

Re: NASA TRIES, FAILS TO WITHHOLD PLANETARY DEFENSE REPORT

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2007-05/msg00199.html>

- *From:* Fred J. McCall <fmccall@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 17 May 2007 13:54:30 GMT
-

Ian Parker <ianparker2@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

:On 16 May, 20:06, simberg.interglo...@xxxxxxxxxx (Rand Simberg) wrote:
:> On 16 May 2007 10:43:17 -0700, in a place far, far away, Ian Parker
:> <ianpark...@xxxxxxxxxx> made the phosphor on my monitor glow in such a
:> way as to indicate that:

:>
:> >On 16 May, 13:45, Mike <yard22...@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote:
:> >> fromwww.fas.org

:>
:> >> NASA TRIES, FAILS TO WITHHOLD PLANETARY DEFENSE REPORT
:> >> The National Aeronautics and Space Administration earlier this year
:> >> attempted to block public access to a comprehensive report on
:> >> planetary
:> >> defense against asteroids, but the document found its way into the
:> >> public domain anyway.

:>
:> >Why the secrecy? This only serves to confirm my view that NASA is a
:> >giant bureaucracy where people are intent on saving their arses.

:>
:> We see you slunk away and hoped we'd forget, but we're still waiting
:> to see scans of Leahy and Daschle's death certificates, Ian.

:
:Right here are the references. I have to make a confession here. As
:you can probably judge I gave the account on recollections. The
:reports in fact say that they contracted Anthrax but recovered.

:
Still wrong. Neither Leahy nor Daschle even came in contact with
anthrax.

:
:<http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/cbw/anthrax.pdf>
:This reference is rather glutinous. It consists of an almost diary
:account about what happened.

:
Perhaps you should try actually reading it? It contradicts both your

Re: NASA TRIES, FAILS TO WITHHOLD PLANETARY DEFENSE REPORT

original claim and your current one.

:

:Its main shortcoming is that it does not
:cover the most recent events. Original investigations, which I
:recollected said that the Anthrax had come from a US military program.

:

Not in the way that you mean it. Not even original reports said that.

:

:The latest reports say that the Anthrax was pure but did not have any
:penetration aids, such as silica, in it.

:

False as a general statement. Some of it was and some of it was not.

:

:BTW there is a biological weapons program.

:

False in the way that you mean it.

:

:Also looking through you can see that the
:investigation was carried out in a very amateurish way.

:

In what way?

:

:The report
:towards the end mentions tensions between the FBI, CIA and the
:military.

:

For some definition of 'tensions'.

:

:<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/24/AR2006092401014.html>
:This makes it clear that no additives (silica) were present. Why this
:was thought to be the

:

???

:

: [Loon spew elided]

:

:

Re: NASA TRIES, FAILS TO WITHHOLD PLANETARY DEFENSE REPORT

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

:This is a more or less encyclopaedic compendium with loads and loads
:of other references. It seems to believe.

:1) That Al Qaeda had nothing to do with it.

:2) That it was brewed up in a commercial or academic lab in the New
:Jersey area.

:

Note that this is one guy who has no special knowledge about anthrax,
the investigation, or anything else germane.

:

:If this was right someone must know who did it. People in a modern lab
:simply don't work unsupervised on their own to that extent. It could
:have been a foreign power like the Russians. Why they should want to I
:really don't know.

:

:What gives rise to suspicion is fundamentally the amateur nature of
:the investigation.

:

You mean the one you elect to cite.

:

:

: [Remaining loon spew elided]

:

Keep working, Ian. Perhaps some day you'll get SOMETHING about this
episode right...

—

"Ignorance is preferable to error, and he is less remote from the
truth who believes nothing than he who believes what is wrong."

— Thomas Jefferson

.