

# Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.space.policy/2008-03/msg00551.html>

---

- *From:* American <[samuelfransom@xxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:samuelfransom@xxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 29 Mar 2008 12:44:02 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Mar 29, 9:18 am, Willie.Moo...@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:  
: I don't fault the USA for keeping some things private at  
: this time. The world is a dangerous place, and some things  
: need to be kept private. However, over-reliance on

That would be nice. However, nothing "visible" to public eyes will ever be able to operate in complete secrecy, and IMO, if considered in another nations best interests, will immediately render anything of interest that is "locatable", the ongoing subject of intense scrutiny.

: secrecy can cause its own troubles. Disinformation isn't  
: the huge problem some make it out to be. It is merely a  
: factor in controlling important information. No amount of  
: disinformation can stem the tide of a sea change in con-

Eventually, the applied science of physical systems will prevail in uncovering enough small truths about something to make the larger picture come in to focus for all to see. Yet one impression I'm getting is that perhaps, the most "advanced" of us is only "rediscovering" some very small microcosm of a much larger plan, happening right here on earth, in front of the whole universe.

: ditions. In the 1950s whites in America had huge errors  
: in their judgments about blacks. The consensual reality

"Retroactively", yes, but "realistically", it was probably meant to be that at some point in time, a greater sense of self-respect came with the awareness of their own achievements, i.e., astronomer Benjamin Banneker, who developed the first striking clock in America, agricultural chemist George Washington Carver developed applications for the peanut, Daniel Hale Williams performed the first successful open heart surgery (1856 - 1931), Percy L. Julian, who developed cortizone (1899-1975), Dr. Charles Richard Drew (1904-1950) set up the first blood bank, and Emmett Chappelle (1925-) for a method that instantly detects

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

bacteria in water. Along with these scientists there are a host of inventors worth mentioning: Thomas L. Jennings (1791–1859), dry cleaning process, Norbert Rillieux (1806–1894), evaporation technique for sugar, Benjamin Bradley (1830–?), steam engine for a warship, Elijah McCoy (1844–1929), lubricator for steam engines, Lewis Howard Latimer (1848–1929), electric lamp and carbon filament for light bulbs, Granville T. Woods (1856–1910) telegraph for train communications, Madame C.J. Walker (1867–1919), hair care system, Garrett Augustus Morgan (1877–1963), automatic traffic signals, Frederick McKinley Jones (1892–1961), refrigeration system for trucks, David Crosthwait, Jr. (1898–1976), HVAC patents, Patricia Bath (1942–), Laser probe for cataracts, and Mark Dean (1957–), the ISA bus for intercomponent computer communications. There should be absolutely no doubt that Martin Luther King was in the right place at the right time.

: in America was diametrically opposed to the reality of race.

IMO, any contribution or invention that helps ALL of humanity deserves recognition. Unfortunately, we cannot say this about those who are good at giving "hate" speeches. It is mostly ignorant reactionaries who get stirred up by these kinds of things.

: Much evil was done in the name of race. Yet despite the

As soon as you mention the word "evil", the "invisible" becomes "visible", "located", and "marked" for observation, and this is what bad media is all about – but it would seem that more people these days are interested by another's "dirty games" than they are true scientific ingenuity. Let's face it to THEM, ingenuity is BORING.

: beliefs of the majority, Martin Luther King prevailed.

When the people rallied behind their leader, it didn't matter anymore who in Washington "thought" that ONLY THEY were in charge. The loudest outcry was the loudest voice in America at that time.

: The errors and falsehoods accepted as fact about race in America in the 1950s, could not withstand the reality.

It is quite true that the curse over forever banning the black person from the so-called "society" of the white man was broken, in at least the environment surrounding their social sector, e.g. city of Atlanta and elsewhere.

: Reality one out. No matter how hard fought the case for

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

: the lies. I cannot imagine any disinformation campaign  
: being as effective in spreading lies about anything as  
: the lies about race in the 1950s. Yet, those lies could

Race relations gained a foothold in the national media so—much—so that the entire nation could have become embroiled in racial controversy. As the reporting on these cases grew, I'm sure there were the situational ethics of what events would have demanded more attention, simply because there was potential that certain events could have become more "forceful" as time went on.

: not withstand the reality of the value and contributions  
: of all races. So, I'm not overly concerned about disin-  
: formation, as long as we have some freedom to think and  
: act as free men and women.

"Disinformation" today, IMO, mostly concerns the bad reception that new or revolutionary ideas receive from mainstream media. There was a time that one might appear as a "snake oil salesman" to the townspeople unless the product showed some benefit to their livelihoods – today many ideas are too fantastic to be ignored, but some posse comitatus will be out to prevent it from being too "widespread". This retrogrades the effort and intelligence of the inventor, and, in the long run, turns him back into a "snake oil salesman".

: I am mostly concerned about the false sense of security  
: secrets give those who create them. While great nations

IMO, that is probably because the "secret" has either been "stolen" for some other purpose than its true intent, as Einstein once recalled about his involvement with the nuclear bomb: "I made one great mistake in my life... when I signed the letter to President Roosevelt recommending that atom bombs be made; but there was some justification – the danger that the Germans would make them."

In this case a war HAD TO precede the use of atomic energy for peaceful means. Would that be the same for a device that creates free energy if the free energy could be used to create an explosive device of cosmic proportion?  
(The answer IMO, HAS TO BE, in terms of the survival of the human species, an unequivocal NO)

: do have great secrets to keep, too much reliance on secrecy  
: limits the effort you can apply to important secrets, while  
: protecting all the lesser secrets. Further, what was im-

Is it just a man's design after all? (Then it will fail).

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

## Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

The "earth man" cannot be trusted with the future of his own species, and that is not to say that some other, more advanced species is at "our own steering wheel" trying to lead us away from our own self-destruction.

: portant to keep private in one era, may be best shouted  
: from the rooftops in another. Who makes this decision?

The better spirit, the brightest mind, and the richest "king" are the most capable. It's the follow-up of responsibility that's the problem here.

: How is it to be made? This all requires deep strategic  
: analysis, that is capable of making massive changes in policy.

No doubt that we're drawing territorial lines in the sand here, and I wonder how some differently assorted "parts of the whole secret" get distributed according to how the "resources" get accessed.

: This likely doesn't get done in military circles, and the  
: analysis cannot be done by temporary holders of offices like  
: elected officials – who are given partial mission specific  
: information in the context of a crisis. At root secrets are

The more people have access to the descriptions of the many paths that a secret project can take during its start-up, the more chances can occur for some "foul-up" can occur, whether it's artificially induced by a third party (so that the idea can be "confiscated" and patented somewhere else, with a slightly different application), or that the resources are suddenly made "too expensive to afford" for the project to be a success on its own. In either case here, there are market forces at work that may be trying to suppress the implementation of anything that attempts to "replace" an existing technology.

: the anathema of a free society, and once the classification  
: bandwagon gets started, its awfully hard to stop until the  
: whole thing comes crashing down. This is the common mode  
: failure where the defenders of liberty destroy liberty in  
: their zeal using the wrong instruments to achieve their goal  
: – and looking at the defenders themselves is the least  
: likely failure mode to be seriously examined by  
: those defenders.

Interesting how an idea might revolutionize the needs of a community, or even region of communities, but when the growth of a new idea reaches its "saturation" point, is when the "versatility" of the product has become minimized. IMO, part of the profits made on a new idea should go back

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

into the R&D, for either further refining, or exploring a newer market niche that can "blow away" the competition. I would imagine that there are probably some trade secrets between industries that help to keep the whole group involved in a monopoly. Such tactics, I suspect, is probably the case with most of our energy industries today.

: Unlike some here I do not believe humanity is threatened by  
: the United States and its policies. Rather, the United  
: States threatens its own ability to lead by not taking the  
: needs of the emerging global community seriously, and  
: seriously develop approaches to leadership appropriate  
: for the day and age it finds itself.

IMO, the "emerging global community" SHOULD HAVE THE ABILITY to take care of most of its own needs, just as soon as they are able to learn how to build an infrastructure for themselves, and not always under the jurisdiction of some international presence. This is what must happen in Iraq, albeit the presence of terrorists are hindering Iraq's own chances for a fair and equitable governing body from taking the reins from the radical Islamo-fascists, who want total control under another would-be despotic leader.

: Much of our policies were created in the post world war  
: two era yielding cold war strategies that had their desired  
: effects. These policies appropriate 60 years ago, are

Yet just now we're witnessing McCain, who this past March 27, indicated that he wants Russia "thrown out" of the G-8 for being "too belligerent". (Sounds like fightin' words, huh?) – Yet maybe this is what the transnationalists would like – another "cold war" at the expense of its taxpaying citizens. (Uh-huh, been there, done that already, now what?) Well, we can leave it up to McCain to help in finding all the future prospects open for keeping our Pentagon, et al. gainfully employed, right?

: inappropriate today, and the policies themselves are crea-  
: ting the major challenges facing our nation today. This is  
: my only beef with them. They don't work and they no longer  
: serve the nation. So, they should be scrapped and new  
: policies instituted more appropriate to our knowledge and  
: situation today.

At whose expense? Why should they lose all those taxpayer dollars if threats need to be jinned up in order to keep their enterprises afloat? Besides, they're great learning experiences that the rest of the economy just can't produce massively enough and effectively enough for the whole country to "rush into" wholeheartedly, and I'm at a loss

## Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

to figure out how it might be done otherwise. Most people are in it for the training, the experience, and the G.I. Bill, don't you think? I think the key word here is "incentive". There's simply not enough "incentive" to do anything that's not related to "helping others" than by "protecting them", and this pathology becomes validated generally by a few thousand casualties every now and then, making the conflict very "real" in the sense that something very drastic has to be accomplished, in order to protect the 350 million or so "back home".

However, Americans gave credence to this war when the decision was made to go into Iraq in order to "find" the terrorists who were responsible for the entire source of "terrorist activity" OVER THE WHOLE GLOBE than for just the west. Let's face it, Al Queda's target is democracy in general, and where that democracy is the strongest is in America. Therefore, Al Queda is at war with America.

Maybe all this is being done in order to focus the entire world's consciousness on Israel. Maybe that is the key where the "end game" begins to unfold. (One would hope not). If this is true, then this is actually a war between the forces of light and the forces of darkness. (We already know who the victor is there).

: I've given this a little thought and I believe it is time  
: for the USA to scrap its war footing and like Switzerland  
: 500 years ago, unilaterally end warfare and intelligence  
: operations as a means of executing national policy and  
: interest. Military and intelligence should be used only

But this would mean that Switzerland got to the desired peace before the rest of the world did, mainly because not everybody got a chance to jet-ski over to their automatic teller machine, with the same enthusiasm the the Alpiners had, because of (1) lack of snow, (2) lack of mountain ranges to ski in, or (3) lack of yodelers, that the whole world wished they could have also, and would now have to "wait in line" for a ticket to the "Swiss world" of whatever heaven on earth for them, at least, seems to portray.

One could hope all they want, and even if these facts are not true, they are probably metaphors of something that is happening very locally; almost to the point of giving real credence to their folk tales of antiquity: "Tales of a Swiss Grandmother", "The Singing Fir Tree", or even "The Gingerbread Boy".

I'm sorry, but I liked Dorothy in "The Wizard of Oz"

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

the best here, but that's not even one of the choices.

: defense of the homeland. The USA should also normalize  
: banking and trade policies that artificially favor it,  
: and begin to re-develop its manufacturing, mining, and  
: farming sectors. The USA should also stabilize its cur-

By "artificially" aren't you tooling with "most favored nation" status, so that we get to eat all the food that might not be grown here as a "possible" condition for normalization? If that's the case, I'd prefer naturally "canned" over "organically" grown here in the U.S., simply because organic's more "faddish" these days than it is "useful".

: rency and set about to becoming the world's defacto cur-  
: rency and banking system. The USA should declassify all  
: its classified material over the next 20 years, with a  
: special emphasis on licensing missile and nuclear tech-  
: nologies to qualified US companies to achieve dominance  
: in the energy and space development sectors. Space based

Sounds too good to be true, but by all means, we're supposedly trying that already, at the expense of some very hard-to-corner, trouble-making tyrants, and at the same time bleeding the taxpayer dry, trying to deal with things like the U.N., unilateral foreign policy, and foreign aid. All of the missile and nuclear technologies here are like pawns on a giant 3-D chessboard that if removed, open up a world of possibility for the Russian, Chinese thinktanks.

: assets should be developed giving the USA sound leadership  
: in telecommunications, remote sensing, ballistic transport,  
: energy, and raw-materials from off-world.

For that to happen we would need to eliminate the competition worldwide, and with Mexico holding the assets of the largest telecommunications venture in history (est. \$60 Billion, a.k.a. Carlos Slim), we've probably need to deal with how to internationalize these industries a bit more by mass producing them instead of bleeding our customers to death. Remote sensing needs the follow-up of remote drilling, sifting, spectrographically analysing, storing and/or rejecting at the expense of our getting there and back in a BIG way. Could it not be done in the national interest for the prospect of "spinning off" some of these technologies as "private market enterprises"? This would help to establish and secure an off-world presence for laying the ground work of future missions to the asteroids.

A processing plant on Europa for both H2O production and

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

Re: sci space policy targeted by disinformation experts?

transparent aerogel would be well suited for processing the materials required for the construction of a Re-Nitrogenating Facility for regolith excavated from a "dryer" surface of Europa, possibly if a European "biosphere" was in the best interests of those who wished to "stay" outside of the earth's orbit. The possibilities are endless, but so are word salads.

American

.