'T*
> >>
> >>

> >> *They didn't?*
> >> > *topple over shows that they DIDN'T move past their center of*
> >> > *gravity. The simple fact that some people couldn't grasp this*
> >> > *simple aspect of the law of gravity showed me that they weren't*
> >> > *interesting in having a legitimate discussion, but only in having*
> >> > *everybody agree with them that there was an "evil Government*
> >> > *conspiracy" involved in the Towers collapse!*
> >>
> >> *I would love to know what stopped it from collapsing sideways, if*
> >> *that even happened.*
> >
> > *I just said it, in my last paragraph.*
>
>
> *As yes, inertia. The concept that something in motion tends to stay in*
> *motion unless an opposing force stops it.*
>
> *That's a bit of a non-answer, I'm afraid.*

The opposing force was the strength of the building. Take a big stack of floppy disks or books. Bump into it. If you don't hit it hard enough to take it beyond its center of gravity, it will sit there, tilted to one side. Inertial does not mean things keep moving forever, it means things keep moving until another force stops the momentum. In this case the structural strength of the building kept the tilt from going past the center of gravity.

> >> > *As Mark Twain once observed; "Never try to teach a pig to whistle,*
> >> > *it wastes your time and annoys the pig." I got tired of wasting my*
> >> > *time. So I left. I may pop back into this or a similar thread at*
> >> > *some point, but not right now. If you consider that "winning,"*
> >> > *Godspeed.*
> >>
> >> *I notice you've avoided the WTC-7/Meridian Plaza stuff yet again.*
> >> *That's what caused you to drop the threads, it seems to me.*
> >
> > *OK, let's see. Was the Meridian damaged by having pieces of a great*
> > *big tower fall on it? No. Was the Meridian left to burn unattended*
> > *because the firefighters were busy dealing with another catastrophe?*
> > *No.*
>
>
> *Yes. I can see you've done your research.*
>
> > *You don't know that the Meridian fire ran hotter or was more*
> > *damaging than the WTC7 fire because you don't have any data on the*
> > *WTC7 fire except what you could observe through pictures.*
>
>
> *Do you have any data that supports your claim? I'd love to see what it*
> *is. Unless it involves circular logic, of course.*

- >
- >
- > > *We do know*
- > > *the WTC7 fire ran unchecked because they were busy with the Towers, do*
- > > *you know how long the Meridian fire ran?*
- >
- > *Something like 19 hours. I provided you with very compelling accounts*
- > *that not only showed the Meridian Plaza fire was much more intense (you*
- > *provided nothing but your own conjecture, if I recall), but it burned*
- > *much longer than any of the WTC buildings.*
- >
- >
- > *Building fires, being a very visual phenomenon, can usually safely be*
- > *judged largely by visual evidence.*
- >
- > <http://www.sgh.com/expertise/hazardsconsulting/meridian/meridian.htm>
- > *"The twelve-alarm fire burned for 18 hours. The extreme heat caused*
- > *window glass and frames to melt and concrete floor slabs and steel beams*
- > *to buckle and sag dramatically. Large shards of window glass fell from*
- > *the facade, cutting through fire hoses on the ground around the building.*
- > *Three firefighters were trapped on a fully engulfed floor, and efforts to*
- > *rescue them failed.*
- >
- > *The fire would not yield and there were increasing concerns about the*
- > *stability of the structure. Fire officials called off the attack and*
- > *allowed the fire to "free burn," concentrating their efforts on*
- > *containing the fire to this building. When the fire reached the 30th*
- > *floor, a tenant-installed fire-sprinkler system was activated, and the*
- > *worst high-rise fire in U.S. history was finally brought under control."*
- >
- >
- >
- > <http://www.fire-police-ems.com/videos/vo4900.shtml>
- > *"It would later be described by Philadelphia officials as "The most*
- > *significant fire in this century".*
- >
- > *On February 23, 1991 the thirty story office building at One Meridian*
- > *Plaza suffered a major fire that killed 3 firefighters and destroyed much*
- > *of the building.*
- >
- > *Firefighters on arrival found flames coming from the 22nd floor. An*
- > *initial interior attack on this 250' x 250' building was attempted. As*
- > *the fire gained in intensity, the decision was made to allow the fire to*
- > *"free burn" until it reached the upper floors where sprinklers were able*
- > *to extinguish the fire."*
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > *Say, did that debris leap over WTC 6 to get to WTC 7?*

sci.physics: Re: No 757 Hit the Pentagon Re: Four More Years of Murder

Well, the debris did actually hit 7 and not 6 so it must have passed over it.

I don't know why Meridian didn't collapse and WTC7 did. But you haven't presented anything that convinces me that there was a conspiracy or that the firefighters actively "pulled" the building down.