

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

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2004-08/3570.html>

---

**From:** Lil' Bobby Gortician (*master\_at\_mason.snuh*)

**Date:** 08/12/04

Date: 12 Aug 2004 05:53:21 GMT

Sir Cumference <radiodaze@mailcity.moc> wrote in news:jdmdnefXVZ72bofcRVn-ow@gbronline.com:

> *Lil' Bobby Gortician wrote:*

>

>> *Sir Cumference <radiodaze@mailcity.moc> wrote in*

>> *news:Jpidnds4dMzITofcRVn-ig@gbronline.com:*

>>

>>

>>> *Lil' Bobby Gortician wrote:*

>>>

>>>

>>>> *BTR1701 <BTR1702@ix.netcom.com> wrote in*

>>>> *news:BTR1702-A8235C.12430611082004 @news.west.earthlink.net:*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> *In article <Xns9541DD21B2D0Espamspamsnuhspam33@207.14.113.17>, "Lil'*

>>>>> *Bobby Gortician" <master@mason.snuh> wrote:*

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> *Sir Cumference <radiodaze@mailcity.moc> wrote in*

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> *Once again you have been made a complete fool just like your master*

>>>>>>> *Eastman.*

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> *And your hearsay evidence beats the physical evidence \*how\*,*

>>>>>>>> *exactly?*

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> *You apparently don't know the definition of "hearsay".*

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> *Eye-witness testimony is direct evidence, not hearsay.*

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> *"Eyewitness evidence" repeated by others?*

>>>>  
>>>>*Eyewitness evidence is direct testimony. Not something off of a*  
>>>>*third-party web page.*  
>>>>  
>>>>*Please get it straight.*  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>  
>>>>*So all the eyewitness testimony on Eastman's site is just hearsay*  
>>>>*evidence. Just stuff off a third-party web page.*  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>>  
>> *Yep. And it's the same eyewitnesses the rest of you are trying to cite.*  
>>  
>> *But his site is not based on eyewitnesses, it's based on physical*  
>> *evidence.*  
>  
> *Yet here he is talking about someone seeing a plane that could not hold*  
> *more than 12 passengers. He doesn't even give a name or source, yet we*  
> *must believe this witness I suppose.*

I'm glad you disregard eyewitnesses. Let me know when you get around to examining the physical evidence...

> \*\*\*\*\*  
> *"When someone says he saw a plane of a size that could not possibly have*  
> *held more than at most 12 passengers, to me that statement does not*  
> *exclude the F-16 which holds one or two persons (or no passengers or*  
> *pilot if it is flying under remote control) but it does exclude the*  
> *Boeing 757 which holds 170 passengers."*  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>  
> *Like you say, just hearsay evidence from a third party web site, doesn't*  
> *count, means nothing.*  
>  
> *Eastman isn't even in Washington D.C. yet here he give a detailed*  
> *account of what happened, at least in his delusional mind.*  
>  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
> *"The fighter made a long low, ground hugging approach making it very*  
> *difficult to see against the landscape-- in fact since it came in so*  
> *low, it is practically overhead when it comes into view. Especially as*  
> *they are in their cars on a busy freeway, watching either the Boeing or*  
> *the acrobatic distraction plane over Washington, and possibly even the*  
> *huge C-130 bringing up the rear."*  
> \*\*\*\*\*  
>  
> *So all these other eyewitness could not tell the difference between a*

- > *large commercial airliner and a jet fighter. So this jet fighter had*
- > *American Airlines painted on the side I suppose? And this distraction*
- > *C-130 was keeping up with this F-16 jet fighter?*
- > *I can just hear the eyewitness, "hey Bob, look that American Airlines*
- > *757 is about to crash into the Pentagon!!" Never mind that Ted, look at*
- > *the airobatics that C-130 is doing, kool man!!"*
- > *Eastman missed his calling, instead of being a "Pentagon investigator"*
- > *he should have been a stand up comic, he is much better at being funny.*
- >
- > *And here is another of Dickiebird's eyewitnesses.*
- >
- > \*\*\*\*\*
- > *Supersonic attack jet*
- > -----
- > *"Rains Lon Eyewitness:*
- > *The Pentagon By Lon Rains Editor, Space News, was driving up Interstate*
- > *395 from Springfield to downtown Washington. I heard a very loud, quick*
- > *whooshing sound that began behind me and stopped suddenly in front of me*
- > *and to my left. In fractions of a second I heard the impact and an*
- > *explosion. The next thing I saw was the fireball. I was convinced it was*
- > *a missile. It came in so fast it sounded nothing like an airplane."*
- > \*\*\*\*\*
- >
- > *The witnesses comment about being convinced it was a missile fits a*
- > *conspiracy theory so Eastman takes this one even though it is just more*
- > *hearsay evidence from a third party web site, means nothing, no*
- > *credibillity what-so-ever.*
- >
- > \*\*\*\*\*
- > *"even as people were looking for airliners that had been hijacked by*
- > *crazed Arab fundamentalists or Anarchists or anti- globalists and*
- > *airliners were all that people saw (except for the extraordinary few --*
- > *who believed their eyes and ears and reported jet fighter sounds and*
- > *smaller planes of a size that "could seat no more than 12 passengers"*
- > *etc." \*\*\*\*\**
- >
- > *Yea right, all those dozens of eyewitnesses who saw an American Airlines*
- > *plane crash into the west wall of the Pentagon were all hallucinating*
- > *and just did not know what they were seeing, even though some were only*
- > *a few yards from the plane when it flew past and they too "believed*
- > *their eyes and ears". But these eyewitnesses, who actually saw what*
- > *actually happended, can't be believed. Yet these, how many? Maybe two or*
- > *three, he won't say, "extraordinary few", meaning the ones who really*
- > *did not know what they were seeing but their account fits my conspiracy*
- > *theory so they must be correct, therefore we must believe them. Again,*
- > *no names or sources to back up any of these witness statement.*
- > *So as you keep harping, just hearsay evidence from a third party web*
- > *site.*
- >
- > *I really got a belly laugh at Eastman's comment of "FINISHED FILES ARE*
- > *THE RESULTS OF YEARS OF SCIENTIFIC STUDY". His version of "scientific*

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

- > *study" is looking at photo and seeing things that aren't there.*
- > *He wouldn't know a scientific study if it bit him.*
- >
- > *And in one paragraph in regards to his non-scientific research he*
- > *states, "I do all this for nothing".*
- > *Indeed he does, it was all completely for nothing as it only proves he*
- > *is short a few numbers in his zip code.*
- >
- > *You're a moronic pest lil bobby and it has been fun laughing at you and*
- > *Eastman.*
- >
- >

You act like these sites are primarily based on eyewitness testimony. But that's your argument, not ours.

Ours are based on physical evidence, which you seem to lack. But it's nice of you to at least check out the sites.

No 757 Hit The Pentagon

<http://www.bedoper.com/eastman>

ASCE Report Proves No 757 Hit The Pentagon

<http://www.bedoper.com/pentagon/asce>

--

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

Virgin Message Board

[http://bedoper.com/cgi-bin/plugins/BBS/bedoper\\_ubb/Ultimate.cgi?action=intro](http://bedoper.com/cgi-bin/plugins/BBS/bedoper_ubb/Ultimate.cgi?action=intro)