
Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 19:55:09 GMT

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

msgtpainFirst you want to tell us all how stupid Bush is, because instead of funding the deployment of "cheap and effective" detectors, he just tells everyone they can't take liquids on a plane.

Now, as we've seen, those "cheap and effective" detectors you're talking about already are in most US airports, and they are absolutely worthless against these explosives. You fail at that argument, and quietly drop it.

Ok, let's assume for a moment that your articles demonstrate conclusively that cheap and effective detectors are completely non-existent, in that they can't see through metal cans. And also, the myth that any concentrated chemical is "undetectable" is a foolish myth - chemical detectors detect anything you want. They merely need to be geared to solvents as well as more "regular" explosives. But whatever. We'll assume that because these machines can't see through metal canisters, they may as well not exist. (Because it's easy to sneak metal canisters onto airplanes.)

Even then, sneaking the parts of a binary compound onto a plane is the easy part of actually making these explosives work. Here's one example:

http://www.theregister.co.uk/2006/08/17/flying_toilet_terror_labs/

So I suppose the question is, why would Bush administration be rescinding funding from bomb detector research while banning all liquids on planes in an effort to prevent the fairly preposterous notion of a binary liquid explosive? (Feel free to demonstrate to me that there are more effective liquid explosives to the example I posted above, but be conclusive.) All while not asking his Republican friends in Congress to pass security measures (like this one:

<http://www.theorator.com/bills109/hr4373.html>) that would actually serve to defend America from real threats?

To this end, I have a hard time believing Bush is the "Anti-Terror President".

msgtpainSo, now we move on to it being "ironic" that I post the exact text needed to rebuff your above argument, but I don't include a paragraph about how TSA people didn't have as much R&D funding as they needed, because they had to pay their employees.

No, the point was that the 6 million dollars was not cut from deploying new detectors, but from research into new detectors. And seeing how you missed this, it suggest to me that you did not even read the link I posted, or at least not critically.

msgtpainWhile this doesn't have any bearing at all regarding our current debate about whether or not Bush is stupid for eliminating liquids on a plane, lets explore it for a second.

This new argument which you would like to present is that Bush is trying to make it so we can't develop cheap, effective detectors. We now know that they don't exist (see above), so lets discuss how Bush is preventing them from coming in to existence by asking for \$6 million to cover

an overage in the federal security department.

Quote:Homeland Security said Friday its research arm has just gotten a new leader, former Navy research chief Rear Adm. Jay Cohen, and there is strong optimism for developing new detection technologies in the future.

Lawmakers and recently retired Homeland Security officials say they are concerned the department's research and development effort is bogged down by bureaucracy, lack of strategic planning and failure to use money wisely.

The department failed to spend \$200 million in research and development money from past years, forcing lawmakers to rescind the money this summer.

Notice the use of the word "lawmakers" in those paragraphs.. "Lawmakers" rescinded \$200 million this summer from the same R&D department, because that R&D department has been plagued with inefficiencies.

Quote:Homeland Security is spending a total of \$732 million this year on various explosives deterrents. It has tested several commercial liquid explosive detectors over the past few years but hasn't been satisfied enough with the results to deploy them.

\$732 million this year.. Did you read that? They're spending \$732 million this year alone, and Congress also took away \$200 million from their budget because they just didn't seem to need it (i.e., they couldn't find ways to spend it). So, now we have Bush asking that \$6 million be diverted to cover an overage in another security sector, and you're up in arms about it? Bush asked that 0.8% of this years budget be spent on something else.. Congress rescinded 27% of their budget, because it wasn't even being spent. Bush asked for 3% of what Congress ALREADY took away from them.. and you want us to believe that Bush is trying to make it so we can't have the detectors we need in our country?

You're directly comparing money cut from "The R&D Department" with money Bush attempted to divert from "Specific Programs". They are not the same thing.

Oh, and how do you know Bush is moving the money to cover an overage in another security sector?

And on a final note, following this posting, I'll be transitioning to school, so don't expect many more posts out of me for a while. So I'll just post these two quotes, which I find more than mildly compelling:

"I think that the proposition of going to Baghdad is also fallacious. I think if we were going to remove Saddam Hussein we would have had to go all the way to Baghdad, we would have to commit a lot of force because I do not believe he would wait in the Presidential Palace for us to arrive. I think we'd have had to hunt him down. And once we'd done that and we'd gotten rid of Saddam Hussein and his government, then we'd have had to put another government in its place. What kind of government? Should it be a Sunni government or Shi'i government or a Kurdish government or Ba'athist regime? Or maybe we want to bring in some of the Islamic fundamentalists? How long would we have had to stay in Baghdad to keep that government in

place? What would happen to the government once U.S. forces withdrew? How many casualties should the United States accept in that effort to try to create clarity and stability in a situation that is inherently unstable? I think it is vitally important for a President to know when to use military force. I think it is also very important for him to know when not to commit U.S. military force. And it's my view that the President got it right both times, that it would have been a mistake for us to get bogged down in the quagmire inside Iraq." — Dick Cheney at the Washington Institute's Soref Symposium, April 29, 1991

"I don't think anybody anticipated the level of violence we encountered" [in Iraq.] — Dick Cheney, National Press Club in Washington, D.C., June 19, 2006
