

I received this in an email from a regular contributor to our monthly comedy ragazine The Tallahassee Fun, Food & Entertainment, powered by YouCanWin.Com. I forwarded it to 5 other regular contributors and one sent back a reply that might make you think a little.

GATORADE IS NOT THE PROBLEM by Bob Lonsberry © 2006

Toiletries don't commit acts of terrorism. Muslims do.

So why can't I take my toothpaste on the plane? How is it that Gatorade is forbidden?

Why can't I have a bottle of water? Because we aren't really fighting a war with terror, we are losing a struggle with political correctness. It is not so much the evil of outsiders, it is the cowardice of Americans.

The cowardice that won't let us call a spade a spade, that makes us all live in an alternate reality, puts survival secondary to servility. We are fighting World War III with one arm tied behind our back. Last week was a good example.

A group of two or three dozen fascist Muslims in England and Pakistan plotted to blow up 10 or 12 passenger-laden airliners in transatlantic flight. The purpose was to surpass the attacks of September 11. The means was the detonation of explosive liquids disguised as common liquids like Gatorade or shampoo. The plot was discovered, followed and hopefully foiled by British intelligence with an assist from Americans and Pakistanis. Immediately, new restrictions were put on airline passengers.

Because the plotters planned to use liquids, passengers were forbidden to bring liquids onto airplanes.

Not medicines, not creams, not drinks, not nothing. Untold hundreds of thousands of airline passengers immediately and indefinitely lost the right to carry liquids or pastes on themselves or in their carry-on luggage. Which is stupid. Because Gatorade's not the problem. Muslims are the problem.

Can we be honest enough to just admit that for a minute? The plotters uncovered in England were all Muslims. They all had Muslim names. They all but one or two were of Pakistani descent. They were motivated by religious bigotry. They wanted to kill because they were Muslim and

they wanted to kill the people they wanted to kill because they weren't Muslim.

Yet political correctness forbids us from mentioning that, much less acting upon it.

In fact, on the ABC network news over the weekend, the plotters were called "British Extremists"

* as if somehow the fact they were in Great Britain was defining of their extremism. The fact is they were Muslim extremists, but the American media is so in bed with the diversity-training crowd that fact can't be mentioned.

Also on American newscasts over the weekend, the story was told of three men buying thousands of disposable and untraceable cell phones, an activity with possible terrorist linkages. Not surprisingly, very few accounts noted that the men were Muslims with Muslim names.

Political correctness has sanitized this fight to such an extent that we are not allowed to even identify the enemy.

Which is not toothpaste. It is Islam. An Islam practiced by tens of millions of people around the world and which repeatedly and consistently puts armies and cells of terrorists in action around the world. No doubt there are peace-loving Muslims, it's just that they have an amazing capacity for keeping a low profile or demanding that people respect their religion.

Our desire not to offend Muslims and their culture stands great potential to cost American lives. Countless American lives. Here's what I mean:

Let's lay aside political correctness for a moment and use scientific analysis. Let's use reason and logic for just a minute.

For example: How many terrorist acts have been committed involving liquids carried onto airplanes by passengers?

Answer: Zero.

Second question: How many terrorist acts involving airliners have been committed by Muslims?

Answer: All of them.

Third question: Why are we focused on liquids instead of Muslims?

Answer: Beats me.

Why is it that the protection of our airline industry is focused on products, not people? Why is it that we go to such extreme lengths to screen materials, but purposely avoid screening the people who carry them?

Wouldn't we be safer if we focused our security efforts largely on Muslim passengers?

Especially young, male Muslim passengers? Isn't the fact that every single act of airliner terrorism involved a young, male Muslim relevant?

Does it make sense to take away a mother's bottle of Children's Tylenol and a grandmother's bottle of Coke while at the same time purposely not profiling likely terrorists?

Can't we be honest enough to admit that profiling potential terrorists by religion, national origin, gender and age is a good idea? Aren't we bright enough to understand that asking a few extra questions of a young Muslim airline passenger is not the same as pulling over a black man just because he's driving in a "white" neighborhood?

A group of people was arrested last week for plotting a terrorist attack. They were young Muslim men. Just like the group before that and the group before that and the group before that. And the group before that.

So, naturally, you can't take Chapstick on an airplane.

Toiletries don't commit acts of terrorism. Muslims do.

Maybe if the government spent less time looking at your carry-on bag and more time looking at young male Muslim passengers we'd all be a lot safer and a lot less inconvenienced. This isn't about Gatorade, this is about jihad. It's time to stop

focusing on products and start focusing on people.

People who happen to be Muslim.

- by Bob Lonsberry ?© 2006

I hope everyone who isn't opposed to getting rid of this "political correctness" crap will forward this to as many patriotic Americans as they know. It doesn't seem to be a democracy when the minorities rule, direct, constrain or have more rights than the majority



Dear Chris:

1) There is no simple answer to your question. This is a legitimate question that deserves a convoluted answer which would include a comprehensive historical and political analysis that is beyond the scope of this brief message. However, as an American, what you should do (a humble suggestion), is to take advantage of the November elections and try to get rid of the incumbent Republicans. As a matter of fact, there is a brand new and appropriate reason for doing just this (*besides a parade of other reasons*): **NEW REASON:** The new venture of the power house in Washington is to protect sexual predators against the interest of minors (*Example: The case of "Fat Ass Hastert" and his other Republicans brothers protecting "Mr. Asshole Foley"*). This is something we should consider as Americans at the time of the upcoming elections. The problem of "Indians and their fight against oppression over the years" is not "an immediate necessity" in comparison to other pressing issues we now face as a nation. Eventually, we will have to confront this paradox if we really want to portrait ourselves as decent people to the eyes of the future learners of history. As you know very well, the issue concerning the **Indians fighting terrorism since 1492** is a more complicated matter that requires the interconnection of multiple interrelated historical facts that are also linked to the the dynamics of our contemporary system of government. I just included this picture of the Indians to put the writings of **Bob Lonsberry** in a larger contextual spectrum (*perspective*).

2) In relation to **the issue of Muslims**, as you well know, there is a remarkable difference between radical asshole Muslims and regular or average law-abiding Muslims. This is similar to the case of the difference between radical asshole Christians (*who use terrorism against women's clinics and kill abortion doctors*) and regular law-abiding Christians. So, only a stupid person like **Bob Lonsberry** cannot see this obvious discrepancy.

3) In respect to the **airline security topic**, this idiot (**Bob Lonsberry**) does not have the required intellect to realize that the central architects of the contemporary airline security measures are the same incompetent agents of the current US government. That is, the same people who work at the Homeland Security agency who also responded to Katrina. This without mentioning the people at the very top of this agency (*the real players*) who ignored the multiple warnings about Osama Bin Laden's intentions to attack the US just months before 911 (*the concert pianist Condoleezza Rice is one of them*). So, if he is pissed about the crazy measures of prohibiting the transport of nail polish and hair gel by airline passengers, he should also be pissed about our current state apparatus responsible for the nonsensical and existing security approaches to guard the nation, the disaster of the war in Iraq, the Weapons of Mass Delusion, the Katrina response, the manipulations of public fears by Karl Rowe, the systematic and documented denial by the Bush administration as it pertains to the disaster of the current war that has claimed more American victims (*US. soldiers*) than 911, the documented incompetence of Rumsfeld, the bashing of gays just before elections, Ann Coulter's victimization of the widows of 911, the campaign of collective deception sponsored by FOX NEWS, the recent attempt by Bush to alter article 3 of the Geneva Convention, the unlawful spying upon Americans citizens, and Katherine Harris' breathing the same air as other Floridians. This is without mentioning a carrousel of other dramatic depictions of dysfunctions and corruption reflected by the White House and those who are close to it at this chronological junction.

4) If **Bob Lonsberry** had an IQ above 15 (*I don't believe this is the case*); it would not be difficult for him to understand that focusing exclusively upon Muslims in general as the central target to combat terrorism is just the equivalent of mowing the yard with an electric shaver (*a very stupid thing to do*). Although the radical Muslims segment of the world population is a real threat to our national security, to exclusively focus on this side of the equation (*based upon an irresponsible generalization*) is simply more dangerous than the radical Muslims themselves. This is simply so because of the following premises: to combat a devious enemy, such as the radical Muslims, it requires an intelligent strategy developed by people who are indeed possessing an IQ above 15. Take care,