

# Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2007-07/msg00981.html>

---

- *From:* The\_Man <[me\\_so\\_horneeeee@xxxxxxxx](mailto:me_so_horneeeee@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 15 Jul 2007 12:01:17 -0700
- 

On Jul 15, 2:46 pm, malibu <[vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jul 15, 11:58 am, malibu <[vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jul 15, 11:20 am, malibu <[vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jul 15, 11:15 am, The\_Man  
<[me\\_so\\_hornee...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:me_so_hornee...@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jul 15, 12:27 pm, malibu  
<[vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:vega...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

On Jul 15, 8:33 am,  
The\_Man  
<[me\\_so\\_hornee...@xxxxxxxx](mailto:me_so_hornee...@xxxxxxxx)>  
wrote:

How many  
people have  
seen a  
program on  
the  
Discovery  
Channel  
called

## Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

"Conspiracy  
Test"? I am  
amazed (but  
I shouldn't  
be) that it  
received  
very little  
news play.

In the  
program,  
the two  
rival  
theories  
(FBI v.  
General  
Partin) are  
tested. The  
hosts build  
a truck  
bomb a la  
Timothy  
McVeigh,  
and then  
test its  
effect on a  
concrete  
column like  
the one  
closest to  
McVeigh's  
Oklahoma  
City truck  
bomb. The  
distance  
from truck  
to bomb is  
identical  
to the  
theories of  
the Federal  
building  
bombing.

The FBI  
calculations  
predicted a

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

force of  
5,000 lbs.  
Those of  
General  
Partin  
(supposedly  
an ordnance  
expert)  
were 500  
lbs of force

–  
clearly not  
enough to  
have  
brought  
down the  
building.  
Based upon  
these  
calculations,  
General  
Partin  
suggested  
that other  
bombs had  
been  
planted  
inside the  
building.  
Does this  
sound  
similar to  
suggestions  
about a  
certain  
event in  
September  
2001?

There was  
also a claim  
that  
seismographic  
data showed  
TWO  
tremors –  
inconsistent  
with a  
single truck

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

bomb, but  
consistent  
with a truck  
bomb PLUS  
internal  
bombs.

Many  
people  
found the  
size of the  
hole in the  
street  
problematic,  
and  
the fact that  
the only  
part of the  
truck found  
was the rear  
axle, from  
which the  
ruck was  
actually  
identified.

The  
program  
had access  
to the best  
seismographic  
equipment  
in the  
country, and  
had sensors  
on the  
concrete  
column to  
measure the  
ACTUAL  
force.

This a  
classic case  
of

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

experiment  
versus  
theory.

Surprise,  
surprise!

The actual  
force  
measured  
was 5,500  
lbs –  
consistent  
with the  
FBI's  
predictions,  
but NOT  
General  
Partin. It  
turns out the  
military  
"Expert"  
was off by a  
whole order  
of  
magnitude.  
If I made a  
prediction  
in a very  
serious  
matter that  
was off by  
an order of  
magnitude,  
I would  
be very  
depressed  
and  
humiliated.  
Not the  
General,  
though. He  
was  
still sticking  
by his  
invalidated  
results.

## Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

Perhaps the  
"skills" that  
got the  
General his  
high rank  
were not in  
mathematics.

But what  
about the  
TWO  
seismic  
events?  
There were  
two seismic  
events  
with THIS  
truck bomb,  
too. In fact  
(Though  
this was not  
mentioned  
on  
the  
program),  
the test  
bomb  
shakes were  
even  
FURTHER  
apart from  
each  
other than  
the ones at  
OKlahoma  
City.

What about  
the truck? It  
was  
completely  
vaporized in  
the test –  
except  
for ... drum  
role  
please.... the

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

rear axle.

And the  
hole? The  
crater in the  
test was  
actually  
SMALLER  
than the  
hole at the  
Murrah  
Building,  
even though  
it was  
conducted  
on soft  
earth, and  
not a city  
street.

Hmmm.  
Does this  
give me any  
hints as to  
the  
accuracy of  
the  
conspiracy  
theorists  
about 911  
or the Moon  
"hoax"?

Except I watched the live  
on-site newscasts where  
they reported finding a  
second unexploded device,  
and  
I have seen recordings of  
these newscasts since.

Have you ever watched an episode of  
"Cops"? Have you heard the

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

explanations of events by witnesses there?  
Are you really that  
"surprised" and "shocked" that stupid people  
jump to conclusions or  
just plain make shit up?

Surprise, surprise– suddenly  
there are no more  
mention of any sophisticated  
bombs;

Yeh, because there WERE no bombs – just  
badly shaken people jumping to  
conclusions.

just some good  
ol boy and his truck a'  
manure

You probably believe all the witnesses at the  
Salem Witch Trials, who  
said they saw levitations and witches and  
spells. The "truth" of the  
reality of witches was "suppressed" by the  
Massachusetts Bay Colony.  
Can you say "fascism"?

Same old, same old.  
The government is telling  
the truth, the whole truth,  
and nothing but the truth–  
until 25 years later, when  
it don't matter any more.  
Can you say 'Fascism'?

John.– Hide quoted text –

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

– Show quoted text –

Do you still believe Pearl Harbour was a surprise?  
Now that it has been admitted that it wasn't, do  
you believe the \*before\* government story or  
do you believe the \*after 25 years\* government  
story. (or 50 years or whatever)

They are diametrically opposed, but  
they are \*both\* official stories–  
which do you believe?

Or perhaps you believe both? With training  
in QM you probably could, come to think of it,  
without a qualm and eating your jam and toast with a smile.

John

no answer?  
i thot not

Still silent?

I was eating lunch. I apologize for HAVING A LIFE. I am also working  
on a project.

It makes it pretty hard to argue that the  
gov't is telling the truth, when they have  
already admitted that they lied to you about  
things like Pearl Harbour, doesn't it?

What "lie" about Pearl Harbor? The suggestion that FDR "knew" the  
Japanese were going to attack Pearl Harbor, but let them do it, so  
that he get into the war?

It is beyond ludicrous. FDR had been Undersecretary of the Navy during

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

Re: Oklahoma City Bombing "Conspiracy" Debunked

WWI. He would allow thousands of sailors to be killed, and dozens of the ships that he had overseen construction of, destroy, on the slim chance that the American public would be MORE likely to enter the war?

In all OTHER countries, the response to a sneak attack was despair and surrender. Kind of the like the effect of 911.

There is absolutely NO evidence of such a thing.

Does it occur to you that they lie as a matter of course?

Who is this "they"? Democrats? Republicans? Liberals? Conservatives? Do you mean like Kennedy's lies about his health, when asked point-blank whether he had Addison's disease? Or the white-wash of his "heroism" in the Pacific, which would have gotten any other commander court-martialed?

I agree that "they" lie, but "they" are almost as incompetent at lying as they are at running wars. We are therefore safe.

Do you wonder \*why\* they are lying to you as a matter of course?

Do you think lying is a \*good\* thing?

If they asked you to go online and deflect any efforts to determine the truth with more lies, would you do it?

No, I'm too busy. But if they paid me enough, I'd try to do a good job of it :-)

Is that in fact what you are doing?

No.

Do you have any morals?

Maybe.

Do you think morals are a \*good\* thing?

"Morals" is usually a means to tell other what to do, while allowing yourself free rein.

Do you think morals are only applicable within the framework of religion?

No, since I am an atheist.

WHERE exactly are you coming from  
horny MAN?

Unfortunately, not somewhere nice....

John- Hide quoted text -

- Show quoted text -

.