

# Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg02002.html>

---

- *From:* Iarnrod <[iarnrod@xxxxxxxx](mailto:iarnrod@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 26 Feb 2008 14:11:55 -0800 (PST)
- 

Phil Cartwright wrote:

Iarnrod wrote:

On Feb 23, 7:50 am, Phil Cartwright <[pca...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:pca...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote:

Iarnrod wrote:

Just to satisfy you? No thanks.

[ad hominem response]

[more name calling]

Purest nonsense;

[ad hominem response]

[more name calling]

you'd been calling people names for weeks before I even jumped in here...

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

[ad hominem response]

[more name calling]

So far, you've said nothing of substance.

[more name calling]

and your tone with me was  
hostile from your very first  
response to one of my posts.

Not.

Yes it was.

Actually, no it wasn't.

Actually, yes it was.

Actually, no it wasn't. You conceded this point much earlier, time to  
move on. Or do you habitually change your positions when the mood  
suits? Don't bother answering, hypocrite.

Correct. I  
didn't try to  
give you  
orders.

But you did.

No I didn't.

But you did.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

But actually, no I didn't

But actually, yes you did.

Actually, not only did I \*not\* give you orders, but you were the one constantly trying to give \*me\* orders, such as how to post and where to post and how I should phrase and structure my replies to another person. You must lie awake at night worrying that people on usenet aren't obeying your rules. Then you accuse \*me\* of giving orders when I never did. Hypocrite.

I even pointed out a further instance in your previous post in my response to it.

[ad hominem response]

[more name calling]

So far, you've still said nothing of substance.

[more name calling]

I  
never  
thought  
you  
did.  
I  
simply  
thought  
that  
your  
devil's

advocacy

was  
based  
on  
things  
that  
are  
not  
possible.

Then  
you  
thought  
wrong.

Not  
at  
all

Yes  
you  
did.

No  
I  
didn't

Yes  
you  
did.

No I didn't.

Yes you did.

No I didn't

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Yes you did.

No I didn't.

Yes you did.

No I didn't.

Hardly  
relevant,  
when  
I  
am  
discussing  
your  
replies  
to  
other  
people,  
and  
other  
peoples'  
replies  
to  
you  
and  
other  
people.

You  
were.

No  
I  
wasn't.

You were.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

No I wasn't.

Yes you were.

No I wasn't.

Yes you were.

No I wasn't.

Yes you were.

Who  
is  
"we",  
then,  
if  
you're  
not  
referring  
to  
\*all\*  
of  
the  
participants  
of  
this  
thread?  
(Which  
set  
obviously  
includes  
Henry.)

That's rather  
obvious.

No, actually, it is not.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Yes, actually it is

No, actually, it is not.

Yes, actually it is.

No, actually, it is not.

Yes, actually, it is.

[ad hominem response]

How very logical.

[yet more name calling]

That's  
simply not  
true. "We"  
can find  
anything  
even if the  
one moron  
doesn't  
recognize it.

No, then a smaller "we" has  
found it.

[ad hominem response]

[and another personal attack]

How very logical.

[and another]

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Then what are you doing?

I told you, we're bashing Hankie the Wankie.

How very on-topic, worthwhile, and useful.

You do realize this is alt.conspiracy?

But you're not posting about conspiracies, you're posting about some random person's supposed defects.

That's your opinion, and it's wrong.

Your postings that consist solely of personal attacks directed against me are not on topic in either newsgroup.

Since you started the personal attacks, by your own tacit admission since you admitted I was treating you civilly up until the point you chose to call me an "asshole," why don't you take this matter up with yourself, Phillip? Let us know how it turns out.

Uh, excuse me? \*You're\* the one who keeps trying to redirect replies \*only\* to alt.physics.

I have of course done nothing of the sort.

[more personal attacks, mixed with irrelevancies about alt.physics]

[more incorrect summations by Phillip the self-righteous pedant and wannabe netkop, who by admission, whining and evidence has redirected replies only to sci.physics]

I still don't see how alt.physics is at all relevant in a thread that is not crossposted to that newsgroup.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Then, first, why do you redirect replies \*only\* to sci.physics, which you whine you must \*manually\* do and asked me to stop correcting? Second, you're wrong that it's not crossposted because it has been included as a ng in this thread from the very start.

Why did you bring up alt.physics?

I didn't. You did. You seem to want this discussion \*only\* in sci.physics then whine like a schoolgirl that it's off-topic there. I must continually re-add alt.conspiracy, the one I read, because of your cutting it out of reply headers.

and if you're not trying to debunk his conspiracy theory, you should not be posting to alt.conspiracy.

[ad hominem response]

[another personal attack]

That would seem to make your posts off-topic in both groups you're cross-posting them to. Take it to alt.flame.

[ad hominem response]

Actually it wasn't ad hominem; it was a notation that Phillip once again is trying to give people orders as to how and where to post on usenet, something he continually denies doing, then snips the evidence that he in fact does!

[more personal attacks]

Still you've said nothing of substance.

[more personal attacks]

Ever  
consider  
that  
if  
every  
day  
you  
"shove"  
things  
"in  
his  
face"  
and  
insult  
him,  
and  
every  
day  
he  
stubbornly  
refuses  
to  
learn  
anything,  
these  
two  
things  
just  
might  
have  
something  
to  
do  
with  
one  
another?

No.

Well,  
\*that\*  
explains  
a

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

lot.

Yes but

Yes, but nothing.

[ad hominem response]

[more personal attacks]

Still you've said nothing of substance.

[namecalling again]

You  
must  
be  
a  
newbie.  
This  
is  
usenet.

Neither  
statement  
seems  
relevant,  
and  
the  
former  
is  
furthermore  
unsupported  
by  
any  
evidence  
and,  
indeed,  
is

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

incorrect.

False.

No, not false.

Yes, false.

No, not false.

Yes, false.

No, not false.

Yes, false. Obviously false since you're still endeavoring to discuss it. If it were not relevant you would be dropping it.

I've been using usenet for decades...

No you haven't.

Yes I have.

No you haven't.

Yes, I have.

No you haven't.

, and this being usenet  
and my not being new to it  
have no relevance to the

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition  
matter under discussion.

Yes they do

No they don't.

Yes they do, quite obviously.

No they don't, quite obviously.

Yes they do, quite obviously.

Only a conspiracy nut would believe that  
this being usenet might somehow be relevant to the question of exactly  
what happened on 9/11. Are you a conspiracy nut?

Your premise is as silly as it is incorrect. This is more evidence of  
your newbiehood.

[ad hominem response]

[more name calling]

On the contrary, I know  
precisely what a flamewar  
is, and also where  
they belong. The newsgroup  
sci.physics, at the very least,  
IS supposed  
to be an intellectual  
discussion group, and not a  
combat arena. Go away.  
All of you. :P

[ad hominem response]

[yet more name calling]

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

No, it was an /argumentum  
ad-hominem/.

[ad hominem response]

[and still more]

Observe the irony content. Much more and a type II  
supernova might result.

It would consume you in your petulant anger, Phillip. You said you  
were going away. Why don't you just stay away?

Because you forgot to shut up and stop personally attacking me.

I get dibs on replies since you started it. I get to go last.

Now, \*you\* forgot to shut up. What's your justification? Wait, don't  
bother answering that one either.

You should have just let it drop...

No, hypocrite, you should have. Look, "asshole," you started it, suck  
it up and take it. That's what happens when you throw the first punch.  
Do you often hit girls?

but instead you tried to stick a proverbial knife in my back.

Responding to your personal attacks is sticking a knife in your back?  
Are you always a drama queen? Did you complain on the playground when  
some schoolgirl hit you back too?

Why?

Because you're not as special as you seem to think you are? Because  
you're not immune to replies-in-kind when you decide to call people

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

"asshole" for no reason?

Now I feel the need to point out to the world when you've made posts consisting of 100% off-topic name-calling drivel with no substance related to 9/11 whatsoever.

Likewise, Mr. Kettle! How about reading your own posts before you post? Eh?

And you've just done it yet again.

Because \*you\* posted a reply "consisting of 100% off-topic name-calling drivel with no substance related to 9/11 whatsoever" and I am replying to it. If you get back on topic, maybe replies to you would be on-topic! Amazing how that would work!

Why don't you stop?

Erm... why don't you? Again with the hypocrisy.

I am now  
downwardly revising my  
estimate of your intelligence  
and, particularly,  
short-term memory  
function.

[ad hominem response]

[another name calling response by Iarnrod]

No, it has been to try to educate you. This now seems to be futile so I will probably quit now.

[ad hominem response]

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

[and another]

Goodbye, this time for  
good.

[ad hominem response]

And that's it. Nothing intelligent; nothing with any kind of  
substance.

[an entire paragraph of nothing but namecalling]

If you have nothing better (or more physics-related, conspiracy-related,  
or 9/11-related) to write, please do shut up now.

See? Again with giving orders. This seems to be a particular blind  
spot for you, Phillip, but I trust that my pointing it out to you  
right here and now will shake the cobwebs from your "brain." Why does  
it bother you that people on usenet just simply take advantage of the  
right to freely speak without paying one bit of heed to your orders?

Nothing to do with physics. Nothing to do with conspiracies.

[yet another pointless and content-free insult]

Nothing, indeed, but name-calling.

[and another]

The only reason I'm responding at all is to point this out...

[and another]

, and to state for the record that a) I'm not a newbie,

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Yes you are. You have 193 posts going back to May last year.

Under this news access; I posted under a nickname for years and years before that.

Prove it. Link us to your first post, newbie.

I was there on day one of endless September; I watched "AOLers" enter the lexicon; I was there for the whole cancelbunny controversy. OK, I wasn't there for the great renaming, that was before my time, but still.

Were you trying to give everyone orders back then too? Did they all obey you?

And if all that grandiose BS were true, explain why you seem to have no conception of how this whole thing works?

b) my intelligence is sufficient for me to have long since earned a university degree in physics,

[snip]

Now this is getting ridiculous.

You can stop anytime you can let go of your compulsion to order people around, Phillip.

You more or less just flat-out called me a liar there. I think we can not have any further intelligent discussion; that would require that you actually be intelligent, and willing to engage in a civil discourse on a meaningful subject.

Actually it would require you to stop calling people "assholes" for no reason and then expect that they won't snipe back at you, Phillip. I have more intelligence than you judging from our exchange back before you decided to be the abusive netkop.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

You no longer show any interest in debating anything with me except my shortcomings as perceived by you, a topic I don't find of any interest whatsoever.

You have an overinflated view of your own worthless contributions to this exchange, which occasioned my sinking down to your level.

You might prefer to discuss that topic with your psychiatrist, who's much more likely to be interested and to be able to help you.

Just because you're in therapy for your god complex doesn't mean all other people are.

and c) I *\*was\** originally on your side, until you turned on me like a rabid dog. :P

[a whole lot of namecalling including calling me "boring"]

Well, if I'm boring, why don't you stop pestering me and go find something more interesting to do?

I already have. I bang this shit out in two minutes. You're not that good. I've already done three very interesting things just since starting this reply.

Or do you have an irresistible compulsion to have the last word?

Four.

If so, all I can say is "it figures".

Then let that be the end of Phillip!

Long live Emperor Phil! We will never forget him.

.