

# OUTPOST



April 2010—Issue #231

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR A SAFE ISRAEL

## Ostriches of the Hour

Herbert Zweibon

In the February *Outpost* we compared Dutch politician (and possibly future Prime Minister) Geert Wilders to Winston Churchill. Like the great Englishman in the 1930s, Wilders is the man of the hour, describing the need to act against dangers others refuse to see or hope to deflect through appeasement. Although it was predictable that he would be demonized by the politically correct left (who have put him on trial in his own country for defaming Islam), it came as a shock when in a single day three prominent conservatives on the Fox news channel, Glen Beck, Bill Kristol and Charles Krauthammer sharply attacked him. Beck called Wilders “a fascist,” Kristol “a demagogue” while Krauthammer dismissed him as “extreme, radical and wrong.” The Center for Security Policy’s Frank Gaffney delivered the needed rebuke to the trio: “In fact, at great personal cost and with extraordinary courage Geert Wilders has been trying to save his country from the true fascists of our time, those whose demagoguery is unmistakable and whose extremism is all too real: Shariah-adherent Muslims in the Netherlands, in Europe more generally and in the wider world—including, increasingly here in the United States.”

What explains the trio’s behavior? Krauthammer provided the key when he declared condescendingly that Wilders did not know the difference between Islam and Islamism, with the latter “an ideology of a small minority.” Daniel Pipes is the authority for this distinction without a difference. As Hugh Fitzgerald emphasizes in *Jihad Watch*, scholars of Islam, Moslems who have turned against Islam, proponents of what Krauthammer would call “Islamism” all deny there is such a distinction. Fitzgerald lists the famous scholars of Islam in whose tens of thousands of pages of learned works the word “Islamism” never appears. Ibn Warraq says he has no idea what “Islamism” may mean; Wafa Sultan says repeatedly “there is no difference between Islam and Islamism. Even Prime Minister Recep Erdogan of Turkey, busy undoing Ataturk’s secularization of Turkey, asserts “there is no difference between Islam and Islamism.” Blogger Yashiko

Sagamori says mordantly “The difference between Islam and Islamism is exactly the same as the difference between Fascism and Fascismism.”

In an exchange with Wafa Sultan, Pipes provided insight into why he clings to the invented dichotomy between Islam (good) and Islamism (bad). Sultan argued that terms like “radical Islam” conceal the true nature of Islam as a political ideology that aims to subdue the world under Shari’a. Pipes countered that if Islam is the problem, the West has no solutions. This suggests Pipes believes in a “moderate Islam” because the alternative—a single “immoderate” Islam—is too painful to contemplate. It may well be for the same reason that Krauthammer adopts the supposed division between Islam and Islamism as self-evidently true. As screenwriter Roger Simon suggests, he may be terrified that Wilders is right.

The same ostrich mentality keeps the absurd Arab-Israel “peace process” going forward. Fitzgerald expresses the hope that the spectacle of Islamic outrages against Christians throughout the world will force a recognition of the mortal danger Islam poses and “among those coming to their senses, all over the Western world, will be those in Israel who for several decades have refused—so unpleasant is it for them to contemplate—that the war being waged against them is prompted by Islam, has no end, and any concessions will whet, not sate, Arab appetites.”

As a small beginning, those like Beck, Kristol and Krauthammer who see themselves as champions of Western civilization and who are looked up to as standard bearers by a broad public, need to understand that a man like Geert Wilders should be celebrated as their champion, the defender of core Western freedoms and principles from those who pose the greatest danger to them in the twenty-first century. •

### Table of Contents

<b>From Grovel To Grace</b> by William Mehlman	...3
<b>David Petraeus: Neocon Hero</b> by Diana West	...5
<b>Israel, The Holocaust And The Survival Lesson</b> by Daniel Greenfield	...7
<b>For The Arabs: This Year In Jerusalem</b> by Ruth King...	9

From the Editor

## Christians in Moslem Lands

While sympathetic Western media report on Moslem leaders outdoing one another in outrage at a Swiss ban on minarets, the media give those same Moslem leaders a pass when it comes to genuine atrocities against their own Christian populations. Egyptian-born Magdi Khalil, director of the Middle East Freedom Forum, describes an Islamic atrocity on the Coptic Christmas eve that largely escaped Western media attention, even though, unlike the attempted Northwest airline bombing, it was “successful.”

Six Copts were murdered leaving church in southern Egypt after Christmas mass. Khalil believes the massacre was carried out with the sanction of state security forces, since the police took several hours to arrive, a frequent pattern when Copts contact Egyptian police after attacks. Khalil notes that Copts have suffered over 1500 attacks and lost millions of dollars worth of property yet have received no compensation. Coptic girls are abducted, raped and forced to convert to Islam with not a single perpetrator having been prosecuted. While Islamic extremists carry out the attacks, Khalil says the Mubarak regime uses Copts as scapegoats to deflect public anger from its own failures.

## A Hamas Hostage

Here's another example of Western double standards. British journalist Paul Martin was freed after being held captive in Gaza by Hamas for four weeks. Writes journalist Tom Gross: “What is amazing is the incredible lack of coverage of Paul Martin's case in the media (including outlets where he had worked, such as the BBC and the *Times* of London) and the lack of concern from human rights groups.”

The BBC, and other liberal media, focused a great deal of attention on Alan Johnson, another British reporter held captive in Gaza—but then he was blatantly pro-Palestinian. Gross notes that, in the case of Martin, Hamas wanted to deter journalists who might want to tell the truth about the Hamas regime. According to the Palestinian *Maan* news agency Hamas seized Martin because “he sought to distort the image of Palestinians by going to tunnels, trying to prove that Hamas smuggles weapons, that we used children as human shields during the war.”

## Mark My Words!

Mark Hasten has written a memoir of his extraordinary life (*Mark My Words!* available from Amazon and *Barnes and Noble.com*) of special interest to AFSI members because Hasten was on the Altalena, and offers a firsthand account of what happened to the ship when it came under fire in the most disgraceful action of Ben Gurion's government.

His story is also of great interest because

Hasten is representative of a large number of victims of Nazism who became remarkably successful in this country. While all but his immediate family was butchered by Ukrainian Nazis, Hasten, his parents and his brother escaped from Poland to Kazakhstan. Hasten grew up without schooling, on the fringe of a camp in the gulag where the family escaped starvation thanks to his mother's gardening skills. Hasten eventually joined a Polish brigade of the Red Army. After the war the little family was reunited in Poland, had a hair-raising escape to Czechoslovakia, and then spent years in displaced persons camps. Hasten joined the Irgun in Europe and found himself on the Altalena on his way to fight for the Jewish homeland.

The attack on the ship was a tremendous shock to the young patriot who nonetheless joined the infant Israeli army. After the war he found his Irgun background was an insuperable barrier to finding work in Labor-dominated Israel and he went to Montreal where he married an American girl, moving to the United States. Through sheer chutzpah and determination he managed, despite his lack of formal education, to be admitted to Southern Methodist University's School of Engineering. He went on to a successful career as an engineer for General Mills and then, in partnership with his brother, went into a series of businesses, winding up as a major banker and real estate entrepreneur in Indiana. He has been active in Jewish charities, Democratic politics and in Israel causes.

It's an amazing story, a tribute to the opportunities this country offers and the talents, intelligence and resolve of young Jews who overcame overwhelming obstacles to achieve the American dream.

## Funding Enemies

Before responding generously to an appeal from your local Jewish federation, you might explore how they are spending your money. In Boston, Hillel Stavis did just that for the Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston, one of the country's highest funded charitable groups with assets close to half a billion and annual revenues close to two hundred million. One of their central activities, so they claim, is support for Israel. Their method of doing so is novel  
(continued on page 11)

### Outpost

Editor: Rael Jean Isaac

Editorial Board: Herbert Zweibon, Ruth King

Outpost is distributed free to  
Members of Americans For a Safe Israel  
Annual membership: \$50.

**Americans For a Safe Israel**

1751 Second Ave. (at 91st St.)

New York, NY 10128

tel (212) 828-2424 / fax (212) 828-1717

E-mail: [afsi@rcn.com](mailto:afsi@rcn.com) web site: <http://www.afsi.org>

# From Grovel To Grace

William Mehlman

“The Simpsons,” whose animated exploration of the outer limits of familial dysfunction has been delighting TV audiences for 20 years, were scheduled to touch down at Ben-Gurion International Airport on Passover eve. Their script called for them to proceed to the Western Wall, where in the space of a commercial break, Homer, “pater” of this fey familias, is stricken with a case of “Jerusalem Syndrome,” a malady that afflicts its victims with severe messianic delusions. Homer, in this instance, appears to be convinced he is the herald of a “Second Coming” of sorts, deputized to reroute a world hell-bent for Armageddon onto a path to eternal love and peace.

With The Simpsons episode not scheduled to air until March 28th, we cannot report on how Homer’s mission fared. We can, however, take comfort from the producer’s assurance that by the time it’s over “the Christians, the Jews and the Muslims are united in that they all get mad at Homer.” That is clearly a step up from the damage exclusively wreaked on Israel by Homer’s two Jerusalem Syndrome-afflicted immediate predecessors—U.S. Vice President Joseph Biden and Brazilian President Lula da Silva.

Biden, a self-proclaimed “Zionist,” had ostensibly come to Israel to talk about America’s “strategy” for dealing with the glowering Iranian nuclear threat, when his exorcistic passions were aroused by the vision of a demonic Jewish apartment project rising in northern Jerusalem, at which point he began smashing the furniture. Picking his way through the debris, “Lula,” as he’s affectionately called, arrived on the heels of Biden’s departure, billed as “the prophet of peace and dialogue.” Within a day, the “prophet” hied himself and the missus over to Ramallah, where, adorned with a checkered Fatah “kefiyah,” he deposited a green and yellow wreath at the mausoleum of Yasser Arafat. This, after declining “Israel’s invitation to lay a wreath at the grave of Theodor Herzl, whose 150th birthday anniversary is being commemorated this year.

While Lula’s gross behavior is just a footnote to the diplomatic devastation Biden left in his wake, it illustrates the level of contempt in which the Jewish State has come to be held. The blood on the floor from this fresh attempt by the Obama Administration to eviscerate a 60-year relationship of strategic interdependence and shared democratic ideals is not yet dry, but its message is evident even to a pipsqueak like Lula: “We own you and you will bend to our presumed interests, no matter what the cost.”

Suggestions that repeated apologies to the Vice President and genuflections to Secretary of State Clinton have assuaged the wounds to their delicate

sensibilities are illusory. In the face of a spate of Congressional charges of “overkill” emanating from both sides of the aisle—but chiefly from the Republican side—Biden is pretending he wasn’t nearly as “insulted” by the Ramat Shlomo apartments kerfuffle as the media had made him out to be. Mrs. Clinton, meanwhile, was characterizing her follow-up 45-minute telephonic dressing down of Prime Minister Netanyahu as “not a big deal,” even as Israeli Ambassador to the U.S. Michael Oren was declaring U.S.-Israeli relations to be in their “worst crisis in 35 years.”

---

**Obama to Israel: We own you and you will bend to our presumed interests, no matter what the cost.**

---

What the Secretary of State and her “boiling mad” White House boss pointedly did

not rescind in the interest of damping down the flames were the four unconscionable ultimatums delivered to Netanyahu in the course of that telephone tirade. Demanded were the abandonment of the Ramat Shlomo project; the cancellation of Jewish housing construction in all Jerusalem areas acquired after June 1967; the release of hundreds of Palestinian Arabs prisoners prior to the launching of U.S. Special Envoy George Mitchell’s “proximity” peace efforts; and an Israeli agreement to address such “core” issues as the repartition of Jerusalem, the boundaries of the contemplated Palestinian state and the “right of return” to Israel of a mutually agreed upon number of Palestinian “refugees.”

While the Obama administration well knows that satisfaction of these demands would pulverize the ruling Likud coalition, that appears precisely to define the White House’s end-game. Sustenance to that thesis is provided by a recent *Atlantic Magazine* blog column by Jeffrey Goldberg, whose credentials with the Obama administration are considered impeccable. “So what’s the Goal?” Goldberg asks rhetorically. It is to “force a rupture in the governing coalition that will make it necessary for Netanyahu to take into his government [Tsipi] Livni’s Kadima party,” Goldberg replies. “He would rather, I understand, not have to deal with Netanyahu...but he’d rather have a Netanyahu who is being pressured from the left than a Netanyahu who is being pressured from the right...It’s clear to everyone at the White House and the State Department...that no progress will be made on any front with Avigdor Lieberman’s far-right party Israel Beitenu [characterized by Goldberg as a collection of “gangsters”] and Eli Yishai’s fundamentalist Shas [“medievalists”] remaining in Netanyahu’s...coalition.”

The prime minister was keeping his seven-member security cabinet in lock-jawed mode as he prepared to fly off to Washington to address the AI-PAC conference and do a sit-down with President

Obama, but the leftist Israeli media was still in full cry. Writing in *Ha'aretz*, even as he conceded that the President of the United States “does not like us,” Yoel Marcus assigned total blame for the parlous state of U.S-Israel relations to Netanyahu, whose “casual attitude to his scandalous conduct calls into question his fitness to continue serving as prime minister.”

Taking up the cudgels for the right, former Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Arens submitted that given the Obama administration’s knowledge that there was no freeze on housing construction in Jerusalem, much less the routine planning activities preceding construction, the “bad timing” identified as the catalyst for Biden’s ire and Clinton’s “pile-on” was a red herring. “There is no need for all this [Israeli] groveling...What Americans must be finding out to their chagrin,” he added, “is that this approach is making it more difficult, if not impossible for [Mahmoud] Abbas to come to the negotiating table...Now he will demand the cessation of construction in Jerusalem and possibly the freezing of all planning activity...as a condition for beginning negotiations with Israel. After all, he cannot be less ‘Palestinian’ than Obama...”

The sharpest echo of Arens’ concern was emanating from, of all unlikely places, *The Washington Post*: “American chastising of Israel invariably prompts still harsher rhetoric and elevated demands from Palestinian and other leaders. Rather than join peace talks, the Palestinians will now wait and see what unilateral steps Washington forces. A larger question concerns Mr. Obama’s quickness to bludgeon the Israeli government....The President is perceived by many Israelis as making unprecedented demands on their government, while overlooking the intransigence of the Palestinian and Arab leaders. If this episode reinforces that image, Mr. Obama will accomplish the opposite of what he intended.”

Maybe it was the impact of these and other tough supporting messages from Christians United for Israel, B’nai Brith International, and the Rabbinical Council of America, among others. Maybe it was the “climb-down” letter to Obama co-sponsored by Illinois House Republican Mark Kirk and Pennsylvania Democrat Chris Carney. Maybe it was simply the only response left to him after being thrown against the ropes, but Netanyahu suddenly rediscovered his spine. In the space of two days, he publicly proclaimed a “binding” termination in September of the 10-month construction freeze in Judea and Samaria and a vow that “building anywhere in Jerusalem will continue as it has over the past 42 years.”

Whatever reconciliatory statements emerge from the prime minister’s meeting with Obama, it would be naïve in the extreme to believe the President has tempered his desire for a sovereign Fatah enclave in Judea and Samaria and the Israeli concessions necessary to make it happen. Fresh confirmation of those objectives is provided by an insidious new element that has crept into the Obama tactical mix. Initially picked up by a reporter for *Yediot Aharonot*, it

quoted Biden as remarking to a stunned Jerusalem audience that Israel’s intransigence was undermining the security of American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Biden’s statement set off alarm bells in Israel and the U.S. In its implication that Israel’s policies might threaten American military lives lie the seeds of a dissolution of the broad-based U.S. public support that has been the Jewish State’s mainstay through White House administrations, friendly and less friendly, over the last six decades. Those alarm bells were positively clanging a day later when the chief of the U.S. Central Command General David Petraeus told the Senate Armed Services Committee that “the enduring challenges between Israel and some of its neighbors present distinct challenges to our ability to advance our interests....Arab anger over the Palestinian question limits the strength and depth of U.S. partnerships with governments and peoples in the AOR [CENTCOM’s Middle East Area of Responsibility] and weakens the legitimacy of moderate regimes in the Arab world...”

Unless one is ready to credit Petraeus with concocting this thinly-veiled plea to dump Israel all by his lonesome, it may be taken as an illustration of the lengths to which this White House is ready to go to compel the Jewish State to its will. Not in all the 62 years of its existence has any U.S. administration dared to employ America’s deep-felt concern for its troops as a lever to turn public opinion against Israel.

Benjamin Netanyahu will have to find a way to deal with all this and the advancing Iranian nuclear threat in the weeks and months ahead. Only a fool would envy him. Two recent events, neither of which have anything to do with statecraft per se, may offer a glimmer of hope. One couldn’t help noticing the intensity of pride on the prime minister’s face two weeks ago as he helicoptered to Kiryat Shmona to witness the award of first prize in Israel’s renowned National Bible Quiz for Youth to his 15 year-old son Avner. In accepting it as No. 1 among 12,000 entrants, the boy remarked that he had learned his Bible from the best Bible teacher anyone could have—his grandfather, the noted historian Benzion Netanyahu.

Days later, the father of the Bible Quiz whiz stood before a packed house at the Begin Heritage Center in Jerusalem to pay tribute to the same man on his 100th birthday. It was a moving speech, projecting what one observer described as the “kind of admiration, love and respect that not many sons feel for their fathers.” Another confessed that “this was one of the few times I believed every word he said.”

The courage of the son who spoke so eloquently that night and of the father who viewed Israel’s potential for greatness through the prism of his own son’s triumph will be unsparingly quantified in the days to come. In its measure may reside our fate as a people and a nation.

*William Mehlman represents AFSI in Israel.*

# David Petraeus: Neoconservative Hero?

Diana West

Vice President Joe Biden was embarrassed by an Israeli announcement that the Netanyahu government was building 1,600 new homes in East Jerusalem. He should have gone and cut a ribbon on the project.

Instead Biden, according to the Israeli daily *Yedioth Ahronoth*, engaged in a private, and angry, exchange with the Israeli Prime Minister. "This is starting to get dangerous for us," Biden reportedly told Netanyahu. "What you're doing here undermines the security of our troops who are fighting in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan." *Yedioth Ahronoth* went on: "The vice president told his Israeli hosts that since many people in the Muslim world perceived a connection between Israel's actions and US policy, any decision about construction that undermines Palestinian rights in East Jerusalem could have an impact on the personal safety of American troops fighting against Islamic terrorism." The message couldn't be plainer: Israel's intransigence could cost American lives.

Where did this bizarre notion come from—that a plan to construct housing units several years from now for religious Jews in a Jewish neighborhood in Israel's capital city endangered American lives? The answer seems to lie with General David Petraeus.

Last June I noted General Petraeus' *MoveOn.org*-like take on Guantanamo Bay, his desire to close it because it causes us problems and violates (unspecified) Geneva conventions and his willingness to find "justifications" for the existence of Hezbollah.

Petraeus' testimony to the Senate Foreign Services Committee on March 16 bears out a distinctly Arabist outlook—the CENTCOM chief seems to view Israel as a root cause of American problems in the Islamic world. Setting up "a number of cross-cutting issues that serve as major drivers of instability, interstate tensions, and conflict," or "as obstacles to security," he began with Israel. He said in his prepared statement: "Insufficient progress toward a comprehensive Middle East peace. The enduring hostilities between Israel and some of its neighbors present distinct challenges to our ability to advance our interests in the AOR [Area of Responsibility]."

Does Petraeus mean by "enduring hostilities" the fact that the Islamic world wants to eradicate Israel?

Petraeus' statement continued: "Israeli-Palestinian tensions often flare into violence and large-scale armed confrontations."

Isn't it amazing that the Israelis don't just let the neighbors' rockets just keep falling?

"The conflict foments anti-American sentiment, due to a perception of U.S. favoritism for Israel."

Funny, last time I looked the U.S. was allied with Israel.

"Arab anger over the Palestinian question limits the strength and depth of U.S. partnerships with governments and peoples in the AOR and weakens the legitimacy of moderate regimes in the Arab world."

As in: Darn it, Uncle Sam, that country is still there! Can't you do something about that? The *umma* is restive.

Thought outside the box: Maybe those "partners" just aren't on our side.

"Meanwhile, al-Qaeda and other militant groups exploit that anger to mobilize support."

Anger, anger—has Petraeus never, ever heard of jihad—and specifically, the jihad against Israel, a once *dhimmi* nation subjugated by Muslim invaders that has since been restored to sovereignty?

"The conflict also gives Iran influence in the Arab world through its clients, Lebanese Hezbollah and Hamas."

Goodbye, Israel, goodbye problems with Iran? Hmm. Maybe that's why the past two administrations have seemed so unconcerned about Iranian nukes.

Petraeus' testimony comes two months to the day after a team of senior military officers from CENTCOM arrived at the Pentagon to brief Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Adm. Michael Mullen on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Here is how a blog posted on *Foreign Policy* described it. "The team had been dispatched by CENTCOM commander Gen. David Petraeus to underline his growing worries at the lack of progress in resolving the issue...The briefers reported that there was a growing perception among Arab leaders that the U.S. was incapable of standing up to Israel, that CENTCOM's mostly Arab constituency was losing faith in American promises, that Israeli intransigence on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was jeopardizing U.S. standing in the region, and that Mitchell himself was (as a senior Pentagon officer later bluntly described it) 'too old, too slow ... and too late.'"

The *Foreign Policy* posting noted that no previous CENTCOM commander had expressed himself on what is essentially a political issue. But Petraeus wasn't finished: two days after the Mullen briefing, Petraeus sent a paper to the White House requesting that the West Bank and Gaza (which, with Israel, is a part

---

**Where did this bizarre notion come from—that a plan to construct housing units in Israel's capital city endangered American lives? The answer seems to lie with General David Petraeus.**

---

of the European Command -- or EUCOM), be made a part of his area of operations.

The *Foreign Policy* piece now includes an update: "A senior military officer denied Sunday that Petraeus sent a paper to the White House...CENTCOM did have a team brief the CJCS on concerns revolving around the Palestinian issue, and CENTCOM did propose a UCP change, but to CJCS, not to the WH," the officer said via email. "Gen. Petraeus was not certain what might have been conveyed to the WH (if anything) from that brief to CJCS." (UCP means "unified combatant command," CJCS refers to Mullen; and WH is the White House.)

So, Petraeus did propose to put Israel under his purview, but to Mullen, not to the White House.

There are important and powerful lobbies in America. But no lobby is as important, or as powerful, as the U.S. military. While commentators and pundits might reflect that Joe Biden's trip to Israel has forever shifted America's relationship with its erstwhile ally in the region, the real break came in January, when David Petraeus sent that briefing team to the Pentagon with a stark warning: America's relationship with Israel is important, but not as important as the lives of America's soldiers.

On the one hand are the general's words—in the *Foreign Policy* blog and most recently in his own written statement to the Senate Armed Services Committee. On the other hand are his supporters, who don't believe his words, either as reported in *Foreign Policy* or even as presented to the Senate.

Writing at *Contentions* Max Boot is leading the Petraeus-is-pro-Israel defense (or at least that it is "a lie" that he is "anti-Israel"). The *Foreign Policy* report was "incorrect." All that happened, according to Boot, citing an unnamed insider, is that there was a "staff-officer briefing—on the situation in the West Bank, because that situation is a concern that CENTCOM hears in the Arab world all the time. Nothing more than that." In one sentence, the essence of the original story! If CENTCOM is briefing the Joint Chiefs on "the situation in the West Bank" due to concerns CENTCOM hears in the Arab world "all the time," it makes sense that CENTCOM is going to convey those concerns—as, indeed, *Foreign Policy* reported. Did Petraeus want those Arab concerns known to the Joint Chiefs because he believes they are bunk or because he takes them as, um, Gospel?

Petraeus' Senate testimony with its talk of "Arab anger" over "the Palestinian question" limiting U.S. effectiveness simply underscores the essence of the *Foreign Policy* report. Boot argues with the testimony as well. Writes Boot: "Actually, that's not what Petraeus said. Rather, it's pulled from the 56 page Central Command "Posture Statement" filed by his staff with the Senate Armed Services Committee."

Well, it's from a 56 page written statement, but it's called "Statement of General David H. Petraeus, U.S. Army Commander U.S. Central Command Before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the Posture of U.S. Central Command 16 March 2010."

Filed by his staff?

Boot goes on to cite Petraeus' spoken testimony, pointing out that the general did not read aloud the paragraph concerning Israel-Palestinian hostilities from his prepared statement. You can read the whole testimony but here is the money quote: "Again, clearly, the tensions, the issues and so forth have an enormous effect. They set the strategic context within which we operate in the Central Command area of responsibility..."

This is the axis on which the Arab narrative turns: that Israeli-Palestinian tensions are the main problem in the world; that all grievances flow from it; that what happens there drives what happens everywhere—or, as Petraeus says, "they set the context within which we operate in the Central Command area of responsibility." But Boot doesn't see this. His analysis: "So there you have it. General Petraeus obviously doesn't see the Israeli-Arab 'peace process' as a top issue for his command, because he didn't even raise it in his opening statement. When he was pressed on it, he made a fairly anodyne statement about the need to encourage negotiations to help moderate Arab regimes. That's it."

That's it?

If truly incorrect, it is up to Petraeus to refute the Arabist, anti-Israel attitudes now far and widely attributed to him by media taking his words, written and spoken, at face value. Personally, I'm not holding my breath. The fact is, assuaging "Arab anger" is, when you think of it, is the very heart of "hearts and minds" current counterinsurgency doctrine (COIN)—and Petraeus wrote the book.

He also wrote a Ph.D. thesis at Princeton in 1987 called "The American military and the Lessons of Vietnam: A Study of Military Influence and the Use of Force in the Post-Vietnam Era." One of his two faculty advisors, it is interesting to note was Stephen Walt—of Walt and Mearsheimer infamy (hat tip to Andrew Bostom). In his acknowledgements, Petraeus writes: "Professor Stephen Walt also deserves my gratitude. As my second faculty adviser—replacing Professor Barry Posen during the writing of my dissertation—Professor Walt offered numerous sound suggestions and comments. Like Professor Ullman, he displayed tremendous competence not only as an academic, but as a teacher as well."

Petraeus is delivering the 2010 Irving Kristol Lecture at the American Enterprise Association this spring. Maybe he'll take the opportunity to explain what he learned.

*Diana West is a nationally syndicated columnist.*



Petraeus

# Israel, the Holocaust and the Survival Lesson

Daniel Greenfield

Holocaust Memorial Day, part of that dubious practice in which we assign one day to important events and people—Mothers, Grandmothers, Presidents, Veterans, World War II—and forget them the rest of the time, has come and gone. But the Holocaust itself was long ago co-opted to promote a humanist philosophy of universal tolerance, and in doing so it was universalized and turned into nothing more than another reason we all need to learn to get along.

Some have expressed wonderment that European countries and cities where Muslim persecution and violence is intimidating and driving out Jews at a rate unseen since the 1930's are still going through the farce of holding official ceremonies, nodding at how awful the whole thing was and beaming confidently that it can never happen again. But the humanist hijacking of the Holocaust is only another of the weapons used to promote tolerance toward Muslims, and intolerance toward Jews.

The universalization of the Holocaust was also the dejudaization of the Holocaust, turning the dwindling number of survivors into props in the great international classroom of tolerance, even as rocks are being thrown at their heads by the Muslim beneficiaries of that school of tolerance. All the while the humanist hijackers of the Holocaust who vociferously insist on using the murder of six million Jews as an illustration in their multicultural curriculum, angrily denounce any Jews who actually try to connect the hate toward Jews then and the hate toward Jews now. The same humanists who cynically exploit the Holocaust in their distorted version of history can always be counted on to jump up and denounce Jews for—exploiting the Holocaust.

But the Holocaust does indeed have a very important lesson to teach both Jews and non-Jews. Not the lesson of universal tolerance, but the lesson of the need for individuals and communities to be able to defend themselves.

There are essentially two responses to the Holocaust. The first is the humanist one, which treated the murder of six million as a "teachable moment" in which the world could be led to a great moral awakening that would insure that nothing like it could ever happen again. Ridiculous numbers of Jews and non-Jews in the West accepted it as a given, just as they had accepted it as a given in the 1930's that no such event could ever take place in a civilized country. That faith in human moral evolution was a product of the

Enlightenment and for all its pretenses at a higher morality, was based on the arrogant notion that people were becoming progressively more moral, as they became more educated. That correlation was the product of a misplaced faith in culture as morality. The Nazis conclusively demonstrated that technological and cultural sophistication is not indivisible from morality, that one can be a cultured monster after all.

There has been no great moral awakening since 1948. Anti-Semitism became slightly less fashionable for a while, but is making a strong comeback. The world has seen genocides happen and done nothing while they happened. The vast array of humanitarian organizations created after World War II have on balance done as much harm as good. The UN has shown that not only is it as useless as the League of Nations in serving

as either a means of active intervention, or even as a voice of conscience, but that it can actually be turned into a puppet of the killers themselves with very little effort. The multicultural societies of the West have not stopped bigotry; in many cases they have actually fostered it. The great humanist experiment is dead, though its stench is impossible to escape.

Nevertheless Jews in the West have become painfully invested in the humanist answer, because it is so optimistic about human nature and so very comforting. To believe that people coming together will end all evil in a flash of universal understanding is the pseudo-religious impulse inherent in so many political movements. The idea that the Holocaust was a mistake that the world overlooked, but that can be transformed into a positive impulse with enough readings of *The Diary of Anne Frank* is childishly naive and yet painfully human. But more is asked of adults when confronting human evil than of 13 year old girls. Anne Frank was not murdered by people who killed because they had not read Anne Frank's diary as children. She was killed by people, who in many cases would have been entirely capable of reading her diary, empathizing with it and yet killing her anyway. The inability to understand this is why so many Jews continue to cling to the humanistic promise of a better world, little realizing that the world is simply the environment in which human nature expresses itself. The environment can be improved, but human nature will remain the same.

And so we come to the second response to the Holocaust, the practical one. This response does not concern itself with all the asinine humanist philosophizing. Instead it strips down the Holocaust to the

---

**The vast array of humanitarian organizations created after World War II have on balance done as much harm as good.**

---

bare bones as an event in which large numbers of Jews were killed by, or for the most part with the cooperation of, the authorities, and its solution is to remove the Jews from the jurisdiction of those authorities into their own national jurisdiction.

To the humanists, the reason for the Holocaust was intolerance. To the practical minded, the reason for the Holocaust was that Jews were vulnerable and therefore targets. Both were talking about the same thing, but their emphasis was very different. The humanists' prescription for Jews smacked of Stockholm Syndrome; the practical position on the other hand was a matter of simple self-defense.

The State of Israel was not born out of the Holocaust, but out of a national longing for the land that was 2000 years old. But the Holocaust helped define the need for that land, even to those who could not feel that longing. It provided a practical answer to the practical problem of Jewish survival, and that was something the humanists could never forgive it for.

The conflict between the humanist and the practical solution to the Holocaust underlies much of the distaste and even outright hatred of the left for Israel. The creation of the State of Israel in the aftermath of the Holocaust has always seemed to the Humanists like a deliberate rejection of their philosophy, a retreat into nationalism, which to them was the very cause of the Holocaust. While it was the USSR that innovated the meme that the Jews were the new Nazis, their lefty fellow travelers quickly picked up the idea because it was a logical outgrowth of their philosophy that you were either part of the collective solidarity of mankind or one of the killers. Part of the solution or part of the problem. In their minds the creation of Israel was millions of Jews opting out of being the solution and becoming the problem instead.

And now for the left, Israel is the great problem of the world. Because it demonstrated a lack of confidence in the humanist solution of teaching universal tolerance and fostering a great moral awakening in mankind. As Einstein breezily told one of the post-war commissions, Israel was unnecessary because something like the Holocaust could never happen again. And that particular brand of humanist arrogance can only deal with the rising hatred toward Jews by insisting that their multicultural project is working perfectly... but it is the Jews themselves who are at fault.

Yet today critics point out that Jews are endangered in Israel, which they argue proves that the practical solution is no solution as well. And that's true. But it ignores the actual practical solution, which is not to merely build a country, but to build an independent

country. And while Israel was relatively independent for the first few decades, it has become steadily more dependent: politically, economically, psychologically and culturally dependent. And that dependence is what is now crushing the life out of the nation.

The Jews of Europe in the 1930's depended on the authorities to protect them. That made them dependent. Being dependent only made them more vulnerable. This fed the same vicious cycle that had destroyed Jewish community after community in Europe. Because the Jews could only be safe by depending on written or oral promises from the ruler that their rights would be respected if they settled in City X or Town Y. And then when there was a budget squeeze, taxes and fines would be imposed on them, and eventually there were riots and property seizures. The survivors would try to hang on or flee, and either way the cycle would begin again. The Jewish communities were dependent on the rulers, and that in turn

made them targets, which only made them more dependent on the goodwill of the rulers.

The extent to which you depend on the protection of the authorities limits your ability to dictate the terms of that protection. In the contemporary American example, you can have smaller government and armed town watches or a ban on guns and a cop on every block with the right to enter your home if he pleases. The more you depend on the authorities for protection, the less say you have in how you get protected, and the more those who protect you rule over you.

Israel started out controlling its own security, but through its growing alliance with the United States, has increasingly lost control of its own security. In 1981 when Saddam Hussein began developing nuclear technology, Israel did not ask the United States for permission before launching a covert mission to bomb his Osirak reactor. In 1992, Israel was not even allowed to bomb the Scud missile sites pounding its cities. Instead the country was forced to rely on imported U.S. troops with Patriot missiles to provide its security for it. Today, less than 30 years later, it is assumed that Israel needs American permission before launching an attack on Iran's reactors.

In the 1950's, Israel responded to terrorist attacks from Gaza by covertly sending troops across the border into Egypt and wiping out the villages that were the source of the attacks. Today when Israel shoots a single terrorist, U.S. and European governments immediately summon the Israeli ambassador to demand an explanation and issue official statements condemning the killing. In 1967, facing an Egyptian invasion,

---

**Israel has become steadily more dependent: politically, economically, psychologically and culturally dependent. And that dependence is what is now crushing the life out of the nation.**

---



Israel took the element of surprise and struck first. In six days, the forces of Egypt and Jordan were routed, and Jerusalem, Gaza, Judea, Sinai and Samaria were liberated. In 1973, facing another invasion, the Israeli government bowed to pressure from Kissinger and waited for the attack to come. The resulting war nearly destroyed Israel.

Israel has become dependent. The alliance with the U.S., one that was logical and mutually useful, when the U.S. needed to move into the Middle East to counterbalance Soviet influence, has turned dysfunctional as its leaders have begun to act like proconsuls, demanding an endless feast of concessions from Israel to appease Islamic terrorists. Meanwhile Israeli governments have come to accept an inferior role, while taking at face value the promises that the US will guarantee its security.

In the 1930's, the Czechs believed that the Western powers would guarantee their security. So did the Poles. Both nations spent over 50 years as conquered nations and protectorates of other powers. The

Jews of Europe expected that the authorities would protect their rights, even in the event of an invasion. What followed was the Holocaust.

The only meaningful lesson of the Holocaust is that if you expect others to protect your life or your rights, you are giving them the power to take away your rights or your life, when and as they please. Israel has foolishly put itself into the familiar position of the Jews of Europe, looking to the authorities for protection and trying to win their favor, complaining about the abuse, but only sliding further into dependency. If Israel does not break that cycle, it will be destroyed. To survive, Israel must realize that its people and its soldiers are the only human beings who can protect the state, and that only those who dictate the terms of their own protection are truly free.

---

**The only meaningful lesson of the Holocaust is that if you expect others to protect your life or your rights, you are giving them the power to take away your rights or your life, when and as they please.**

---

*Greenfield blogs as Sultan Knish. This appeared on his blog of Feb 3, 2010.*

---

## For The Arabs It's This Year In Jerusalem

Ruth King

Who said this on May 6th, 1998? "Well, I think that it will be in the long-term interest of the Middle East for Palestine to be a state....[in] the territory that the Palestinians currently inhabit, and whatever 'additional territory' they will obtain through the peace negotiations."

It was then First Lady Hillary Clinton. What exactly did she mean by "additional territory" beyond that which the Palarabs inhabit?

Was it Jerusalem? Current events would make it seem so.

When, on September 24, 1996, Prime Minister Netanyahu opened an entrance to an archaeological tunnel in Jerusalem leading to the lower tier of the giant rocks of the walls of the Temple's Holy of Holies, the event set off a tsunami of violence orchestrated by Yasser Arafat who arranged for bus loads of Arabs to come to the capital and join the local mob in throwing Molotov cocktails and rocks. The PA police, whose ostensible job was to quell the riots, joined in and fired on Israeli soldiers. The media and the Clinton State Department blamed Israel. Even supporters of Israel criticized Israel for "provocation" and bad "timing,"

What was Israel's response to the attack on its

sovereignty in its capital city? Bowing to Clinton's demands for "confidence raising measures" Israel acceded to the Hebron Accord of January 14th 1997, wherein Israel agreed to transfer control of Hebron to the Palarabs with a tiny enclave to remain under Israeli control. To cement the deal that abdicated control of the first royal capital of Jews in the Land of Israel, Netanyahu shook hands with Arafat.

The surrender of Hebron left Dennis Ross crowing that this was only the beginning of a process that would lead to final status negotiations. And was he ever right.

The Clinton administration shuttled one emissary after another with one ultimatum after another, until Netanyahu succumbed to the considerable charms of Madeleine Albright. (Arafat resisted them so that she actually ran after him, locking the doors to prevent his staged angry departure after a tantrum.) Israel signed the Wye River Memorandum with President

Clinton as the official witness on October 23, 1998. This not only implemented the Hebron Accord but—barely noticed at the time—stipulated "final status" negotiations for Jerusalem. On November 17, 1998, Israel's Knesset approved the Wye River Memorandum by a vote of 75-19, in spite of the fact that it opened up an Arab claim to Jerusalem.

Forgive me for saying we told you so, but we did tell you so. In *Outpost* we wrote that the surrender of Hebron was a temporary waystation on the road to



The archaeological tunnel.

the surrender of Jerusalem.

In September 2000, Ariel Sharon visited the Temple Mount with full acquiescence of the local Arab administrators. Again, this "provocation" resulted in an outbreak of violence called by Arab Knesset member Abdel Malik Dehamshe "a new, massive intifada." Again, the media and the U.S. power elite uttered shrill demands for "an end to violence on both sides" and renewal of the peace process, as the term "occupied East Jerusalem" gained currency.

Israel's response? The Or Commission to investigate. By the time that the commission printed its findings in 2003, they had concluded that "thousands of demonstrators paralyzed the country, destroying Jewish property and attacking Jewish citizens on Israel's main roads. In a number of instances Jewish citizens were just inches from death at the hands of an unrestrained mob." The report also highlighted the use of rocks and gunfire against Israelis and the reluctance of the PA police to thwart the rampage. But by then the damage had been done, and Israel's enemies were on a roll.

And now there is a new crisis in Jerusalem with unprecedented harsh language from the Obama administration. Even the ADL is "shocked, shocked" by the threatening tone.

Israel announced plans to build housing units in a well-established Jewish neighborhood in the northern section of its capital. Rioting Palarabs, whose earlier "protests" centered on Israel's legitimate right to restore and protect national and religious shrines, after so many of them had been destroyed and desecrated by Arab thugs, saw a pretext for redirecting their rage toward Jerusalem. The code-word for the legal housing project is "settlement"—that word is enough to incite Arabs and their protagonists in the West.

Vice President Biden was in Israel at the time and that's when all hell broke loose. Instead of telling the American Vice President that Israel retains the right to build anywhere in its capital, the Israeli Prime Minister apologized for the timing and, typically, some of Israel's erstwhile supporters intoned that it was "unhelpful."

Israel's response? An apology to Biden for, you guessed it, the poor timing of the announcement. The American response immediately after the "apology" has been unprecedented in tone and content. An unnamed official in the State Department spoke of "house-building on Arab land" and for emphasis warned: "The Israelis know the only way to stay on the positive side of the ledger—internationally and with us—is to not have them recurring."

Hillary Clinton stated that she considers the

announcement an "insult" to the United States which "threatens the relationship." In a telephone call to Netanyahu she warned him that he must act to repair the relationship and show his commitment to an alliance which, she reminded him, was key to Israel's security in a hostile region.

The Quartet of "peace mediators"—the United States, the European Union, the United Nations and Russia—also condemned the "settlement" plan and scheduled an emergency meeting in Moscow.

P.J. Crowley of the State Department, who had cravenly apologized to Muammar Qaddafi after Libya "cleared up" the meaning of jihad, went on to slam Israel with the following ominous words: "This action had undermined trust and confidence in the peace process and in America's interests." Got that? Sixteen hundred apartments in Israel's capital now undermine "America's interests."

Equally worrisome, in *The New York Times* of March 14, Thomas Friedman quotes Biden as saying "What you are doing here undermines the security of our troops who are fighting in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan." To impute that American troops' security is undermined by anything Israel does is downright vicious. Our armed forces are confronting enemies who share the same hateful ideology that drives Fatah/Hamas/Abbas, whose minions cheered 9/11 and the suicide squads of Al-Qaeda and the Taliban.

Israel's response? This is the breaking news as I sit at the keyboard. "AP - Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told German and Italian leaders Saturday that Israel does not plan to speed up the controversial construction of settlements, a government source said." And there you have it. Instead of reasserting Israel's sovereignty over its capital, the elected guardian of Jerusalem caved again.

When this reaches our readers, Jews everywhere in the world will celebrate Passover. As they reach the end of their recitation of the prayers and the retelling of the Exodus they will say "Next Year in Jerusalem." Even the wretched Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto who rose up against the Nazis on Passover 1943 uttered those words.

But the Moslem/Arab world is saying "this year in Jerusalem." That is the bitter herb on our Passover plates.



Joe Biden



P.J. Crowley

**Join AFSI's Chizuk Trip To Israel May 9-17.** Visit Jewish communities in Samaria and Judea and new communities in the Negev. Call AFSI (212) 828-2424 or email [afsi@rcn.com](mailto:afsi@rcn.com) to make your reservation

(Continued from page 2)

to say the least since they fund a host of groups whose attitude to Israel ranges from hostile to viciously hostile.

For the latest reporting period, here are some such recipients: the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), Democracy Now!, the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee, The Tides Foundation; Media Matters; The New Israel Fund; Brit Tzedek v'Shalom, Amnesty International; Physicians for Social Responsibility; the Workmen's Circle. The AFSC has such a long tradition of anti-Israel propaganda that in 1979 AFSI published a pamphlet on its activities entitled "The Friendly Perversion: Good People and Dirty Work." Now, Stavis notes, it is busy "reaching out" to the Iranian mullahs. The Unitarian Universalist Association church in Cambridge hosts an Israel Apartheid Week event. Democracy Now!, writes Stavis, "is the media vehicle for Amy Goodman, a longtime Israel-hater, who never saw a Palestinian act of 'resistance' she couldn't relate to." As for Media Matters, Stavis notes that through George Soros' affiliated non-profits like *MoveOn.Org* and the Center for American Progress, it has plenty of money to spend bashing Israel. For a run down on the lot of them go to Stavis's blog *JstreetJive.com*.

Stavis has focused on Boston, The more important question, as he notes, is "How many other major Jewish philanthropies are engaged in funding anti-Israel non-profits?"

## Syria Jeers At Hillary

While Hillary spent three quarters of an hour on the phone dressing down Netanyahu for daring to build apartments in Ramat Shlomo, a solidly Jewish neighborhood in northern Jerusalem, our Secretary of State uttered not a peep when Assad, despite all her wooing to wean him from Iran, joined with Ahmadinejad at a news conference in Damascus to make fun of her efforts. Said Assad: "We must have understood Clinton wrong because of bad translation or our limited understanding, so we signed the agreement to cancel the [need for] visas [between the two countries]. I find it strange that they [Americans] talk about Middle East stability and peace and the other beautiful principles and call for two countries to move away from each other." Ahmadinejad joined in: "Clinton said we should maintain a distance. I say there is no distance between Iran and Syria. We have the same goals, same interests and same enemies."

## The Gitmo Lawyers

There has been a flood of self-serving op-eds and statements from lawyers, left and right, declaring criticism of lawyers in the Obama Justice Department who represented Gitmo detainees is unjustified—we are told they are in the proud tradition of John Adams who defended British soldiers prosecuted for the Boston Massacre.

But the United States was not at war with Eng-

land at the time of the Boston massacre and the British soldiers were lawful police. Former prosecutor Andrew McCarthy explains why the demand to be told the names of seven Justice Department political appointees who while in private practice voluntarily represented detainees at Guantanamo Bay is perfectly legitimate. Writes McCarthy: "Advocating for the enemy is a modern anomaly, not a proud tradition. Defense lawyers representing accused criminals perform a constitutionally required function. Not so the Department of Justice's Gitmo volunteers. They represented *al Qaeda* operatives because they wanted to, not because they had to. The suggestion that they serve a vital constitutional function is self-adulating myth. Their motive was to move the law in a particular direction."

Indeed it transpires that Attorney General Eric Holder himself filed an amicus brief on behalf of shoe bomber Jose Padilla—a fact he failed to disclose at the time of his confirmation hearing. Says McCarthy: "It is easy to see why he may have preferred to forget it. The brief advocated a return to the pre-9/11 approach of regarding *al Qaeda* as a cabal of criminals to be prosecuted, not enemies to be vanquished militarily. Unsurprisingly, this is exactly the policy he has since implemented as attorney general, in conjunction with the Department of Justice's other former detainee lawyers."

## The New Middle East

Ahmadinejad has described the New Middle East as Moslems see it, which does not quite correspond to the vision of Simple Shimon, who coined the term. "The New Middle East," Ahmadinejad told reporters, "will be a Middle East without Zionists and without imperialists. With Allah's help, this will happen."

## Europe's In-Israel Lobby

Much is made of the supposed nefarious activities of the "Israel Lobby," most recently on England's Channel 4 which aired an absurd documentary claiming the Lobby "owned" the Conservative Party.

The real, and genuinely sinister lobby is in Israel, an EU funded lobby on behalf of Arabs, seeking to shape Israeli policies according to EU ideas. In *The Jerusalem Post* (Feb. 23), Seth Frantzman reports that starting in 2002 the EU began lavishly funding NGOs in Israel, with virtually all the money going to Arab outfits. The largest single beneficiary was that favorite of the New Israel Fund, the Association for Civil Rights in Israel, which provides the most for the anti-Israel buck, with its stream of lawsuits on behalf of "Palestinian rights" (including those of Arab terrorists). In the rare cases where the recipients are Jews, the anti-Israel intent is the same. Frantzman notes around \$73,000 was directed to former IDF soldiers to get them to "break the silence" and provide testimony that might help European courts put soldiers or their officers on trial for war crimes.

With all these EU funds streaming into Israel for the Arab population, writes Frantzman, "not one

---

cent was directed specifically towards any of the numerous and diverse Jewish communities in Israel: Ethiopians, Russians, Yemenites, Persians or Jews from the Caucasus.

## Best Word on Dubai

By now millions of words must have been spilled on the assassination of Hamas terrorist Mahmoud al-Mabhouh in Dubai. The most sensible were those of journalist Claudia Rosett. Dubai's security forces, she observed, had given an impressive display of their surveillance abilities. Which points to a big question: if Dubai surveillance is this adept, where's the rest of the Dubai video collection? "For starters, where's the full surveillance footage of al-Mabhouh himself?...Who exactly did he meet in Dubai? What for? Did he do any banking in Dubai? How often had he visited before? In recent years have Dubai authorities perchance stored away enough video of al-Mabhouh and his terrorist comrades for a full length feature film?"

Dubai, Rosett notes, is Iran's top trading partner, described in a Brookings Institution paper as playing "a critical role as Iran's offshore bankers and exporter." More than half the 9/11 hijackers passed through Dubai en route to attack the U.S. Half the funds they spent preparing the attacks was wired to them via Dubai banks. After Saddam's overthrow documentation showed Saddam had used Dubai as a hub for sanctions-busting front companies. If within 24 hours Dubai authorities could piece together the trail of the killers of one top terrorist, could they not give the public "a much better window on the deadly nature of

the business pursued in airports, malls and hotel rooms by such killers as the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, or by Iran's pet terrorist organizations, Hezbollah and al-Mabhouh's outfit—Hamas?"

You can bet the rest of Dubai's video collection will remain under wraps.

## Cheers for Venus Williams

Venus Williams won over Israel's Shahar Peer in the semifinals of the Dubai Championships. But the real (media-neglected) story was why Peer was there to play at all. It was because Williams refused to compete if the United Arab Emirates did not admit the Israeli athlete.

## Who Wrote the Cairo Speech?

Obama's address to the Muslim world delivered at Cairo University June 4, 2009 was aptly described by Anne Bayefsky as "a distortion of history, an insult to the Jewish people and an abandonment of very real human-rights victims in the Arab and Muslim worlds." And now we know who wrote it.

It was Stephen Cohen, founder of the Institute for Middle East Peace and Development, Harvard Ph.D, visiting professor at Hebrew University, Princeton and other high powered institutions. So reports Hillel Stavis who was present when Cohen took credit in a speech at Harvard's Center for Middle East Studies. Apparently Rahm Emanuel called Cohen a week before Obama headed to Cairo and asked him to prepare a first draft for the speech, "A New Beginning."

•