

Garrett

Subject: Fw: BEECHER FOLLOW-UP REVISED
From: "Garrett, Benjamin C." <Benjamin.Garrett@ic.fbi.gov>
Date: Fri, 22 Sep 2006 13:40:59 -0400
To: <msm@wjh.harvard.edu>

Matt:

I feel obligated to share this Matsumoto venom with you. I feel assured the facts will not set him free!

Ben

-----Original Message-----

From: Beecher, Douglas J.
To: Garrett, Benjamin C.
Sent: Fri Sep 22 13:00:00 2006
Subject: FW: BEECHER FOLLOW-UP REVISED

You'll find this interesting

From: Todd, Ann R.
Sent: Fri 9/22/2006 12:50 PM
To: Beecher, Douglas J.
Cc: Dizinno, Joseph A.; Wilson, David L.
Subject: FW: BEECHER FOLLOW-UP REVISED

Doug:

Just when I thought I understood the issue..... Please help me make sense of Mr. Matsumoto's latest assertions.

Thanks.....

Special Agent Ann Todd
Office of Public Affairs
FBI Laboratory
(703) 632-7014

-----Original Message-----

From: gmatsumoto@bloomberg.net [mailto:gmatsumoto@bloomberg.net]
Sent: Friday, September 22, 2006 11:34 AM
To: Todd, Ann R.
Subject: BEECHER FOLLOW-UP REVISED

Agent Todd: Gary Matsumoto here. I believe FBI scientist, Dr. Douglas Beecher, did a gross disservice to the American people by publishing information on the anthrax bioaerosol that was at best inaccurate; at worst it was intentional distortion. As a basis for his assertion that "Individuals familiar with the compositions of the powders in the letters have indicated that they were comprised simply of spores purified to different extents (6)"; Dr. Beecher cites the article I wrote for Science. As the author of that article I can tell you that his citation was inaccurate. Since the 2001 attacks, no one "familiar with the composition" of the powders has said it was

pure spores. In my Science article, I reported that Dr. Matthew Meselson of Harvard University and Dr. Ken Alibek stated they "saw" no additives in the ECMS they saw of the Daschle anthrax, but Army scientists at USAMRIID and AFIP say they did. In the four years since they made their joint statement, neither Meselson nor Alibek have offered any explanation for this contradiction. The discrepancy alone begs scrutiny. But this is especially the case as Dr. Meselson is notorious for his inaccuracy on biowarfare issues. When the U.S. Army concluded the Soviets used mycotoxin weapons against Hmong tribespeople in S.E. Asia, Meselson countered that the Army's "yellow rain" finding was really bee feces. Military scientists did chemical analyses of mycotoxin residue to make their conclusion. Dr. Meselson's bee poop theory is not only counterintuitive, he provided no scientific foundation for this counter-theory. Dr. Meselson is most notorious for being the chief western proponent of Soviet propaganda in the 1980s that the 1979 Sverdlovsk anthrax deaths were really due to the ingestion of undercooked, contaminated sausages. Now Meselson claims to have viewed ECMS of the Daschle anthrax without providing actual evidence that he has done so.

As any responsible scientist will concede that merely view ECMS is insufficient grounds to say anything authoritative about how the Senate anthra powders were engineered; though, in this case, the Army scientists who viewed the ECMS stated, contra-Meselson, that they saw silica nanopowder on the Daschle and Leahy spores. Because of this contradiction, it behooves Meselson to support his assertions, but he has yet to do so. In fact, neither Meselson or Alibek have provided any evidence that they did, indeed, see the ECMS they claim to have seen. Neither of them did lab work on the material. Neither of them published data to support their unofficial conclusions. Their comments contradict the on-the-record findings of U.S. Army scientists who analyzed the material for the FBI. They also contradict actual; 2001 FBI reports that detailed silica and polymerized glass findings in the Daschle powder. Based on these facts, the comments by Meselson and Alibek carry little authority.

What is patently absurd about Beecher's exercise is the fact that Beecher refutes the validity of my Washington Post article with my own work. Again, I wrote the Science article, but Beecher omits this fact from the body of his text; no doubt because even people of limited IQ would recognize how ridiculous this is. I suppose Beecher assumed that members of the media are too lazy or dimwitted to catch his intellectual connivances, and today's Hartford Courant article would support such an assumption. Irrespective of what Beecher thinks of my work, in reporting that the anthrax bioaerosols were just pure spores, Beecher omits all references to the numerous on-the-record statements by federal officials and military scientists, confirming the presence of silica nanopowder on the surface of the Daschle and Leahy spores. Despite his disclaimer at the end of his article, there will be many people who will assume his opinions have the express endorsement of the FBI. On those grounds alone, Dr. Beecher has misled the American public. As journalist, I object to the misrepresentation of my work; as a citizen, I object to Beecher's carefully parsed misrepresentations, which, because of the breadth of what he omits, smacks of deliberate distortion. On the assumption that Dr. Beecher knows a little bit of what he's written about, he appears to be a man with an agenda, which he has advanced with editorial dishonesty.

I can tell you that no one I have spoke to at the FBI, including Special Agent Rick Lambert and Dr. Dwight Adams, dared to say, as Dr. Beecher has now done, that the Senate spores were untreated. When I pressed both on the issue of silica additives, neither would say it. Had either one of them done so, they would have contradicted the findings made by the laboratories that actually analyzed those powders.

Furthermore, as you will no doubt recall, Michael Mason, the Assistant DIC of the FBI's Washington field office, stated, on-the-record, the FBI efforts to

reverse engineer the Senate anthrax bioaerosols at Dugway Proving Ground failed. They failed because Dugway scientists were given express instructions to make aerosols using methods that are primitive by today's standards, and to make the aerosols without silica. Not surprising, the resulting material would not even aerosolize. Dr. Beecher's irresponsible reportage is as much a discredit to the FBI, and Mr. Mason's honesty is a tribute to it. Sincerely,
Gary Matsumoto
cc. D Weierman, FBI, Washington Field Office