
Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 23:30:28 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Wed, 16 August 2006 11:35

I find this highly ironic because you posted the part of the article that simultaneously made you look good and was tangential from the original \$6 million that was diverted from research into better explosives detectors.

So did you even read the whole article or what?

msgtpainRead 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.

Good thing Bush tried to cut research funding.

You are such a dumbass it's hilarious.. You don't even know how to create and defend your own arguments.

First 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.

So, 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.

While 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 existance 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" recinded \$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?

Since you'll simply ignore all this too, lets move on to your next argument.

http://abclocal.go.com/kgo/story?section=nation_world&id=4456363
