

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2008-02/msg02040.html>

- *From:* Phil Cartwright <pcartw@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 26 Feb 2008 23:23:19 -0500
-

Iarnrod wrote:

Phil Cartwright wrote:

Iarnrod wrote:

On Feb 23, 7:50 am, Phil Cartwright
<pca...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Iarnrod wrote:

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.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Actually, yes it was.

> You conceded this point much earlier

No, I did not.

[some namecalling]

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

But you did.

No I didn't.

But you did.

But actually, no I didn't

But actually, yes you did.

Actually, not

Actually, yes

> [more namecalling]

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

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

did.

No
I
didn't.

Yes you
did.

No I didn't

Yes you did.

No I didn't.

Yes you did.

No I didn't.

Yes you did.

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.

No I wasn't.

Yes you were.

No I wasn't.

Yes you were.

No I wasn't.

Yes you were.

No I wasn't.

Who
is
"we",
then,
if
you're
not
referring

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

to
all
of
the
participants
of
this
thread?
(Which
set
obviously
includes
Henry.)

That's
rather
obvious.

No,
actually, it
is not.

Yes, actually it is

No, actually, it is not.

Yes, actually it is.

No, actually, it is not.

Yes, actually, it is.

No, actually, it is not.

Then what
are you
doing?

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

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.

No, it's a fact, and it's correct. This latest posting of yours is the same — there is nothing about physics, or
conspiracies, or 9/11 in it. Nothing at all save for put-downs of another usenet poster, in fact.

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

[insults, "you admitted", etc.]

I admitted nothing of the sort.

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]

[still more personal attacks]

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

Then, first, why do you redirect replies *only* to sci.physics...

> [snippety–snip–snip]

But what does any of that have to do with alt.physics?

you whine you must *manually* do and asked me to stop correcting?

You don't need to "correct" anything; I keep needing to "correct" you!

Second, you're wrong that it's not crossposted because it has been included as a ng in this thread from the very start.

Excuse me? I said that alt.physics was not crossposted, and you claim that that is wrong because *sci*.physics has been crossposted? Just what kind of twisted logic do they use on your home planet, anyway?

Why did you bring up alt.physics?

I didn't.

Yes you did, in <7cc74668–cd60–4af7–924c–9f846646fd57@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> -- my post <fpe2s5\$ee2\$1@xxxxxxxx> immediately prior did not mention alt.physics at all, while your reply did.

Oh, but I see from this also that you post through google groups. That seems to explain a great deal. :P

> You did. You seem to want this discussion *only* in

sci.physics

I fail to see how this is relevant to the issue of alt.physics.

[some namecalling]

That would
seem to
make your
posts
off–topic in
both groups
you're

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

cross-posting
them to.
Take it to
alt.flame.

[ad hominem response]

Actually it wasn't ad hominem

Actually it was

[repeats the ad hominem attack]

It's no more a logically correct way to argue just for having been repeated ad nauseam. (Perhaps this needs to be inducted into the official list of logical fallacies with Latin names? "Argumentum ad nauseam"; argument by repetition without saying anything new.)

Regardless, no matter how many times you repeat it, something that amounts to "in my opinion, my opponent is an idiot; therefore I am right" just doesn't fly.

You
must
be
a
newbie.
This
is
usenet.

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

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

and,
indeed,
is
incorrect.

False.

No, not
false.

Yes, false.

No, not false.

Yes, false.

No, not false.

Yes, false.

No, not false.

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

I can't drop it because you keep leaving the thread with an incorrect summary. I have to keep correcting it for
the record. It's annoying. Please stop it.

I've been
using usenet
for
decades...

No you haven't.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Yes I have.

No you haven't.

Yes, I have.

No you haven't.

Yes, I have.

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

No they don't, 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?

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

[ad hominem argument]

That doesn't magically come true just by repetition, nor does it affect the fact that what part of the internet this is has nothing to do with whether 9/11 was an inside job.

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.

No, you started it.

Now, *you* forgot to shut up.

After you.

You should have just let it drop...

[more nasty name calling]

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

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

[more nasty name calling]

Why?

[more nasty name calling]

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.

[more nasty name calling]

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.

I did not. My previous post contained no namecalling, except where I quoted you doing so.

If you get back on topic, maybe replies to you would be on-topic!

After you.

Why don't you stop?

Erm... why don't you? [and more namecalling]

After you.

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

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

See? Again with giving orders.

What orders? I see a request, not an order. Perhaps you should go have your eyesight checked.

[assorted namecalling]

> Why does it bother you that people on usenet just simply take
> advantage of the right to freely speak

I don't like it when they abuse that right to speak negative opinions of other people instead of engaging in constructive debate, particularly when they do so to the exclusion of actually being on-topic, and especially when they crosspost this drivel and it's on-topic in none of the newsgroups thus afflicted.

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

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.

Why? It's irrelevant to a discussion of 9/11 and it's none of your business anyway.

You prove I wasn't.

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.

[pointless personal attacks]

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

Again with calling me a liar! Of course, I know exactly how this thing works, indeed clearly better than you
do.

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

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

[snip]

Now this is getting ridiculous.

[snip]

Taking me out of context AND insulting me, now? I had, there, taken exception to your basically calling me a liar.

reason and then expect that they won't snipe back at you, Phillip.

I didn't call you any name in my previous post. In what way, then, are you sniping "back" at me in the post I'm replying to? It seems to me that you are just sniping at me for no good reason.

[snip self-aggrandizement by Iarnrod]

This window into your psychology is fascinating. Can I use you as my case study for Aberrant Psychology 216.6?

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.

[more namecalling, but nothing else]

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

Re: WTC Towers: The case for controlled demolition

You seem to be confused. I'm not in therapy.

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.

Then why haven't you shut up yet?

[more namecalling, but nothing else]

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

Four.

Argumentum ad non-sequitur, now? (That's more or less "argument by posting completely random
nonsense", for the Latin impaired.)

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

Then let that be the end of Phillip!

Death threats now? How lame.

If you follow the usual pattern, the H*tl*r or N*zi comparison will be coming any day now, and then I've
won. :P

—
There's only four things you can be certain of: taxes, change, spam, and death.