

**News and Current Events :: regarding the "Ground zero mosque"-"How Fox Betrayed Petraeus"****regarding the "Ground zero mosque"-"How Fox Betrayed Petraeus", on: 2010/8/22 14:46**

(there's some truth telling here)

August 21, 2010

How Fox Betrayed Petraeus By FRANK RICH

THE "ground zero mosque," as you may well know by now, is not at ground zero. It's not a mosque but an Islamic cultural center containing a prayer room. It's not going to determine President Obama's political future or the elections of 2010 or 2012. Still, the battle that has broken out over this project in Lower Manhattan— on the "hallowed ground" of a shuttered Burlington Coat Factory store one block from the New York Dolls Gentlemen's Club— will prove eventful all the same. And the consequences will be far more profound than any midterm election results or any of the grand debates now raging 24/7 over the parameters of tolerance, religious freedom, and the real estate gospel of location, location, location.

Here's what's been lost in all the screaming. The prime movers in the campaign against the "ground zero mosque" just happen to be among the last cheerleaders for America's nine-year war in Afghanistan. The wrecking ball they're wielding is not merely pounding Park 51, as the project is known, but is demolishing America's already frail support for that war, which is dedicated to nation-building in a nation whose most conspicuous asset besides opium is actual mosques.

So virulent is the Islamophobic hysteria of the neocon and Fox News right— abetted by the useful idiocy of the Anti-Defamation League, Harry Reid and other cowed Democrats— that it has also rendered Gen. David Petraeus's last-ditch counterinsurgency strategy for fighting the war inoperative. How do you win Muslim hearts and minds in Kandahar when you are calling Muslims every filthy name in the book in New York?

You'd think that American hawks invested in the Afghanistan "surge" would not act against their own professed interests. But they couldn't stop themselves from placing cynical domestic politics over country. The ginned-up rage over the "ground zero mosque" was not motivated by a serious desire to protect America from the real threat of terrorists lurking at home and abroad— a threat this furor has in all likelihood exacerbated— but by the potential short-term rewards of winning votes by pandering to fear during an election season.

We owe thanks to Justin Elliott of Salon for the single most revealing account of this controversy's evolution. He reports that there was zero reaction to the "ground zero mosque" from the front-line right or anyone else except marginal bloggers when The Times first reported on the Park 51 plans in a lengthy front-page article on Dec. 9, 2009. The sole exception came some two weeks later at Fox News, where Laura Ingraham, filling in on "The O'Reilly Factor," interviewed Daisy Khan, the wife of the project's organizer, Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf. Ingraham gave the plans her blessing. "I can't find many people who really have a problem with it," she said. "I like what you're trying to do."

As well Ingraham might. Rauf is no terrorist. He has been repeatedly sent on speaking tours by the Bush and Obama State Departments alike to promote tolerance in Arab and Muslim nations. As Jeffrey Goldberg of The Atlantic reported last week, Rauf gave a moving eulogy at a memorial service for Daniel Pearl, the Wall Street Journal reporter murdered by Islamist terrorists in Pakistan, at the Manhattan synagogue B'nai Jeshurun. Pearl's father was in attendance. The Park 51 board is chock-full of Christians and Jews. Perhaps the most threatening thing about this fledgling multi-use community center, an unabashed imitator of the venerable (and Jewish) 92nd Street Y uptown, is its potential to spawn yet another coveted, impossible-to-get-into Manhattan private preschool.

In the five months after The Times's initial account there were no newspaper articles on the project at all. It was only in May of this year that the Rupert Murdoch axis of demagoguery revved up, jettisoning Ingraham's benign take for a New York Post jihad. The paper's inspiration was a rabidly anti-Islam blogger best known for claiming that Obama was Malcolm X's illegitimate son. Soon the rest of the Murdoch empire and its political allies piled on, promoting the incendiary libel that the "radical Islamists" behind the "ground zero mosque" were tantamount either to neo-Nazis in Skokie (according to a Wall Street Journal columnist) or actual Nazis (per Newt Gingrich).

These patriots have never attacked the routine Muslim worship services at another site of the 9/11 attacks, the Pentagon

n. Their sudden concern for ground zero is suspect to those of us who actually live in New York. All but 12 Republicans in the House voted against health benefits for 9/11 responders just last month. Though many of these ground-zero watch dogs partied at the 2004 G.O.P. convention in New York exploiting 9/11, none of them protested that a fellow Republican, the former New York governor George Pataki, so bollixed up the management of the World Trade Center site that nine years on it still lacks any finished buildings, let alone a permanent memorial.

The Fox patron saint Sarah Palin calls Park51 a "stab in the heart" of Americans who "still have that lingering pain from 9/11." But her only previous engagement with the 9/11 site was when she used it as a political backdrop for taking her first questions from reporters nearly a month after being named to the G.O.P. ticket. (She was so eager to grab her ground zero photo op that she defied John McCain's just-announced "suspension" of their campaign.) Her disingenuous piety has been topped only by Bernie Kerik, who smuggled a Twitter message out of prison to register his rage at the ground zero desecration. As my colleague Clyde Haberman reminded us, such was Kerik's previous reverence for the burial ground of 9/11 that he appropriated an apartment overlooking the site (and designated for recovery workers) for an extramarital affair.

At the Islamophobia command center, Murdoch's News Corporation, the hypocrisy is, if anything, thicker. A recent Wall Street Journal editorial darkly cited unspecified "reports" that Park51 has "money coming from Saudi charities or Gulf princes that also fund Wahabi madrassas." As Jon Stewart observed, this brand of innuendo could also be applied to News Corp., whose second largest shareholder after the Murdoch family is a member of the Saudi royal family. Perhaps last week's revelation that News Corp. has poured \$1 million into G.O.P. campaign coffers was a fiendishly clever smokescreen to deflect anyone from following the far greater sum of Saudi money (a \$3 billion stake) that has flowed into Murdoch enterprises, or the News Corp. money (at least \$70 million) recently invested in a Saudi media company.

Were McCain in the White House, Fox and friends would have kept ignoring Park51. But it's an irresistible target in our current election year because it revives the most insidious anti-Obama narrative of the many Fox promoted in the previous election year: Obama the closet Muslim and secret madrasa alumnus. In the much discussed latest Pew poll, a record number of Americans (nearing 20 percent) said that our Christian president practices Islam. And they do not see that as a good thing. Existing or proposed American mosques hundreds and even thousands of miles from ground zero, from Tennessee to Wisconsin to California, are now under siege.

After 9/11, President Bush praised Islam as a religion of peace and asked for tolerance for Muslims not necessarily because he was a humanitarian or knew much about Islam but because national security demanded it. An America at war with Islam plays right into Al Qaeda's recruitment spiel. This month's incessant and indiscriminate orgy of Muslim-bashing is a national security disaster for that reason — Osama bin Laden's "next video script has just written itself," as the former F.B.I. terrorist interrogator Ali Soufan put it — but not just for that reason. America's Muslim partners, those our troops are fighting and dying for, are collateral damage. If the cleric behind Park51 — a man who has participated in events with Condoleezza Rice and Karen Hughes, for heaven's sake — is labeled a closet terrorist sympathizer and a Nazi by some of the loudest and most powerful conservative voices in America, which Muslims are not?

In the latest CNN poll, American opposition is at an all-time high to both the ostensibly concluded war in Iraq (69 percent) and the endless one in Afghanistan (62 percent). Now, when the very same politicians and pundits who urge infinite patience for Afghanistan slime Muslims as Nazis, they will have to explain that they are not talking about Hamid Karzai or his corrupt narco-thug government or the questionably loyal Afghan armed forces our own forces are asked to entrust with their lives. The hawks will have to make the case that American troops should make the ultimate sacrifice to build a Nazi — Afghan, I mean — nation and that economically depressed taxpayers should keep paying for it. Good luck with that.

Poor General Petraeus. Over the last week he has been ubiquitous in the major newspapers and on television as he pursues a publicity tour to pitch the war he's inherited. But have you heard any buzz about what he had to say? Any debate? Any anything? No one was listening and no one cared. Everyone was too busy yelling about the mosque.

It's poignant, really. Even as America's most venerable soldier returned from the front to valiantly assume the role of Willy Loman, the product he was selling was being discredited and discontinued by his own self-proclaimed allies at home.

Re: regarding the "Ground zero mosque"-"How Fox Betrayed Petraeus" - posted by StarofGOD (), on: 2010/8/22 18:05

I still think this is unbelievable that they would even consider building a mosque in the place of the twin towers.

It's kind of ironic how it seems most Americans are more tolerant of Muslims than they are of African Americans.

Starof God, on: 2010/8/22 20:51

did you read the piece?

its two and a half blocks away, and there has been another mosque two and a half blocks away.

did you read the piece?

Re: Starof God - posted by StarofGOD (), on: 2010/8/22 21:01

i skimmed it. I thought I had heard it was in the exact same spot.

Re: regarding the "Ground zero mosque"-"How Fox Betrayed Petraeus" - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/8/22 21:06

Politics. Gets to smell worsen than a 10 acre pond of catfish that has gone belly-up two days ago in July.

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by StarofGOD (), on: 2010/8/22 21:07

lol sandra, you should come to missouri. i'd love to meet you :p

Re: - posted by openairboy, on: 2010/8/22 21:20

Stopped reading when he dropped "So virulent is the Islamophobic hysteria of the neocon and Fox News right Â— abetted by the useful idiocy of the Anti-Defamation League, Harry Reid and other cowed Democrats Â— that it has also rendered Gen. David Petraeus's last-ditch counterinsurgency strategy for fighting the war inoperative. How do you win Muslim hearts and minds in Kandahar when you are calling Muslims every filthy name in the book in New York?"

This is such utter nonsense. Opposition has nothing to do with "Islamophobia" and, as far as I've heard, it has nothing to do with calling Muslims "every filthy name in the book". Where has Fox done this? Where has the ADL done this? Where has Harry Reid done? It cannot be demonstrated, because it is not true.

The irony is that, yes, the only way to appease the hearts of the Muslims in Kandahar is the conversion of America to Islam. So, perhaps Mosques dotting the landscape will soften their hearts, because it is repent or perish!

Christians must "oppose" Islam at every turn, but we must never do it in the name of America, "sensitivity", "tolerance", but only in the Gospel. The Muslims are idolaters and will become like the one they worship. He is a perverse deity and no deity at all.

Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2010/8/22 21:21

"lol sandra, you should come to missouri. i'd love to meet you :p"

Well....you could come to MS but don't come when it is so stinking hot - someone said it is so hot the thermometers don't even work anymore!

ginnyrose

removed-aint worth it, on: 2010/8/22 21:38

removed, it just ISNT worth the time.

Re: removed-aint worth it - posted by openairboy, on: 2010/8/23 0:23

Quote:

-----removed, it just ISNT worth the time.

But a passive-aggressive response is?

no boy, on: 2010/8/23 1:10

you wrote:

"But a passive-aggressive response is?"

there was nothing passive about my previous response, it was an aggressive defense of the Constitution and the right of freedom of religion, which men far better than you have shed their blood to defend, so i decided it wasnt worth it to cast my pearls before swine, and i deleted it,

Does that clear it up for you boy?

Re: no boy - posted by jlosinski, on: 2010/8/23 2:44

At ease Neil, if it wasn't worth posting it wasn't worth mentioning that it wasn't worth posting... Now I'm confused ;)

Anyway, I understand where you are coming from, I fought for those very same rights 7 years ago. With that being said, I also fought for the rights of those who oppose this mosque. I don't think anyone is denying that it's legal to build the mosque at its current location, if they are, they don't understand the issue, but there is absolutely nothing wrong with opposing its construction either. Agree?

Joe

Re: - posted by Matthew2323 (), on: 2010/8/23 5:40

Here's a helpful article by Gary DeMar about freedom of religion and America's history with Islam:

Thomas Jefferson and the Ground Zero Mosque Written by Gary DeMar

President Obama stepped into it over the weekend. Speaking Friday August 13, 2010, at a White House dinner to honor Ramadan, the President told his audience, "Muslims have the right to practice their religion as everyone else in this country," an obvious reference to the controversy surrounding the Ground Zero mosque. On Saturday, while spending the day in the Gulf, the president attempted to clarify his earlier remarks: "I was not commenting and I will not comment on the wisdom of making the decision to put a mosque there. I was commenting very specifically on the right people have that dates back to our founding. That's what our country is about."

Utah's attempts at statehood were held up over the religious practice of polygamy. It wasn't until Utah agreed to include in its constitution a ban on polygamy that the territory was considered for statehood. Statehood was officially granted on January 4, 1896.

Prior to Utah's statehood, the Supreme Court had ruled that "Bigamy and polygamy are crimes by the laws of all civilized and Christian countries" and "the spread and practice of polygamy is . . . contrary to the spirit of Christianity and of the civilization which Christianity has produced in the Western world." So contrary to President Obama, it's not true that all people have "the right to practice their religion." The First Amendment does not give unlimited freedom to individuals or groups who act in the name of religion, especially when that religion's goal is the domination of the world or even a part of it by force.

On a side note, Judge Vaughn Walker, in the Proposition 8 decision, is arguing that the more than seven million people who voted to define marriage as between a man and a woman have no standing in their appeal of the case because the

They could not prove how homosexual marriage harms them. The same argument could be made over bigamy and polygamy since no one is forced into multiple marriages and thereby can't suffer harm by the polygamous practices of others. The Supreme Court in 1890 saw great societal harm in the religious practice of polygamy. In my estimation, the same argument can be made for Islam. Consider that German authorities "have closed a Hamburg mosque used by the Sept. 11 attackers as a meeting place before they moved to the United States. A statement by Hamburg officials says the Taiba mosque was shut down and its cultural association was banned" August 9, 2010.

The First Amendment begins: "Congress shall make no law. . . ." There is no prohibition on municipalities, counties, or states. Constitutionally, Congress, since it is supposed to be the only law-making national body, cannot make any law regarding religion that would affect the states. Cities, counties, and states can make determinations based on religion. An appeal to "our founding" will prove this to be true. Nearly all the state constitutions at the time had particular requirements dealing with religion over which the national government had no jurisdiction. If the states wanted the same, less, or more freedoms than found in the national constitution, the states had to provide for them in their constitutions. For example, here are the religious provisions in Alabama's constitution:

That no religion shall be established by law; that no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect, society, denomination, or mode of worship; that no one shall be compelled by law to attend any place of worship; nor to pay any tithes, taxes, or other rate for building or repairing any place of worship, or for maintaining any minister or ministry; that no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this state; and that the civil rights, privileges, and capacities of any citizen shall not be in any manner affected by his religious principles.

Why include these words if the First Amendment applied to the states?

President Obama and other supporters of the Ground Zero Mosque appeal to our nation's "founding," in particular Thomas Jefferson. Here are some additional comments the President made on August 14 in reference to Jefferson:

And tonight, we are reminded that Ramadan is a celebration of a faith known for great diversity. And Ramadan is a reminder that Islam has always been a part of America. The first Muslim ambassador to the United States, from Tunisia, was hosted by President Jefferson, who arranged a sunset dinner for his guest because it was Ramadan—making it the first known iftar at the White House, more than 200 years ago.

First, Islam is not noted for its religious diversity. Christians cannot evangelize in Muslim countries. Churches are burned while police do nothing. Muslims who convert to another religion can be executed. Even the presence of the Bible is prohibited by our own military and the behest of Islamic officials when American soldiers are deployed in Muslim nations:

Bibles were confiscated and destroyed after Qatar-based Al Jazeera television showed soldiers at a Bible class on a base with a stack of Bibles translated into the local Pashto and Dari languages. The U.S. military forbids its members on active duty—including those based in places like Afghanistan—from trying to convert people to another religion. Reuters quotes Maj. Jennifer Willis at the Bagram Air Base, north of Kabul, who said "I can now confirm that the Bibles shown on Al Jazeera's clip were, in fact, collected by the chaplains and later destroyed. They were never distributed."

Second, President Obama's favorable appeal to Jefferson is only part of the story. The Koran's peace initiatives are Orwellian: "Submission to Islam is peace." Peace is the absence of any religious or political opposition. This is the indisputable history of Islam as Paul Johnson writes:

Koranic teaching that the faith or "submission" can be, and in suitable circumstances must be, imposed by force, has never been ignored. On the contrary, the history of Islam from Arabia was followed by the rapid conquest of North Africa, the invasion and virtual conquest of Spain, and a thrust into France that carried the crescent to the gates of Paris. It took half a millennium or reconquest to expel the Moslems from Western Europe. The Crusades, far from being an outrageous prototype of Western imperialism, as is taught in most of our schools, were a mere episode in a struggle that has lasted 1,400 years and were one of the few occasions when Christians took the offensive to regain the "occupied territories" of the Holy Land.

What did Jefferson learn from his study of the Koran? As early as 1786, Jefferson, who was serving as the ambassador to France, and John Adams, the Ambassador to Britain, met in London with Ambassador Abdrahaman, the Dey of Tripoli's ambassador to Britain, in an attempt to negotiate a peace treaty based on Congress' vote of funding. Peace would come at a price. If America wanted "temporary peace," a one-year guarantee, it would cost \$66,000 plus a 10% commission. "Everlasting peace" was a bargain at \$160,000 plus the obligatory commission. This only applied to Tripoli.

Other Muslim nations would also have to be paid. The amount came to \$1.3 million. But there was no assurance that the treaties would be honored. In vain Jefferson and Adams tried to argue that America was not at war with Tripoli. In what way had the U.S provoked the Muslims, they asked? Ambassador Abdrahaman went on to explain "the finer points of Islamic jihad" to the Koranically challenged Jefferson and Adams. In a letter to John Jay, Jefferson wrote the following:

The Ambassador answered us that it was founded on the Laws of their Prophet, that it was written in their Koran, that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority were sinners, that it was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be found, and to make slaves of all they could take as Prisoners, and that every Musselman who should be slain in battle was sure to go to Paradise.

Abdrahaman was paraphrasing the Koran's "rules of engagement" found in the 47 Surah: "Whenever you encounter the ones who disbelieve, seize them by their necks until once you have subdued them, then tie them up as prisoners, either in order to release them later on, or also to ask for ransom, until war lays down her burdens." Unless a nation submitted to an Islamic nation, whether it was the aggressor or not, that nation was by definition at war with Islam. Jihad means "to submit." A non-aggressing nation is still at war with Islam as long as it hasn't embraced Islam. Islam's goal is to conquer the world, either by the submission of one's will or by Allah's sword.

When President Jefferson refused to increase the tribute demanded by the Islamists, Tripoli declared war on the United States. A United States navy squadron, under Commander Edward Preble, blockaded Tripoli from 1803 to 1805. After rebel soldiers from Tripoli, led by United States Marines, captured the city of Derna, the Pasha of Tripoli signed a treaty promising to exact no more tribute.

President Obama is not the first person who has tried to whitewash Islam's history with America. Rep. Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), a Muslim, took his constitutional oath on Jefferson's copy of the Koran. How ironic given Jefferson's disdain for Islam's principles. There's a reason the "Marines' Hymn" begins with these words:

From the Halls of Montezuma,

to the shores of Tripoli.

The line "To the shores of Tripoli" refers to the First Barbary War, specifically the Battle of Derne in 1805. Jefferson, embroiled in a war with Islamic terrorists in his day, commented, "Too long, for the honor of nations, have those Barbarians been suffered to trample on the sacred faith of treaties, on the rights and laws of human nature!" Little has changed since Jefferson's day. The Muslims of the Ground Zero Mosque will say one thing and mean another.

Endnotes:

1. Davis v. Beason, 133 U. S. 333, 341-344, 348 n. (1890).
2. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. United States 136 U.S. 1, 49 (1890).
3. The seven million people have standing because their votes were nullified by a single judge. In addition, the process of amending the California constitution is by referendum: "A proposed amendment or revision shall be submitted to the electors and if approved by a majority of votes thereon takes effect the day after the election unless the measure provides otherwise" (Art. 18, sec. 4). This, too, was violated by a single judge's poorly argued decision.
4. "Iftar (Arabic: إفتار), refers to the evening meal when Muslims break their fast during the Islamic month of Ramadan."
5. Fred Jackson, "U.S. military destroys soldier's Bibles," OneNewsNow (May 5, 2009).
6. Paul Johnson, "Relentlessly and Thoroughly: The Only Way to Respond," National Review (October 15, 2001).
7. Quoted in Joseph Wheelan, Jefferson's War: America's First War on Terror, 1801-1805 (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2003), 40-41.
8. Robert Spencer, The Truth about Muhammad: Founder of the World's Most Intolerant Religion (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2006) and Robert Spencer, The Politically Incorrect Guide to Islam (and the Crusades) (Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 2007).

ery, 2005).

9. Thomas Jefferson, congratulatory letter to Lt. Andrew Sterett (1760–1807). Quoted in Joseph Wheelan, *Jefferson's War: America's First War on Terror, 1801–1805* (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2003), 102.

Re: no boy - posted by openairboy, on: 2010/8/23 11:33

Quote:
-----there was nothing passive about my previous response, it was an aggressive defense of the Constitution and the right of freedom of religion, which men far better than you have shed their blood to defend, so i decided it wasnt worth it to cast my pearls before swine, and i deleted it, Does that clear it up for you boy?

You labor in the flesh. I love that the "Constitution" and ones view on the Mosque is more valuable to you than basic Christian charity.

Your response was passive aggressive with your yelling of "ISN'T", as if you are so full of wisdom and have so many pearls, but we're not worthy. Your point was to passively aggressively suggest, as you've explicitly stated here, that I (and others) am (are) swine because one MAY or MAY NOT agree with your understanding of the Constitution and its application in this instance. Then you make a grievous comment about "men far better than I" (although you know absolutely nothing about me or 99.99% of them)? Are all of them in Christ? If not, you speak foolishly.

Hopefully you can step back and see how trifling and petty your posts are.

Take your name seriously and live for Jesus not the United States, not the Constitution and not for the American Soldier.

Grow up, young man, and don't get so angry so quickly.

Re: - posted by openairboy, on: 2010/8/23 11:34

Joe, Good post.

Re: Should we be vocal?, on: 2010/8/23 12:47

A news reporter has stated that they use the site as a Mosque already. The problem is, unfortunate for the Muslim community, it was made public.

Muslims do tolerate other faiths UNTIL they are the majority.

As believers should we be vocal about this?

open air boy, on: 2010/8/23 12:51

say what you want, believe what you want, tell me that i "labor in the flesh", or to "grow up", or that my posts are "petty", but do you really think what another man, made of flesh himself, writes to and about me, matters to me?

not in the slightest, we're done, go in your way.

Re: open air boy - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2010/8/23 13:29

I used to Love it here in the earlier years, we actually had fun with each other, when someone did not agree on the same things, now with all the personal attacks "from so called Christians" it sad. I will always have a place in my heart for this forum, because I know the folks that started it are good folks, and don't condone the personal attacks. We as Christians should never let things get this far out of control, we should just agree to disagree and move on Loving each other, I guess this is just another sign of the end times.

God Bless
Love yaw!
Mr. Bill

Re: regarding the "Ground zero mosque"-"How Fox Betrayed Petraeus" - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2010/8/23 13:51

Revelation 13:18 Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six. (666)

F 6th letter of alphabet = 6

O 15 letter of alphabet = 1 + 5 = 6

X 24 letter of alphabet = 2 + 4 = 6

FOX = 666

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2010/8/23 14:02

Thank you Bill. You have some of the best insight that I have seen as of lately, besides all of your heresy :-P

Joking brother. Much love and good to hear from you again. Blessings!

Re: open air boy - posted by openairboy, on: 2010/8/23 14:04

Wow! Out of the over flow of the heart the mouth speaks. All because folks may or may not agree with a journalist.

Quote:
-----say what you want, believe what you want, tell me that i "labor in the flesh", or to "grow up", or that my posts are "petty", but do you really think what another man, made of flesh himself, writes to and about me, matters to me? not in the slightest, we're done, go in your way.

not in the slightest, we're done, go in your way.

State Department funding copies of Feisal Abdul Rauf's book - posted by White_Stone (), on: 2010/8/24 18:30

(<http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id38691>) HumanEvents

Our tax dollars at work. No one could convince me this administration does not support Islam.

The White House is not my Temple.

WS