
Subject: WTC 7

Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 17:56:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

were to meet somewhere, with no discussion of
>>>our personal politics, we would get along famously. Don't get me wrong,
>>>this
>>>kind of discourse is good. It helps us understand each other better, if
>>>even
>>>just a little. My wish is that we can all have these discussions, and even
>>>when they've been heated, at the end still be the great international
>>>community of PARIS people. That's it, the ICPP! Well, er...maybe a
>>>different
>>>acronym would be better. Anyway, I guess what I'm trying to say is that I
>>>respect you all, weather we share the same view or not.
>>>
>>>Tony
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>On 7/14/05 10:05 PM, in article 42d7280a\$1@linux, "justcron"
>>><justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Usually I just feel like I'm banging my head against the wall trying to
>>>> make
>>>> a point... I still do to a certain extent, but I think we might have
>>>> made
>>>> progress. I kinda understand more where people are coming from. Its
>>>> admirable to think the best about humans and believe the government is
>>>> acting in our best interest. I know people are ultimately concerned
>>>> with
>>>> their own security and survival.
>>>>
>>>> The politicalcompass thing was helpful to show that political beliefs
>>>> are
>>>> really a complex combination of issues, at the very least needing 2
>>>> axes...
>>>> liberal/conservative context is hardly useful to categorize people.
>>>>
>>>> Some people say you shouldn't catch feelings over a message board, but I
>>>> can't help it when we're talking about life and death. If anyone is
>>>> still
>>>> heated... I know I've been disrespectful probably a hundred times over
>>>> the
>>>> years... I'm sorry.
>>>>
>>>> Anyway, I thought it was a good discussion.

>>>>
>>>>
>>

>Anyway, I appreciate you following

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:13:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

have seen this but it's pretty humourous so
>here ya go....

>

>jef

>

>

>

>Last Updated: April 5, 1994

>

>

> The Book of Creation

>

>

> Chapter 1

>

>1

> In the beginning God created Dates.

>2

> And the date was Monday, July 4, 4004 BC.

>3

> And God said, let there be light; and there was light. And when
> there was Light, God saw the Date, that it was Monday, and he got
> down to work; for verily, he had a Big Job to do.

>4

> And God made pottery shards and Silurian mollusks and pre-Cambrian
> limestone strata; and flints and Jurassic Mastodon tusks and
> Picanthopus erectus skulls and Cretaceous placentals made he; and
> those cave paintings at Lasceaux. And that was that, for the first
> Work Day.

>5

> And God saw that he had made many wondrous things, but that he had
> not wherein to put it all. And God said, Let the heavens be divided
> from the earth; and let us bury all of these Things which we have
> made in the earth; but not too deep.

>6

> And God buried all the Things which he had made, and that was that.

>7

> And the morning and the evening and the overtime were Tuesday.

>8

> And God said, Let there be water; and let the dry land appear; and that was that.

>9

> And God called the dry land Real Estate; and the water called he the Sea. And in the land and beneath it put he crude oil, grades one through six; and natural gas put he thereunder, and prehistoric carboniferous forests yielding anthracite and other ligneous matter; and all these called he Resources; and he made them Abundant.

>10

> And likewise all that was in the sea, even unto two hundred miles from the dry land, called he resources; all that was therein, like manganese nodules, for instance.

>11

> And the morning unto the evening had been a long day; which he called Wednesday.

>12

> And God said, Let the earth bring forth abundantly every moving creature I can think of, with or without backbones, with or without wings or feet, or fins or claws, vestigial limbs and all, right now; and let each one be of a separate species. For lo, I can make whatsoever I like, whensoever I like.

>13

> And the earth brought forth abundantly all creatures, great and small, with and without backbones, with and without wings and feet and fins and claws, vestigial limbs and all, from bugs to brontosauruses.

>14

> But God blessed them all, saying, Be fruitful and multiply and Evolve Not.

>15

> And God looked upon the species he hath made, and saw that the earth was exceedingly crowded, and he said unto them, Let each species compete for what it needed; for Healthy Competition is My Law. And the species competeth amongst themselves, the cattle and the creeping things; and some madeth it and some didn't; and the dogs ate the dinosaurs and God was pleased.

>16

> And God took the bones from the dinosaurs, and caused them to appear mighty old; and cast he them about the land and the sea. And he took every tiny creature that had not madeth it, and caused them to become fossils; and cast he them about likewise.

>17

> And just to put matters beyond the valley of the shadow of a doubt God created carbon dating. And this is the origin of species.

>

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:19:08 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

is an Live One.

>12

> And he caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and he took from him
> one of his ribs, which was an spare rib.

>13

> And the spare rib which the LORD God had taken from the man, made he
> woman. And he brought her unto the man, saying:

>14

> This is Woman and she shall purchase your fruit; and ye shall
> realize a fortune thereby. For Man produceth and Woman consumeth,
> wherefore she shall be called the consumer.

>15

> And they were both decently clad, the

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:27:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>

>-----

>The plane was sent into the Pentagon around the same time, to
>what, distract people from noticing the bombs going off in the
>WTC? So why have the planes fly into them, if the US Govt. was
>going to bring them down with bombs? The first WTC bombing was
>from bombs, so it wouldn't have been suspicious to have bombs...so
>why use the planes?

>

>I recall talking to my brother later that day and he said he wasn't a
>bit surprised. Another brother, XXXX, builds electronic safety
>equipment & has strong ties to the FDNY, their Rescue squads and
>knew several men lost on 9-11. There was a FDNY building collapse
>expert who'd investigated the Murrah building collapse in OK working
>the #7 site and was the one who warned the chiefs not to send
>anyone into #7 because it looked so bad.

>

>Apparently my info regarding a single 40,000 gal tank up high may
>have been incorrect, but it is absolutely true that a lot of fuel was
>stored up high and the FDNY opposed it to no avail. XXXXX's

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:29:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ate everyone talking about this...I'm assuming you are referring to my post as being typical of something.

Perhaps you consider the reason for it as being a typical reaction to a typical spin.

"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message news:42d803a0\$1@linux...

>

> "Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:42d80363@linux...

> > I've witnessed building demolitions. That does look familiar, but you're

> > just seeing one side of the

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:31:10 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

very top floors. It's a pretty big stretch

to

> > think that what this is showing is caused by any particular means of

> > structural failure. It's obviously a failure. I didn't see this thing

and

> > hadn't heard of Dan Rather postulating this as a theory, but knowing the

> > *Rather agenda*, it would not surprise me. I'm surprised CBS didn't have

> > Michael Moore as co-anchor.

>

> heh heh... so typical.

>

> > "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message

> > news:42d7fe1e\$1@linux...

> >> Anyway, I appreciate you following up on the conversation.

> >>

> >> I don't think there was pods on the planes, or bombs or remote control

or

> > any

> >> of that crap. I just think there's some type of coverup and the only

> >> smoking gun is WTC7, and the insider trading.

> >>

> >> Here's a better video of it:

> >> http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/wtc7_col_lapse2.mpg

> >>

> >>

> >> Who knows, maybe I'm wrong, but I don't really see too much structural

> > damage
> >> to the facade.
> &

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:42:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

there would not have been any firefighters to "pull".

That Silverstein would admit that officials intentionally demolished Building 7 is bizarre for a number of reasons. Silverstein Properties Inc. had already won an \$861 million claim for the loss of the building

File Attachments

1) [bd7.jpg](#), downloaded 55 times



Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:42:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

gt;>

> >>
> >
> >
>

>referring to the gratuitous partisan comments...

"Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:42d80477@linux...

> I'm assuming you are referring to my post as being typical of something.
> Perhaps you consider the reason for it as being a typical reaction to a
> typical spin.

>
>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
> news:42d803a0\$1@linux...

>>
>> "Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message
>> news:42d80363@linux...

>> > I've witnessed building demolitions. That does look familiar, but
>> > you're
>> > just seeing one side of the very top floors. It's a pretty big stretch
> to

>> > think that what this is showing is caused by any particular means of
>> > structural failure. It's obviously a failure. I didn't see this thing
> and

>> > hadn't heard of Dan Rather postulating this as a theory, but knowing
>> > the
>> > *Rather agenda*, it would not surprise me. I'm surprised CBS didn't
>> > have
>> > Michael Moore as co-anchor.

>>
>> heh heh... so typical.

>>
>> > "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
>> > news:42d7fe1e\$1@linux...

>> >> Anyway, I appreciate you following up on the conversation.

>> >>

>> >> I dont think there was pods on the planes, or bombs or remote control
> or

>> > any

>> >> of that crap. I just think theres some type of coverup and the only
>> >> smoking gun is WTC7, and the insider trading.

>> >>

>> >> Here's a better video of it:

>> >> http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/wtc7_col_lapse2.mpg

>> >>

>> >>

>> >> Who knows, maybe I'm wrong, but I dont really see too much structural

>> > damage
>> >> to the facade.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>

>I know you guys kinda shoot the messenger regarding PBS... but seriously my dad is as hardcore conservative as it gets, and he's never once disagreed with any reporting done by PBS.

"Pulling" Bu

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:42:38 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

in a terrorist incident. FEMA's report states that the cause of building's collapse was fires. Presumably FEMA and the insurance company would be interested in knowing if the building was instead demolished by the FDNY. Moreover, the logistics of rigging a skyscraper for demolition in the space of a few hours would be daunting to say the least, particularly given that demolition teams would have to work around fires and smoke.

A third explanation is less obvious but makes sense of the non-sequiturs in the above explanations: perhaps Silverstein's statement was calculated to confuse the issue of what actually happened to Building 7. By suggesting that it was demolished by the FDNY as a safety measure, it provides an alternative to the only logical explanation -- that it was rigged for demolition before the attack. The absurdity of the FDNY implementing a plan to "pull" Building 7 on the afternoon of 9/11/01 will escape most people, who neither grasp the technical complexity of engineering the controlled demolition of a skyscraper, nor its contradiction with FEMA's account of the collapse, nor the thorough illegality of such an operation. Thus the idea that officials decided to "pull" Building 7 after the attack serves as a distraction from the inescapable logic that the building's demolition was planned in advance of the attack, and was therefore part of an inside job to destroy the entire WTC complex. do i know you??? what cd's??? wait...i remember now...cd's...are certificates of deposits...HELL YES I STILL WANT EM!. this is sooooo cool, in fact, i'm leaving for the post office right now and wait for them...will it be a long wait??? really i need to know cuz sometimes

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:43:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ilding 7

A PBS documentary about the 9/11/01 attack, America Rebuilds, features an interview with the leaseholder of the destroyed WTC complex, Larry Silverstein. In it, the elderly developer makes the following statement:

I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, "We've had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it." And they made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse.

This statement seems to suggest that the FDNY decided to demolish the building in accordance with Silverstein's suggestion, since the phrase "pull it" in this context apparently means to demolish the building. This interpretation is supported by a statement by a Ground Zero worker in the same documentary:

... we're getting ready to pull the building six.

Building 6 was one of the badly damaged low-rise buildings in the WTC complex that had to be demolished as part of the cleanup operation.

An alternative interpretation of Silverstein's statement is that "pull it" refers to withdrawing firefighters from the building. However, according to FEMA's report there were no manual firefighting operations in Building 7, so

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:45:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

they shoo me along if i'm there too long.

;o)

On Fri, 15 Jul 2005 12:29:52 -0600, "Mr Simplicity"
<animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote:

>You still wanna' crank up your hearing aid and listen to those
>songs?.....I've got a CD cookin' right now.....no.....really I
>do.....shit!!!!!!.....I smell smoke.....!!!!!!!

>

>

>"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message

>news:s8vfd19fu98tvlqkhjucl5t227r3sb1vhe@4ax.com...
>> didn't take it personally, really, life's too short...especially as I
>> near the gumming my oatmeal years.
>>
>> ;o)
>>
>> On Fri, 15 Jul 2005 07:22:26 -0400, "justcron"
>> <

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:46:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

not.
>> >>>
>> >>> Tony
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>> On 7/14/05 10:05 PM, in article 42d7280a\$1@linux, "justcron"
>> >>><justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>> Usually I just feel like I'm banging my head against the wall trying
>to
>> >>>> make
>> >>>> a point... I still do to a certain extent, but I think we might have
>> >>>> made
>> >>>> progress. I kinda understand more where people are coming from.
>Its
>> >>>> admirable to think the best about humans and believe the government
>is
>> >>>> acting in our best interest. I know people are ultimately concerned
>> >>>> with
>> >>>> their own security and survival.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> The political compass thing was helpful to show that political beliefs
>> >>>> are
>> >>>> really a complex combination of issues, at the very least needing 2
>> >>>> axes...
>> >>>> liberal/conservative context is hardly useful to categorize people.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Some people say you shouldn't catch feelings over a message board,
>but I
>> >>>> can't help it when we're talking about life and death. If anyone is
>> >>>> still
>> >>>> heated... I know I've been disrespectful probably a hundred times

>over
>> >>>> the
>> >>>> years... I'm sorry.
>> >>>>
>> >>>> Anyway, I thought it was a good discussion.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>
>> >
>>
>posting messed up the quote. This is Silverstein's entire quote:

> I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander,
> telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the
> fire, and I said, "We've had such terrible loss of life, maybe the
> smartest thing to do is pull it." And they made that decision to pull and
> we watched the building collapse.oops, wrong building.

On Fri, 15 Jul 2005 14:45:09 -0400, "justcron"
<justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>
>"rick" <

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:48:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

n@hydrorecords.compound" target="_blank">justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
>>
>> >heh heh... sorry fo the namecalling rick...
>> >
>> >"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> >news:fued1hkcn0qakq3m4gddnf05dlj7f1io3@4ax.com...
>> >> hey, i found out i'm probably a drunk and definitely a jackass...so i
>> >> guess i'm deeper than i thought.
>> >>
>> >> ;o)
>> >>
>> >> On Thu, 14 Jul 2005 23:12:05 -0500, Tony <tonyx@standingxhampton.com>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>Justin,
>> >>>
>> >>>I think the problem with these topics is that everyone seems pretty
>> >>>hell
>> >>>bent on changing somebody else's politics in the course of a few news

>> >>>group
>> >>>posts. That isn't ever going to happen. It takes years for each of us
>to
>> >>>develop our various points of view. The best we can do is try to
>> >>>understand
>> >>>each other and live with the fact that everyone doesn't share the same
>> >>>view.
>> >>>I'm confident that if we all were to meet somewhere, with no discussion
>of
>> >>>our personal politics, we would get along famously. Don't get me wrong,
>> >>>this
>> >>>kind of discourse is good. It helps us understand each other better, if
>> >>>even
>> >>>just a little. My wish is that we can all have these discussions, and
>even
>> >>>when they've been heated, at the end still be the great international
>> >>>community of PARIS people. That's it, the ICPP! Well, er...maybe a
>> >>>different
>> >>>acronym would be better. Anyway, I guess what I'm trying to say is that
>I
>> >>>respect you all, weather we share the same view or

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:51:40 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

l68@hotmail.com" target="_blank">parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:vj0gd114bargo268d2v7g7r6dcktr9mk57@4ax.com...

>> the buildings simply failed due to their structural design. being
>> exoskeletal in nature they did not have the internal strength of the
>> old school (empire state) construction. with no center support to
>> speak of the floors joists fatigued from the heat and collapsed inward
>> on the stairwells.

>
>I think that could be possible.. That is how the big towers collapsed.
>Regarding WTC7, I dont really see anything that would be generating heat.
>No glow.. no smoke, etc. Heres another vid.

>
> http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/wtc7_col_lapse.mpg

>
>
>I really appreciate everyone talking about this...
>First, let me say that, you acting superior while posting a
pack of lies is bad enough, but, your calling people names is
unacceptable.

"Jef Knight" <"Jef Knight"> wrote:

>The idea that you should keep killing "them" before they kill you is is

>pretty sociopathic I think.

Thanks for the analysis. Sure it isn't bipolar, or perhaps paranoid schizophrenic, or maybe just ADD?

Them is the enemy, not the shopkeepers. The suicide bombers, the foreign terrorists, the state sponsors of terrorism. They are knowable, and they are killable.

>Please remember a few important things about
>the "war".

Oh, this will be good. I know it will be real informed with "so" "many" "ironic" "quotes"....

>Let's start with "them". The dehumanizing of others is an important
>diagnostic point in the evaluation of pathological personality
>disorders. Underlying this is the idea that one is not harming a
>"person" but a "thing" or "non-person". It allows the ego to remain
>intact while performing otherwise unthinkable actions.

You obviously do not know any soldiers. Despite understanding that the ghouls must be killed, and understanding that they are indeed, ghouls, our soldiers pay a terrible price for doing the unthinkable, precisely because they are not able to completely depersonalize them. Only to have you call them pathological...

Pathetic. And of course, the actions of the ghouls are not pathological in Jef-land at all, They are understandable, maybe even noble! Maybe they are even like the minutemen!

>But who are "them"? For the most part they are normal, everyday
>families like yours and mine. Shop keepers, TV repairmen, gas station
>attendants, secretaries....who only want to live freely, in peace,

BWAA HAHH AHHA HHHHAAAA!

Oh that's good. Do you screenwrite for Michael Moore?

They are foreigners who come into places like Fallujah and kill

anyone who looks like they may desire freedom, take over the

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:55:16 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nux...

> referring to the gratuitous partisan comments...

>

> "Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:42d80477@linux...

>> I'm assuming you are referring to my post as being typical of something.

>> Perhaps you con

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [rick](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 18:59:46 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sider the reason for it as being a typical reaction to a

>> typical spin.

>>

>>

>> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message

>> news:42d803a0\$1@linux...

>>>

>>> "Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message

>>> news:42d80363@linux...

>>> I've witnessed building demolitions. That does look familiar, but

>>> you're

>>> just seeing one side of the very top floors. It's a pretty big

stretch

>> to

>>> think that what this is showing is caused by any particular means of

>>> structural failure. It's obviously a failure. I didn't see this thing

>> and

>>> hadn't heard of Dan Rather postulating this as a theory, but knowing

>>> the

>>> *Rather agenda*, it would not surprise me. I'm surprised CBS didn't

>>> have

>>> Michael Moore a

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:06:37 GMT

r the thorough illegality of such an operation. Thus the idea
> that officials decided to "pull" Building 7 after the attack serves as a
> distraction from the inescapable logic that the building's demolition was
> planned in advance of the attack, and was therefore part of an inside job
to
> destroy the entire WTC complex.
>
>All of this is addressed in the PM article. Read it.

DC

"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>I know you guys kinda shoot the messenger regarding PBS... but seriously
my

>dad is as hardcore conservative as it gets, and he's never once disagreed

>with any reporting done by PBS.

>

>"Pulling" Building 7

>A PBS documentary about the 9/11/01 attack, America Rebuilds, features an

>interview with the leaseholder of the destroyed WTC complex, Larry

>Silverstein. In it, the elderly developer makes the following statement:

>

> I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander,

>telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the

>fire, and I said, "We've had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest

>thing to do is pull it." And they made that decision to pull and we watched

>the building collapse.

>

>This statement seems to suggest that the FDNY decided to demolish the

>building in accordance with Silverstein's suggestion, since the phrase "pull

>it" in this context apparently means to demolish the building. This

>interpretation is supported by a statement by a Ground Zero worker in the

>same documentary:

>

> ... we're getting ready to pull the building six.

>

>Building 6 was one of the badly damaged low-rise buildings in the WTC

>complex that had to be demolished as part of the cleanup operation.

>
>An alternative interpretation of Silverstein's statement is that "pull it"

>refers to withdrawing firefighters from the building. However, according
to
>FEMA's report there were no manual firefighting operations in Building 7,
so
>there would not have been any firefighters to "pull".
>
>That Silverstein would admit that officials intentionally demolished
>Building 7 is bizarre for a number of reasons. Silverstein Properties Inc.

>had already won an \$861 million claim for the loss of the building in a

>terrorist incident. FEMA's report states that the cause of building's
>collapse was fires. Presumably FEMA and the insurance company would be
>interested in knowing if the building was instead demolished by the FDNY.

>Moreover, the logistics of rigging a skyscraper for demolition in the space

>of a few hours would be daunting to say the least, particularly given that

>demolition teams would have to work around fires and smoke.
>
>A third explanation is less obvious but makes sense of the non-sequiturs
in
>the above explanations: perhaps Silverstein's statement was calculated to

>confuse the issue of what actually happened to Building 7. By suggesting

>that it was demolished by the FDNY as a safety measure, it provides an
>alternative to the only logical explanation -- that it was rigged for
>demolition before the attack. The absurdity of the FDNY implementing a plan

>to "pull" Building 7 on the afternoon of 9/11/01 will escape most people,

>who neither grasp the technical complexity of engineering the controlled

>demolition of a skyscraper, nor its contradiction with FEMA's account of the
the
>collapse, nor the thorough illegality of such an operation. Thus the idea

>that officials decided to "pull" Building 7 after the attack serves as a

>distraction from the inescapable logic that the building's demolition was

>planned in advance of the attack, and was therefore part of an inside job
to

>destroy the entire WTC complex.

>

>"jus

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:08:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

tcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
news:42d809cb\$1@linux...

> It's typical to shoot the messenger when they dont agree with you.

btw... sorry I meant that 'you' as plural, in general... not specifically to
u deej."DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d80a04\$1@linux...

>

> All of this is addressed in the PM article. Read it.

I have read it and it says nothing about Silverstein's admission to pulling
the building...

Or am I missing something?

I know that what I just posted did start to expand into other conspiracies,
but I'm specifically interested in pulling WTC7. If that turns out to be
valid, then we can explore the additional issues. If we can find a WTC7
photo showing enough damage to bring down the building, I'll drop the whole
thing and one which you are willing to dismiss due to the

> source.

>

> It's typical to shoot the messenger when they dont agree with you.

>

When the messenger is a questionable source, yes, I'll admit that I
sometimes shoot first and ask questions later.

I think this has something to do with the *life's too short* feeling I've
got after watching Rather for way too many years.

Gulty as charged.

"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
news:42d809cb\$1@linux...

>

> "Mr Simplicity" <

Subject: Re: WTC 7

gators believe something, that does not make it true. They need evidence to support their beliefs.

PM: Second, a fifth-floor fire burned for up to 7 hours. "There was no firefighting in WTC 7," Sunder says. Investigators believe the fire was fed by tanks of diesel fuel that many tenants used to run emergency generators. Most tanks throughout the building were fairly small, but a generator on the fifth floor was connected to a large tank in the basement via a pressurized line. Says Sunder: "Our current working hypothesis is that this pressurized line was supplying fuel [to the fire] for a long period of time."

Response: How can a fire burn for seven hours without spreading to other offices or other floors? Perhaps some diesel fuel was dripping from a supply pipe. Since the fire was small, and since the building had a steel frame with concrete floors, the fire could not travel to other offices. So how could such an insignificant fire bring down an entire skyscraper? none of these are my words... just a published 'debunking' of the popular mechanics article:

> PM: Many conspiracy theorists point to FEMA's preliminary report, which
> said there was relatively light damage to WTC 7 prior to its collapse.
> With the benefit of more time and resources, NIST researchers now support
> the working hypothesis that WTC 7 was far more compromised by falling
> debris than the FEMA report indicated. "The most important thing we found
> was that there was, in fact, physical damage to the south face of building
> 7," NIST's Sunder tells PM. "On about a third of the face to the center
> and to the bottom--approximately 10 stories--about 25 percent of the depth
> of the building was scooped out." NIST also discovered previously
> undocumented damage to WTC 7's upper stories and its southwest corner.

>
> Response: Where are the photos that prove 25% of Building 7 was scooped
> out? The photos published in reports, and those available on the Internet
> do not show anything other than trivial damage, such as some broken
> windows.

>
> Tom Franklin, a professional photographer for a New Jersey newspaper,
> traveled quickly to the World Trade Center to get photographs. According
> to his own report, he was standing in front of Building 7 at about 4 p.m..
> He took lots of photos, but where are his photos of Building 7? Why would
> he ignore a skyscraper with 25% of its first 10 floors scooped out?

> -----
> PM: NIST investigators believe a combination of intense fire and severe
> structural damage contributed to the collapse, though assigning the exact
> proportion requires more research.

>
> Response: Where is evidence that there was an intense fire in Building 7?

> The photos taken in the afternoon do not show intense fires. Just because
> a few investigators believe something, that does not make it true. They
> need evidence to support their beliefs.

> -----

> PM: Second, a fifth-floor fire burned for up to 7 hours. "There was no
> firefighting in WTC 7," Sunder says. Investigators believe the fire was
> fed by tanks of diesel fuel that many tenants used to run emergency
> generators. Most tanks throughout the building were fairly small, but a
> generator on the fifth floor was connected to a large tank in the basement
> via a pressurized line. Says Sunder: "Our current working hypothesis is
> that this pressurized line was supplying fuel [to the fire] for a long
> period of time."

>

> Response: How can a fire burn for seven hours without spreading to other
> offices or other floors? Perhaps some diesel fuel was dripping from a
> supply pipe. Since the fire was small, and since the building had a steel

>

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:11:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

k">animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:42d808c6@linux...

> >not partisan at all. This would imply something totally
> different

> > to my dislike of Dan Rather and Michael Moore.....because they
> represent

> > themselves to be unbiased documentarians and they aren't. Plain and
> > simple.

>

> Fair enough if thats what you believe. I mean personally I watched
> Bowling

> for Columbine and I thought it was incredibly balanced.

>

> > As much of a whacko as I think he is, if some editorial commentator
> (which

> > is

> > what Rather became before leaving in disgrace) came out with a photo op
> of

> > Ted Kennedy taking a roadside sobriety test, I'd doubt that too because

> > I'd

> > have to consider the source before all else.

>

> I honestly never followed Dan Rather enough to notice his bias. It's
> annoying as hell that all 'journalists' spin the story their own way.

>

> > This is ample reason for me to dismiss the credibility of Rather/CBS. I
> > will, however, backtrack a bit here and admit that my first assumption
was
> > that this story *originated* with CBS/Rather. If so, then I'll not
remove
> > the plate of crow from the oven. If not, then I'll might put it on the
> > table
> > and take a bite. Where did this story originate?
>
> thats a difficult question to answer. Rather's only involvement was doing
> the news that day and commenting "That looks like what we've all seen when
a
> building is destroyed by well placed dynamite" a simple observation,
one
> which I have shared, and one which you are willing to dismiss due to the
> source.
>
> It's typical to shoot the messenger when they dont agree with you.
>
>"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d80a04\$1@linux...
>
> All of this is addressed in the PM article. Read it.

PM: Many conspiracy theorists point to FEMA's preliminary report, which said there was relatively light damage to WTC 7 prior to its collapse. With the benefit of more time and resources, NIST researchers now support the working hypothesis that WTC 7 was far more compromised by falling debris than the FEMA report indicated. "The most important thing we found was that there was, in fact, physical damage to the south face of building 7," NIST's Sunder tells PM. "On about a third of the face to the center and to the bottom--approximately 10 stories--about 25 percent of the depth of the building was scooped out." NIST also discovered previously undocumented damage to WTC 7's upper stories and its southwest corner.

Response: Where are the photos that prove 25% of Building 7 was scooped out? The photos published in reports, and those available on me Internet do not show anything other than trivial damage, such as some broken windows.

Tom Franklin, a professional photographer for a New Jersey newspaper, traveled quickly to the World Trade Center to get photographs. According to his own report, he was standing in front of Building 7 at about 4 p.m.. He took lots of photos, but where are his photos of Building 7? Why would he ignore a skyscraper with 25% of its first 10 floors scooped out?

PM: NIST investigators believe a combination of intense fire and severe structural damage contributed to the collapse, though assigning the exact proportion requires more research.

Response: Where is evidence that there was an intense fire in Building 7?
The photos taken in the afternoon do not show intense fires. Just because a few investi

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:11:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

frame with concrete floors, the fire could not travel to other offices. So
> how could such an insignificant fire bring down an entire skyscraper?
>
>Well.....hummmm.....deisel fuel is probably the least explosive of
all liquid petroleum products so it doesn't react like
gasoline.....this might explain this.....and might not.

"justcron" <

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:13:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
news:42d80c96@linux...
>
> "DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d80a04\$1@linux...
> >
> > All of this is addressed in the PM article. Read it.
>
> PM: Many conspiracy theorists point to FEMA's preliminary report, which
said
> there was relatively light damage to WTC 7 prior to its collapse. With the
> benefit of more time and resources, NIST researcher

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:20:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t;justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
>heres a decent pic of the facade of WTC7. It looks like about 1% of the

>face is damaged.

Are you sure that pic isn't the conspiracy? If that's showing a
damaged WTC-7, and was taken on that day, then why are the

streets so empty? Where are all the people & rescue vehicles, etc?

You sure that pic doesn't happen to be one taken earlier time & then Photoshopped??

Seriously - I was hoping to see something interesting there, but the complete absence of any activity on the streets makes me think it can't be 9/11.

Neil is a reasonable question, but something tells me you're just being a comedian again.

Everyone ran away and everything is covered in that nasty dust.

"Neil" <OIUOIU@OIU.com> wrote in message news:42d81296\$1@linux...

>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>> here's a decent pic of the facade of WTC7. It looks like about 1% of the

>

>> face is damaged.

>

> Are you sure that pic isn't the conspiracy? If that's showing a
> damaged WTC-7, and was taken on that day, then why are the
> streets so empty? Where are all the people & rescue vehicles, etc?

>

> You sure that pic doesn't happen to be one taken earlier time &
> then Photoshopped??

>

> Seriously - I was hoping to see something interesting there, but
> the complete absence of any activity on the streets makes me
> think it can't be 9/11.

>

> Neil

> Closest I've ever come to being able to control what a woman does.

;o)

"rick" <parnell68@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:cuvfd154m65nmboued0lrhk181gvqprle@4ax.com...

> damn, if she just doesn't remind me of a girl i never knew. i do
> remember bouncing like that during a couple of multi-story falls as a
> carpenter...but eventually i hit the ground and stopped bouncing.

>

> On Fri, 15 Jul 2005 11:45:11 -0600, "Mr Simplicity"

> <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote:

>

> > <http://www.izpitera.ru/lj/tetka.swf>

> >

> >
> >"Mr Simplicity" <animix_spamless_@animas.net> wrote in message
> >news:

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:21:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

s now support the
working

> hypothesis that WTC 7 was far more compromised by falling debris than the
> FEMA report indicated. "The most important thing we found was that there
> was, in fact, physical damage to the south face of building 7," NIST's
> Sunder tells PM. "On about a third of the face to the center and to the
> bottom--approximately 10 stories--about 25 percent of the depth of the
> building was scooped out." NIST also discovered previously undocumented
> damage to WTC 7's upper stories and its southwest corner.

>
> Response: Where are the photos that prove 25% of Building 7 was scooped
out?

> The photos published in reports, and those available on the Internet do not
> show anything other than trivial damage, such as some broken windows.

>
> Tom Franklin, a professional photographer for a New Jersey newspaper,
> traveled quickly to the World Trade Center to get photographs. According
to

> his own report, he was standing in front of Building 7 at about 4 p.m.. He
> took lots of photos, but where are his photos of Building 7? Why would he
> ignore a skyscraper with 25% of its first 10 floors scooped out?

> -----

> PM: NIST investigators believe a combination of intense fire and severe
> structural damage contributed to the collapse, though assigning the exact
> proportion requires more research.

>
> Response: Where is evidence that there was an intense fire in Building 7?

> The photos taken in the afternoon do not show intense fires. Just because
a

> few investigators believe something, that does not make it true. They need
> evidence to support their beliefs.

> -----

> PM: Second, a fifth-floor fire burned for up to 7 hours. "There was no
> firefighting in WTC 7," Sunder says. Investigators believe the fire was
fed

> by tanks of diesel fuel that many tenants used to run emergency
generators.

> Most tanks throughout the building were fairly small, but a generator on
the

> fifth floor was connected to a large tank in the basement via a
> pressurized
> line. Says Sunder: "Our current working hypothesis is that this
> pressurized
> line was supplying fuel [to the fire] for a long period of time."
>
> Response: How can a fire burn for seven hours without spreading to other
> offices or other floors? Perhaps some diesel fuel was dripping from a
> supply
> pipe. Since the fire was small, and since the building had a steel frame
> with concrete floors, the fire could not travel to other offices. So how
> could such an insignificant fire bring down an entire skyscraper?
>
>&quo

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:24:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

lank">42d7f51c@linux...
> >> Thank Aaron for this.
> >>
> >> ;o)
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
>nice I found a close up and another one that corroborates the earlier pic.

"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>Fair enough if thats what you believe. I mean personally I watched Bowling
>for Columbine and I thought it was incredibly balanced.

It wasn't. For whatever reason, that guy cannot tell the truth.

http://www.hardylaw.net/Truth_About_Bowling.html

<http://www.bowlingfortruth.com/>

DC"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d81631\$1@linux...

>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>

>

>>Fair enough if thats what you believe. I mean personally I watched

>>Bowling

>

>>for Columbine and I thought it was incredibly balanced.

>

>

> It wasn't. For whatever reason, that guy cannot tell the truth.

>

> http://www.hardylaw.net/Truth_About_Bowling.html

>

> <http://www.bowlingfortruth.com/>

I dunno... I dont have any animosity to MM personally, or anyone for that matter. Theres literally no journalist or whatever that I would call out by name and say they're 100% full of shite."justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
>none of these are my words... just a published 'debunking' of the popular

>mechanics article:

Unfortunately, this material diputes the PM article, but does not debunk it because it contains no evidence, only speculation.

I believe the structural guys. The bottom line with conspiracies is that there is no way to ever convince the believers that there was no conspiracy. This goes for Kennedy, Lincoln, WTC7 and the Illuminati, and you name it. You have to believe someone.

I believe the structural engineers.

have a great weekend.

DCI noticed you stopped responding substansially a few posts ago...

I believe the structural engineers too.

Still waiting for those photos amigo.

"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d81dde\$1@linux...

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [Deej \[3\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:27:20 GMT

br />

>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>>none of these are my words... just a published 'debunking' of the popular

>

>>mechanics article:

>

> Unfortunately, this material disputes the PM article, but does not

> debunk it because it contains no evidence, only speculation.

>

> I believe the structural guys. The bottom line with conspiracies

> is that there is no way to ever convince the believers that there was

> no conspiracy. This goes for Kennedy, Lincoln, WTC7 and the

> Illuminati, and you name it. You have to believe someone.

>

> I believe the structural engineers.

>

> have a great weekend.

>

> DC

>"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d81dde\$1@linux...

>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>>none of these are my words... just a published 'debunking' of the popular

>

>>mechanics article:

>

> Unfortunately, this material disputes the PM article, but does not

> debunk it because it contains no evidence, only speculation.

BTW, you'll note I put 'debunk' in quotes.

Regarding evidence, it is an alternate view OF the evidence."justcron"

<justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>I noticed you stopped responding substansially a few posts ago...

Well heck, I need to do SOME work...

>

>I believe the structural engineers too.

>

>Still waiting for those photos amigo.

As soon as i get 'em.

DC"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>Regarding evidence, it is an alternate view OF the evidence.

Actually it's mostly speculation about the size of tanks and the rate of leaks and what a fire could do. The facts are available unless they believe that everyone is covering up.

DC"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d822c4\$1@linux...

>
> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>
>
>
>>Regarding evidence, it is an alternate view OF the evidence.

>
> Actually it's mostly speculation about the size of tanks and
> the rate of leaks and what a fire could do. The facts are available
> unless they believe that everyone is covering up.

The PM article and the response article share the same evidence."justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>The PM article and the response article share the same evidence.

then why didn't the reposnse article get the details about the fuel oil?

Where it was, how much, where the impacts were, the size of the fire, the way the design of the building affected the collapse etc.

I realize I have an advantage here, knowing someone who was there and knows the details, but I don't they they did their homework before postulating a cove

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [Neil](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:46:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rup and conspiracy.

DC"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d8258c@linux...

>
> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>
>>The PM article and the response article share the same evidence.

>
> then why didn't the reposnse article get the details about the fuel oil?

>
> Where it was, how much, where the impacts were, the size of the fire, the
> way the design of the building affected the collapse etc.

Those d

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:52:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

etails are all in the FEMA report which both articles reference.

> I realize I have an advantage here, knowing someone who was
> there and knows the details, but I don't they they did their
> homework before postulating a coverup and conspiracy.

I'm not looking for a magazine article DC... I'm looking for proof.

I actually read that article in PM when it came out, and only recently
tossed that issue in the trash."justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>I dunno... I dont have any animosity to MM personally, or anyone for that

>matter. Theres literally no journalist or whatever that I would call out

>by name and say they're 100% full of shite.

You know, you're right. I read the book of "Roger and Me" and
thought it was about 30% not full of shit. So, cumulatively, adding
in his most recent work and averaging, Moore is only 93.4%
full of shit.

DC"DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 19:59:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> "DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in

File Attachments

1) [wtc7-fires-close.jpg](#), downloaded 57 times



2) [wtc7-fires.jpg](#), downloaded 57 times



Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:01:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

message news:42d82613\$1@linux...

> >

> > "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

> >

> >>I dunno... I dont have any animosity to MM personally, or anyone for that

> >

> >>matter. Theres literally no journalist or whatever that I would call out

> >

> >>by name and say they're 100% full of shite.

> >

> > You know, you're right. I read the book of "Roger and Me&quo

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:07:11 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

t; and

> > thought it was about 30% not full of shit. So, cumulatively, adding
> > in his most recent work and averaging, Moore is only 93.4%
> > full of shit.

>

> Kinda like the PM article is only 15% full of shit.

>

> Then again I guess one mans shit is another mans perspective.

>

>Its all yours boss... :)

"DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message
news:42d82766@linux...

> >one mans shit is another mans perspective.

>

> Now that is a classic. If that is original, you should tag it to your

> online

> signature. It would also make a great website.

>

> ;oD

>

> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message

> news:

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:34:38 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nk">42d826c6@linux...

>>

>> "DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d82613\$1@linux...

>> >

>> > "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:

>> >

>> >>I dunno... I dont have any animosity to MM personally, or anyone for

> that

>> >

>> >>matter. Theres literally no journalist or whatever that I would call

> out

>> >

>> >>by name and say they're 100% full of shite.

>

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:45:50 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> >

>> > You know, you're right. I read the book of "Roger and Me" and
>> > thought it was about 30% not full of shit. So, cumulatively, adding
>> > in his most recent work and averaging, Moore is only 93.4%
>> > full of shit.

>>

>> Kinda like the PM article is only 15% full of shit.

>>

>> Then again I guess one mans shit is another mans perspective.

>>

>>

>

>I'm with the %50 of New Yorkers who don't believe this stupid conspiracy.

<http://www.zogby.com/search/ReadNews.dbm?ID=855>

I don't buy that the most protected airspace on earth allowed hijacked airliners to freely fly around for an hour.

airplane headed to the school in an attempt to assassinate Bush because he stayed there for an hour and a half after being told "America is under attack.

I don't believe for a second that every scientific report that said that the Boing 757 that "liquefied" after entering

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:47:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

the first 18" of concrete at the Pentagon still had enough structural integrity to go through another 7 feet concrete when passing through the another seven walls. Furthermore, if you believe that, then you would have to believe that the heaviest densest parts of the airplane the two engines and the two landing gears would have left two exit holes not one.

I don't buy for a second that Bush had nothing to hide when he took 411 days to form the 911 commission or that he was hiding anything when agreed to testify in front of the commission only if Cheney was with him and no notes or recordings would be made.

I do believe that the Project for a New American Century, the think tank headed by Cheney

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:53:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

, Rumsfield, Wolfowitz, Pearl and Jeb Bush, Saw a unique opportunity when they wrote before Bush had been elected that"

is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event - like a new Pearl Harbor."

<http://dem>

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:55:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

opedia.democraticunderground.com/index.php/PNAC_10 1

in a magazine to answer questions that the 911 commission avoided.

Yes, the theory that the government fed to Americans is the LEAST reasonable explanation to the events of 9/11. I and those in the 9/11 truth movement want an independent commission formed so we can get s

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 20:58:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ome real answers. What does the Bush administration have to fear from the truth?
-Weslf you want to start getting educated on the subject of 9/11. Watch or listen to Christian theologian David ray Griffins lecture at the University of Wisconsin (broadcast on C-SPAN) here:
<http://www.911blogger.com/2005/04/proper-release-of-griffin-in-madison.html>

Also check out "911 in plane site" and the BBC production "The power of nightmares" here:

<http://www.911wasal>

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 21:07:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

ie.com/phpwebsite/index.php?module=pagemaster&PAGE_user_op=view_page&PAGE_id=22Is
this WTC7 thing compatible with PCI 2.2? :0)

....he frivolously posted while rocking to Steve Earle's "The Revolution
Starts NOW!"

".....in your own neighborhood." - Steve Earle "Wes" <wexus6@aol.com> wrote:

>Yes, the theory that the government fed to Americans is the LEAST reasonable
>explanation to the events of 9/11. I and those in the 9/11 truth movement
>want an independent commission formed so we can get some real answer

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 21:09:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

rs. What
>does the Bush administration have to fear from the truth?
>-Wes

Whew. Ok, whatever you say man. This is how we all sounded
when JFK was killed. Now we are a lot calmer. You will be too
someday. Conspiracies are fun though, aren't they?

have a great weekend

DC http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/localnews/2002382718_horse15m.html Thanks, but I
couldn't possibly use it. It's not my creation. Somehow it
just seems so conclusive and profound.....like the discovery of some
elusive basic truth.

;o)

"justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
news:42d827aa\$1@linux...

> Its all yours boss... :)

>

> "DJ" <animix_spam-this-ahole_@animas.net> wrote in message

> news:

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [DC](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 21:09:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

6@linux..." target="_blank">42d82766@linux...
> > >one mans shit is another mans perspective.
> >
> > Now that is a classic. If that is original, you should tag it to your
> > online
> > signature. It would also make a great website.
> >
> > ;oD
> >
> > "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote in message
> > news:42d826c6@linux...
> >>

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 21:12:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

r />
> >> "DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote in message news:42d82613\$1@linux...
> >>>
> >>> "justcron" <justcron@hydrorecords.compound> wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>>I dunno... I dont have any animosity to MM personally, or anyone for
> > that
> >>>>
> >>>>>matter. Theres literally no journalist or whatever that I would
call
> > out
> >>>>
> >>>>>by name and say they're 100% full of shite.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> You know, you're right. I read the book of "Roger and Me" and
> >>>>>> thought it was about 30% not full of shit. So, cumulatively, adding
> >>>>>>

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [justcron](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 21:16:24 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amless_@animas.net" target="_blank">animix_spamless_@animas.net> skrev i en meddelelse
news:42d7dbae@linux...
> as far as I can understand but I'm seeing Dejj have learned
>> to do some observations from them about the "new" Americans, that's just

>> seems to be German, French, Scandinavian etc. etc.
>
>
> Erling,
>
> The *only* reason tht I posted all this stuff was that I was trying to
> make
> two points that I don't think I made.
>
> The first one was to try to give some small background of my life that was
> relative to the idea that I had a lot invested in my hopes of how I
> thought
> the world could be and so did these folks from Europe and all over the
> world
> really, though most of them were from Europe and the US.
>
> The second point was that I was absolutely floored when these things were
> being observed and shown to me by people who were about as familiar with
> Europeans and Americans as beings from another planet. I didn't like
> hearing
> this. It certainly didn't fit my picture of how the world should be and
> what
> is really scary about it it that no one but the Indians even recognized
> what
> was going on.
>
> I'm nothing special. Everyone has their own reasons for believing what
> they
> believe. My post was well meant, but in retrospect, it seems sort of silly
> to me and I shouldn't have even wasted my time or anyone else's time on
> this.
>
> Regards,
>
> Deej
>
>
>
> "erlilo" <erlilo@online.no> wrote in message news:42d7c519@linux...

Subject: Re: WTC 7
Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 21:17:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

in his most recent work and averaging, Moore is only 93.4%
> >> > full of shit.

> >>

> >> Kinda like the PM article is only 15% full of shit.

> >>

> >> Then again I guess one mans shit is another mans perspective.

> >>

> >>

> >

> >

>

>I know your post was well meant, a bad guy would never write about his life your way as often showing up here. But as I can see it, if you're observing these conflicts in your mixed up homecountry, how can your land trying to make peace in the world without understandings at all when observing these conflicts in metaold roots they have taking with them from their old homecountries into America? They have the roots of nations-conflicts, poorness(don't know if it's a correct word) and wars from all over Europe and other parts of the world deeply anchored in their body and blood allready when emigrated to America with theyr hopes for the future.

By the way, I was nearly emigrated to Canada, was in love with a wonderful teenager I met in North Vancouver in '60 with norwegian roots and wrote with her for three years. But I wasn't enough in love to travel when starting up with my guitar:-) I was trying to get contact again in the late eighties with her and talked with her brother on the phone just to get the knowings, she was killed in a carcrash in the seventies.

erlilo

"Mr Simplicity" <

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [Mike CIMike Claytor](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 22:59:51 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

al(what a word, I don't know if it's correct written

> at

>> all) in America, as far as I can understand but I'm seeing Dejj have

> learned

>> to do some observations from them about the "

Subject: Re: WTC 7

Posted by [Deej \[1\]](#) on Fri, 15 Jul 2005 23:30:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

>> skrev i en meddelelse

>> news:42d758ac\$1@linux...
>> >
>> > "DC" <dcicchetti@urs2.net> wrote:
>> >> So, do you think that Rabin had any more hope of success with these
>> >> people than did Clinton or anyone else?
>> >
>> >
>> > yes, absolutely. talk about it all as you will, rabin remains
>> > the ONLY person to ever effectively reduce the terror plague down
>> > there. you obviously missed the part where i stressed
>> > that i do acknowledge that both approaches, both the
>> > deescalation
>> > one and the brute force one can lead to success.
>> > thats what i wrote. nothing about cowboys or some such,
>> > thats only the stuff you projected into my words, because
>> > im a (insert yet another dumbass euro stereotype here).
>> >
>> >
>> > so, yes, i do acknowledge that both roads can lead to success.
>> > do you? it appears you dont, so whos the dogmatic type here?
>> >
>> >
>> >> No it doesn't, or it would have worked with Hussein, Kim Il Sung,
>> >> Hitler and the Branch Davidians. You are not allowing for insanity
>> >> and evil in the world and you are assuming that a rational person's
>> >> version of a more attractive situation will always be accepted.
>> >
>> >
>> > from a palaestinian point of view, israel is the aggressor
>> > that took their land. they dont have the military power,
>> > so they go the terror route. being the frakkingeuropacifistidiotdude
> that
>> > i am, i despise that
>> > just as much, so id prefer it if you dont switch between
>> > calling me a blind pacifist one moment and then a guy
>> > that doesnt criticize palaestina (and thus somewhat supports the use of
>> > terror),
>> > whatever fits the best.
>> >
>> > from their point of view, theyre actually doing exactly
>> > the same thing - use brute force. they dont have planes,
>> > so they use suicide bombers. if you were on their side,
>> > its what you would recommend. and if the enemy threatened to
>> > use more power, youd recommend that the enemy gets a
>&
