
Subject: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [appshot](#) on Fri, 11 Aug 2006 22:19:04 GMT

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

The terror plot didn't work! Cheers everyone.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 11 Aug 2006 22:25:04 GMT

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

Oh, but according to (the idiots at) shoutwire, it was just Blair scaring his opposition into silence with a FAKE TERROR ALERT! How dare he and Bush do this to the innocent people?!?!?!?!?!?

On an actual serious note, this just shows the effectiveness on increased security. Too bad that security isn't tight enough to where terror threats just make you laugh instead of throw government into a frenzy to tighten down all loose ends.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [PlastoJoe](#) on Fri, 11 Aug 2006 23:29:35 GMT

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

I do have to give the terrorists credit for ingenuity. That plot was certainly one I never would've thought of, or thought to check for. Fortunately, though, they weren't smart enough not to get caught.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 12 Aug 2006 00:08:59 GMT

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

SpyGuy246 wrote on Fri, 11 August 2006 19:29 I do have to give the terrorists credit for ingenuity. That plot was certainly one I never would've thought of, or thought to check for. Fortunately, though, they weren't smart enough not to get caught.

When I was flying back in July, I made sure to finish up my drinks before I got through the security checkpoint because I didn't want any suspicion that I would be attempting to blow up the plane with liquid explosions.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sat, 12 Aug 2006 05:36:08 GMT

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

Uh-oh! This is good news for Bush and Blair and bad news for the terrorists! We better not report

it too much or people might start supporting the war effort!!!

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sat, 12 Aug 2006 15:34:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

...in Iraq?

EDIT: This might also deserve to be read:
<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2006/8/12/173810/788>

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [Kanezor](#) on Sun, 13 Aug 2006 16:59:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:...nearly a quarter of a billion dollars of funding went unused, and even then the administration was still making cuts.I don't understand; if the money was not being unused, then what is the problem in cutting the funding?

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [Herr](#) on Sun, 13 Aug 2006 20:48:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 11 August 2006 16:25Oh, but according to (the idiots at) shoutwire, it was just Blair scaring his opposition into silence with a FAKE TERROR ALERT!

Would not suprise me

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sun, 13 Aug 2006 22:23:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

HerrKealf wrote on Sun, 13 August 2006 16:48j_ball430 wrote on Fri, 11 August 2006 16:25Oh, but according to (the idiots at) shoutwire, it was just Blair scaring his opposition into silence with a FAKE TERROR ALERT!

Would not suprise me

...TEH ALENZ R HIPOTIZING BLAIR AN BUSH AN R TRIKING TEH PUBLIK CUZ DEY DUN WAN U 2 NO ITZ TEH ALENZ PLOT.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 13 Aug 2006 23:55:11 GMT

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

Kanezor wrote on Sun, 13 August 2006 12:59Quote:...nearly a quarter of a billion dollars of funding went unused, and even then the administration was still making cuts.I don't understand; if the money was not being unused, then what is the problem in cutting the funding?

The Homeland Security Department had lots of funding allotted by Congress, but it was too poorly run to actually use it, and so the Bush administration tried to divert funding from one of the more important aspects of airport security even though they had plenty of money laying around. The funding wasn't going unused because it wasn't needed.

And now the Bush administration is talking about how stong they are on protecting airplanes from terrorism. So instead of installing cheap, highly effective liquid/gel explosives detectors that were already funded, the Bush administration though a better course of action was to revise transport rules so that no one can bring any sort of liquid onto a plane.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 14 Aug 2006 01:18:42 GMT

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

Quote:So instead of installing cheap, highly effective liquid/gel explosives detectors that were already funded, the Bush administration though a better course of action was to revise transport rules so that no one can bring any sort of liquid onto a plane.

Sounds good to me.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 01:44:40 GMT

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

Quote:SuperFlyingLiberalSo instead of installing cheap, highly effective liquid/gel explosives detectors that were already funded, the Bush administration though a better course of action was to revise transport rules so that no one can bring any sort of liquid onto a plane.

No such thing dumbshit.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 07:02:13 GMT

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

yea, cause the report that I read stated that these types of detectors were "box" detectors, meaning you could put shit in them, push a button, and 3 minutes later it would give you a report.

So, we're going to install a half a million dollar machine in every airport in America, and then have every airline passenger place their carry-on luggage in it and wait three minutes for the result...

Sounds like a good "simple" solution to me. But what do I know, I'm not a brainwashed liberal tool.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [warranto](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 12:19:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now then how many airports are there in America?

14,893 (2005) According to the CIA. But for convenience, we'll use the number of airports with paved runways (5,120)

$5,120 * \$500,000.00$ (assuming there will be only 1 per airport)= \$2,560,000,000

Now, 3 minutes per report per passenger on a flight where 100 people will be boarding=

300 minutes. = 5 hours.

Of course, more could be ordered to reduce the wait time, but the cost is already at around \$2.5 Billion.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 14:20:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Tue, 15 August 2006 08:19 Now then how many airports are there in America?

14,893 (2005) According to the CIA. But for convenience, we'll use the number of airports with paved runways (5,120)

$5,120 * \$500,000.00$ (assuming there will be only 1 per airport)= \$2,560,000,000

Now, 3 minutes per report per passenger on a flight where 100 people will be boarding=

300 minutes. = 5 hours.

Of course, more could be ordered to reduce the wait time, but the cost is already at around \$2.5 Billion.

Now, I know Detroit Metro has 2 or 3 security checks for every concourse (A, B, and C), so Detroit

would have to have, at least, 3 of those. Then if each security check had to share them, that'd take an extreme amount of time.

Now, how about Washington National airport? That has 4+ checks for each concourse. I have yet to be at LAX or any larger airports, so I can't tell you what they would have. So everybody with a drink must arrive 7+ hours early if they plan on getting on their plane... OR we could just not allow drinks on the plane. Hmm... tough decision, and that's not even considering the price of the equipment.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 15 Aug 2006 15:55:04 GMT

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

msgtpain wrote on Tue, 15 August 2006 03:02yea, cause the report that I read stated that these types of detectors were "box" detectors, meaning you could put shit in them, push a button, and 3 minutes later it would give you a report.

So, we're going to install a half a million dollar machine in every airport in America, and then have every airline passenger place their carry-on luggage in it and wait three minutes for the result...

We may well not be talking about the same machine.

The Article You Probably Should Have ReadA 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.

That's not quite half a million dollars. And since we're not talking about the same machine, it's also reasonable to suspect your estimate of 3 minutes per bag is not quite right, either. But I would like to see this report you substituted for the one I posted, which I must say is an inventive maneuver.

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.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 00:21:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Oh, this is priceless. SFE edited the quote, so it wouldn't blatantly show how much of an idiot he is. I wondered why he didn't cite his source this time.

http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-08-11-explosive-s-detection_x.htm
http://hosted.ap.org/dynamic/stories/T/TERROR_EXPLOSIVES_DETECTION?SITE=AP&SECTION=HOME&TEMPLATE=DEFAULT&CTIME=2006-08-11-22-50-13
http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20060811/ap_on_go_ot/terror_explosives_detection
<http://www.wired.com/wireservice/story.php?nosubnav=true§ion=Politics&storyId=1558330>

I just cited the same article on 4 different news sites all including the "- already in most American airports -" text that seemingly disappeared in SFE's post.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [DarkDemin](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 00:28:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

j_ball430 wrote on Tue, 15 August 2006 20:21 Oh, this is priceless. SFE edited the quote, so it wouldn't blatantly show how much of an idiot he is. I wondered why he didn't cite his source this time.

http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-08-11-explosive-s-detection_x.htm
http://hosted.ap.org/dynamic/stories/T/TERROR_EXPLOSIVES_DETECTION?SITE=AP&SECTION=HOME&TEMPLATE=DEFAULT&CTIME=2006-08-11-22-50-13
http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20060811/ap_on_go_ot/terror_explosives_detection
<http://www.wired.com/wireservice/story.php?nosubnav=true§ion=Politics&storyId=1558330>

I just cited the same article on 4 different news sites all including the "- already in most American airports -" text that seemingly disappeared in SFE's post.

Owned?

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 00:39:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

msgtpain wrote on Tue, 15 August 2006 19:53 That's a lot better than spending billions in an attempt to do the same thing and not "inconvenience" the American traveler.

Actually, think about it. It takes more time to test the stupid bottles. That'd be more of an inconvenience than having to shell out \$2 past the checkpoint.. at least, I would think so.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 15:35:26 GMT

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

msgtpain wrote on Tue, 15 August 2006 19:53

<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>

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?

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.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 15:42:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

msgtpain wrote on Tue, 15 August 2006 19:53 If you know anything, and I mean anything about US government 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.

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 16 Aug 2006 16:52:10 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Heh, slightly off topic, but that aspect of spending is fun.

I don't know how many weekend survival exercises, gliding and "fam flying" trips we did just prior to the fiscal year end in an effort to use up the remaining DND budget allocated to Cadets.

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?

msgtpain 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.

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 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?

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

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [nullvar](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 00:18:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SuperFlyingEngi wrote on Sun, 13 August 2006 18:55
And now the Bush administration is talking about how stong they are on protecting airplanes from terrorism. So instead of installing cheap, highly effective liquid/gel explosives detectors that were already funded, the Bush administration though a better course of action was to revise transport rules so that no one can bring any sort of liquid onto a plane.

Actually, instead of installing explosives detectors (which by the way, we already have, but I'm guessing you don't get out much), we're blowing those fuckers up in Afganistan, Lebanon and Iraq.

PROBLEM SOLVED

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" 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?

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

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 20:36:47 GMT

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

Quote: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.

More like

Quote:And on a final note, following this posting, I'll be covering in fear from msgtpain's superior logic, so don't expect many more posts out of me for a while until I find another website to copy/paste my beliefs from.

Could also be construed as

Quote: YES HE'S GOING AWAY PLEASE ENJOY YOURSELF SO MUCH THAT YOU WON'T WANT TO RETURN

Subject: Re: Terror Plot Thwarted
Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 17 Aug 2006 20:57:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

I'd like to see the financial records that prove he isn't.

Quote:

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:

Compelling for what? That underestimating how bad the fighting was going to be is evidence that funds are being diverted?
