

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-08/1933.html>

From: Synchrodestiny's Child (*master_at_mason.snuh*)

Date: 08/06/04

Date: 6 Aug 2004 17:41:08 GMT

JJ <radiobuff99@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:feadnai2s9qsLY7cRVn-ig@gbroline.com:

>
> *Here you go shit-for-brains, eyewitness accounts, and this is only a few of many, of the crash that debunk everything on that silly conspiracy site you keep yapping about.*

Nothing can or does debunk the information on that site. I invite you to try. "Shit-for-brains".

> *Now if you have some eyewitness reports that say differently how about posting them with references so they can be verified. I am sure you can dig up maybe a couple.*

<http://bedoper.com/eastman/witnesses/index.html>

Tupac Chopra <master@mason.snuh> wrote in news:Xns953BDA982BE70spamspamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17:

> *Tupac Chopra <master@mason.snuh> wrote in news:Xns953BD72C1BCD3spamspamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17:*
>
>> *Tupac Chopra <master@mason.snuh> wrote in news:Xns953AF143E820spamspamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17:*
>>
>>> *Tupac Chopra <master@mason.snuh> wrote in news:Xns953AC3EB77858spamspamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17:*
>>>
>>>> *Laurence Doering <ljd@bcpl.net> wrote in news:2nagm5FuqkikU1@uni-berlin.de:*
>>>>
>>>>> *On 31 Jul 2004 00:38:23 GMT, Phat Albert Camus <master@mason.snuh> wrote:*
>>>>>> *Laurence Doering <ljd@bcpl.net> wrote in*

>>>>> news:2mwig1Fr5vj3U1@uni-berlin.de:
>>>>>
>>>>>> *The problem with the idea of the wings "crumbling back into the*
>>>>>> *fuselage" is that it accepts at face value the "No 757 Hit The*
>>>>>> *Pentagon, You Idiot" peoples' claim that the hole in the*
>>>>>> *Pentagon's exterior wall was relatively small.*
>>>>>
>>>>>> *In fact, the hole in the Pentagon's outer wall was about 120 feet*
>>>>>> *wide.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>> *That is false, by any stretch of the imagination.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>> *Actually, you're right. According to the ASCE report [1], the area*
>>>>>> *of severe damage to the Pentagon's facade was 120 feet wide.*
>>>>>
>>>>>> *So you've changed your story from a 120-foot wide hole, to 120 feet*
> *of*
>>>>> *exterior damage?*
>>>>>
>>>>>> *Why do you persist in calling it a hole, then? A hole is contiguous.*
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> *However, the hole in the wall (the portion of the first-floor wall*
>>>>>>> *where the facade and brick infill was missing,*
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> *That is not a hole, that is exterior damage.*
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> *with all exterior*
>>>>>>>> *columns demolished or severely damaged)*
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> *There is a huge difference between missing and damaged. Only missing*
>>>>>>>>> *columns count, if we are talking about a hole. The rest are exterior*
>>>>>>>>> *damage.*
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> *extended from column lines*
>>>>>>>>>> *8 through 18 for a total of 100 feet. The facade and infill were*
>>>>>>>>>> *missing between column lines 18 and 20, for another 20 feet.*
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>> *If the columns are in place, and they clearly are, then you have no*
>>>>>>>>>>> *100-foot wide hole. You have 100 feet of exterior damage. Which is*
>>>>>>>>>>> *exactly what you describe above.*
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>> *Are you saying the plane only had a left wing and engine,*
> *furthermore?*
>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> *I was wrong -- the hole was only 100 feet wide.*

>>>>>

>>>>>> *The circular hole was at most, 16 feet or so wide.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *There was no circular hole in the exterior wall of the Pentagon.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *Are you claiming that the hole wasn't perfectly round? Is that your angle?*

>>>>

>>>> *Few things in life are perfectly round, especially when dealing with plane crashes. I agree, it was not perfectly round.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *Are you saying it was square?*

>>>>

>>>> *Rectangular?*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *What was the shape of the hole that covered two stories?*

>>>>

>>>> *Was there a 100 foot-wide hole in between the first and second floors?*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> *Figure 3.10 in the ASCE report shows the actual shape and extent of the hole.*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> *<http://bedoper.com/eastman/> shows a circular hole, as do many other photos.*

>>>>

>>>> *Why do you lie about things that are plainly visible?*

>>>>

>>>> *Circular*

>>>> *<http://www.freedomfiles.org/war/pentagon-pics/pentagon-hole-big2.jpg>*

>>>>

>>>> *Circular*

>>>> *[http://perso.club-internet.fr/mouv4x8/11Sept01/A0019b%20Entry%20hole%](http://perso.club-internet.fr/mouv4x8/11Sept01/A0019b%20Entry%20hole%20)*

>> 20

>>>> *by% 20calcul%20Pentagon.jpg*

>>>>

>>>> *Circular "Punch-Out"*

>>>> http://perso.club-internet.fr/mouv4x8/11Sept01/A0004b_Passage_Missile_Pentagon.jpg
>>>>
>>>> Circular "Punch-Out"
>>>> <http://www.freedomfiles.org/war/pentagon-pics/pentagon-punchout.gif>
>>>>
>>>> We'll just ignore how very unlikely it is that a 757 would create a
>>>> nice round hole on exit...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Figure 6.6 shows that the punch-out would have been physically
>>>> impossible, with intact columns in the path of the alleged 757.
>>>>
>>>> So does figure 7.9. Can you explain this round "punch-out", and how
> it
>>>> was formed?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>> The damage to the face of the Pentagon cannot be properly termed a
>>>>>> hole at all. The columns are still extant.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Nope. The exterior columns are missing entirely between column
line
>>>>>> 8 and column line 15. Feel free to point out a picture that shows
>>>>>> the columns in that area "still extant."
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Figure 6.2 shows a total of 5 columns missing from the exterior
wall.
>>>>>> Are the columns 20 feet apart?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> No?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Then where are you getting this figure of a 100-foot wide hole?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> What about all the columns to the right of that?
>>>>>>
>>>>>> By the way, the area between columns 8 and 15 is the bottom of the
>>>>>> circular hole that you claim somehow didn't exist.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Nice work.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Perhaps the width of the damage was 120 feet. The hole was
>>>>>>>> certainly not 120 feet wide.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> You're right, it was only 100 feet wide.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> You don't really know what a hole is, do you? A hole doesn't have

>>>> *columns. A hole would have a lack of columns. You are describing*
>>>> *exterior damage.*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> *But I would love to see some pictures supporting your claim, and*
>>>>> *disproving mine.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *One of the pictures is on your own website.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *Figure 3.8 and 3.9 in the ASCE report show the north and south ends*
>>>>> *of the 100-foot wide hole in the Pentagon's outer wall.*
>>>>>
>>>>> *Figure 3.9 is the same as the third image from the top on your 'No*
>>>>> *757 Hit the Pentagon, You Idiot' page, except that someone has*
>>>>> *cropped the image so it doesn't show the sag in the Pentagon's*
>>>>> *roofline caused by the destruction of the support columns in the*
> *area*
>>>>> *of the hole in the exterior wall. Who cropped that image, and why?*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *I don't know who cropped it. But it clearly shows that the hole was*
>>>> *circular. Despite your protestations to the contrary.*
>>>>
>>>> *Here's a GREAT composite shot that shows the circular nature of the*
>>>> *hole.*
>>>>
>>>> *And the stunning lack of a 100-foot wide hole.*
>>>>
>>>> <http://perso.wanadoo.fr/jpdesm/pentagon/damage/punch-in.jpg>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> *A simple glance at the following photo reveals the falsehood in*
> *your*
>>>>> *statement. Which tends to cast doubt on the rest of your analysis.*
>>>>>
>>>>> <http://www.questionsquestions.net/docs04/bugle/images2/bugle4.jpg>
>>>>>
>>>>> *That's the same image as figure 3.9 and the third from the top on*
>>>>> *your page, and clearly shows the south end of the large hole in the*
>>>>> *Pentagon.*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *With columns in place. Which means you are using a very funny*
>>>> *definition of hole. You're describing damage to the exterior, and*
>>>> *calling it a hole.*
>>>>
>>>> *And you think you're somehow clever for doing so. You only undermine*
>>>> *your own case by lying.*
>>>>

>>>> *Even figure 6.2 and 6.3 in your own evidence shows you're lying.*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> *The north end of the hole is beyond the left edge of the image, and*
>>>>> *north of column line 14 the hole is obscured by the smoke in the*
>>>>> *foreground.*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *You're ignoring the fact that the southern side of that shows all*
the
>>>> *columns that were in place, which proves that there was no 100-foot*
>>>> *wide hole.*
>>>>
>>>> *It also shows a circular hole in the middle.*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> *ljd*
>>>>>
>>>>> *[1] <http://fire.nist.gov/bfrlpubs/build03/PDF/b03017.pdf>*
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *Figure 3.3 is a blatant lie. Why don't you ever address this?*
>>>>
>>>> *Do you think that bumpy white smoke trail is really a 757?*
>>>>
>>>> *Figure 7.4 shows the essential fallacy of the "wings folded and*
>>>> *followed the plane into the center hole".*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> *No 757 Hit the Pentagon*
>>>> *<http://www.bedoper.com/eastman>*
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>> *Let's hope Larry doesn't do the same cowardly thing and snip the*
> *entire*
>>> *message...*
>>>
>>
>> *Neither Larry nor Ralphie nor Lensman seem to want to touch this post*
>> *with a 10-foot pole. Or even a 120-foot pole.*
>>
>> *Interesting.*
>>
>>
>>
>
> *Such a badge of shame. Is there no one in the world who can address*
this
> *post without snipping its content?*

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

>

--

<http://BeDoper.com> - BeOS and a hell of a lot more
BeDoper Portal - <http://www.bedoper.com/portal>