
Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 23:53:29 GMT

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

Quote:"We've focused for the last 10 years on solid explosives and their signatures," said William Martel, a professor of international security studies at Tufts University. "Liquid poses a different problem. Liquids are ubiquitous -- shaving cream, shampoo, bottles of water, juice, infant formula."

Vincent Cannistraro, former executive director of the CIA's counterterrorism center, said he believes the latest plot involved a Yousef formula.

"It's nitroglycerin (plus other things), no question about it," Cannistraro said. "We know it can't be detected by any security machines in use right now, and so it scared the hell out of everyone."

Quote:The newest form of liquid explosives are so-called "binary" formulas like FIXOR, recently developed as part of the humanitarian campaign to clear land mines in Third World countries. They're stable and undetectable until mixed, and also require a detonator.

A report last year from Congress' research arm says that chemical traces often can be detected through screening devices at airports that use puffs of air to dislodge debris, but warned that the "portals" already in use at some airports are expensive and slow.

In addition, the report said, "novel explosive materials will probably not be detected by these systems." Also, if a bomber takes proper precautions, such as carefully sealing containers and not wearing contaminated clothes, those screening devices may not help.

Quote:How hard is it to screen for liquid explosives?

They're a real threat to airlines. Currently security agencies have no test for liquid explosives. Technology is in the works, and several devices have been tested in airports. One kind uses microwaves to distinguish safe, water-based liquids (like coffee or soda) from solvents and other dangerous chemicals used in explosives. But this device can't see through metal containers. Another kind of device sends laser light through clear glass or plastic. The light bounces back with a scatter signature that can be compared to a database of worrisome liquids. But this technology can't see through opaque containers.

<http://www.newsday.com/news/health/ny-hsliquid0809,0,7340017 .story>

http://news.com.com/Liquid+explosives+threaten+air+travel/21_00-7348_3-6104475.html

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5633568>

Oh, and as to YOUR story? How about we post the full story, not just the paragraph that you think will make your point.

Quote:For more than four years, officials inside Homeland Security also have debated whether to deploy smaller trace explosive detectors - already in most American airports - to foreign airports to help stop any bomb chemicals or devices from making it onto U.S.-destined flights.

A 2002 Homeland Security report recommended "immediate deployment" of the trace units to key European airports, highlighting their low cost, \$40,000 per unit, and their detection capabilities. The report said one such unit was able, 25 days later, to detect explosives residue inside the airplane where convicted shoe bomber Richard Reid was foiled in December 2001.

A 2005 report to Congress similarly urged that the trace detectors be used more aggressively and strongly warned the continuing failure to distribute such detectors to foreign airports "may be an invitation to terrorist to ply their trade, using techniques that they have already used on a number of occasions."

Do you need me to read that to you out loud? You're arguing that these detectors, the ones that are already being used in US airports and that they tried to deploy to foreign airports.. should be used instead of taking away liquids on a plane.. Are you really that much of a dumbass? Do you think we're really that stupid that you can continue to play these stupid half-truth games to try to win your arguments?

Read all the quotes from the three sites above. There are NO reliable detectors right now that can detect LIQUID explosives in the form that they believe the terrorists are trying to use. The ones that look PROMISING are either way to expensive, or would bring screening to a stand-still.

So, do you still think Bush is a big moron for restricting liquids from going on planes? Cause, as I see it, you're still the only moron here.

If you know anything, and I mean anything about US governemnt accounting, you will be very familiar with the term "Use it or lose it". It is everywhere, and Bush didn't make it up. Every year, departments are required to submit their budgets for approval. Every year, they are required to return their unused fundage back to fiscal. If they spent less than they asked for, it is standard for fiscal to only allocate to them the amount they spent the year before. It's a huge waste-fraud-and-abuse in my opinion; every year departments go on spending sprees for frivolous and stupid shit just so their budget won't be cut next year. That's the price they have to pay for being financially responsible. But again, Bush didn't invent that, so quit trying to sling shit where it doesn't belong.

Edit

I had to come edit my post because the more I think about it, the more obvious it is to me how much of a complete hypocrit you are being with this argument. After all your lectures about the National Debt, Oil, The cost of the war in Iraq, the corrupt businessmen driving yachts on taxpayer money, etc.. It somewhat amazes me that your current stance is that: "The Bush administration should have spent millions, possibly billions pushing out sketchy technology that they know probably wouldn't even catch the explosives they were going to use---INSTEAD of simply telling

air travelers to leave their cokes at home and wait for a free drink at 10,000'.

I'm assuming that the "you can't bring liquid on a plane" is really "you can't get liquid through the security point", but I may be wrong. If I'm right, I don't think there is an airport in the US that doesn't have dozens of restaurants, stores, newsstands, etc behind the security points. Is it safe to assume that you can simply pass security and then purchase whatever you want to take with you? I mean sure, you may have to spend \$2 on a drink, so-the-fuck-what? That's a lot better than spending billions in an attempt to do the same thing and not "inconvenience" the American traveler.
