

turns and
News-Post" (Aug. 2).

First, I am glad that Steven Hatfill has been exonerated.

Second, that we likely will be able to maintain an element of doubt regarding the allegations against Bruce Ivins is a blessing to his neighbors — which includes us all, and may we continue to behave as such.

Third, in print, he was a fearless defender of sensibilities shared by many; it is not for us to read between the lines.

May he rest in peace.

DEB WASSERBACH
Frederick

Revisiting the anthrax nightmare

Like a fire bell in the night, the Bruce Ivins case invokes the chilling memories of the 2001 anthrax attacks in New York and Washington shortly after 9/11. We might be mollified with the comforting thought that after seven years the government is now prepared to deal with this type of bioterrorism threat. We might think that but we'd be wrong.

If somebody started mailing anthrax around the country in 2008 and President Bush summoned his senior staff into the Oval Office to map out a response, he would find, just as he did in 2001, that there is no new vaccine or new medication to deal with the crisis.

After the anthrax crisis in 2001 the government launched with great fanfare Project Bioshield to

develop new vaccines and treatment for diseases that could be employed as bioweapons. The one given the highest priority was anthrax. In 2004 the Department of Homeland Security awarded a single-vendor, VaxGen, which had never produced an FDA-approved drug, this critical assignment. In 2007 the contract was canceled for failing to yield results. This is just another example of how the government has failed us in its highly touted "War on Terrorism."

I cannot speak for others, but I do not take much comfort in the fact that it took the FBI seven long years to locate the alleged terrorist. That is, if Ivins was, indeed, the culprit and, if he was, that he acted alone.

JERRY McKNIGHT
Frederick

The pictures? They're real

In response to the letter "Photos raise sensitivity issue" (Aug. 1), I understand the writer's concern for her children's sensibilities — I have children, too.

But what astounds me about that writer and the others who have been published is that not one was concerned that these photos are real. Not one voiced any concern for those children who suffered what the photos depicted.

They are quick to uphold the right to free speech — but not the