

To: Benjamin Armbruster; NSIP Core
Cc: PR Core
Subject: RE: Should Libya pay us back?

I just find the demands that war-ravaged and potentially unstable countries should pay us back for helping liberate them from dictators rather than invest in their own stability rather dumb from a US national security perspective, particularly at a time when we're not too forthcoming with necessary investments via foreign aid. I understand the emotional grounding of such claims - we want some gratitude for putting our servicemembers' lives on the line and spending the money necessary to support military operations that removed tyrannical regimes, particularly ones that have American blood on their hands - but they don't add up when you consider US interests in having a stable Libya or Iraq or wherever.

From: Benjamin Armbruster
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 11:06 AM
To: NSIP Core
Cc: PR Core
Subject: Should Libya pay us back?

Ali and I talked about Libya repaying the US/NATO the other day when we were doing the post on Bachmann saying Iraq should repay America for the war. On the surface, I find it somewhat objectionable that we would ask to be repaid for the Libya war but the idea seems to have some support on both sides of the aisle. Wondering what people think --

PIERS MORGAN: Senator, there is a debate now about whether the United States should be repaid the several billion dollars this operation has cost from the frozen assets that Libya has of 30 to 36 billion, depending on which report you read. What is your view of that?

SEN ROBERT MENENDEZ: Well, I certainly think we should be talking to the transitional national council as it moves to establish a government in Libya. And, you know, we do have anywhere between \$30 and \$36 billion in frozen assets. It might very well be that they will have the wherewithal, it seems to me, especially when oil production gets back up and running, to look towards repaying the United States.

That's not why we did this, obviously, but nonetheless it would be an excellent gesture. Along with something that I have been pushing for quite some time, which is making sure that the transitional national council works with us in giving us access to those who still may be in their domain of the Gadhafi regime who may have been part of the Pan Am 103 bombing where 270 citizens lost their lives, including 34 from my home state of New Jersey.

<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1110/20/pmt.01.html>

Benjamin Armbruster
ThinkProgress.org
Center for American Progress
Phone: o - [REDACTED]
Twitter: @TP_Security || @benjaminja

No one is suggesting we profit from it or they pay the whole amount. Hence no incentive is created to actually engage in this kind of activity.

Now there is a huge disincentive to engage. Because it basically means cutting domestically. Rebalancing that a bit makes sense to me.

From: Faiz Shakir
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 11:24 AM
To: Neera Tanden; Peter Juul; Benjamin Armbruster; NSIP Core
Cc: PR Core
Subject: RE: Should Libya pay us back?

I don't think it's fair that we create our own domestic problems and then ask other nations to pay for it.

You see the adverse incentive problem here right? If we think we can make money off an incursion, we'll do it? that's a serious policy/messaging/moral problem for our foreign policy I think

From: Neera Tanden
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 11:23 AM
To: Faiz Shakir; Peter Juul; Benjamin Armbruster; NSIP Core
Cc: PR Core
Subject: RE: Should Libya pay us back?

We have a giant deficit. They have a lot of oil. Most Americans would choose not to engage in the world because of that deficit. If we want to continue to engage in the world, gestures like having oil rich countries partially pay us back doesn't seem crazy to me.

Do we prefer cuts to Head Start? Or WIC? Or Medicaid? Because we live in deficit politics, and that's what is happening and will be happening even more.

From: Faiz Shakir
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 11:21 AM
To: Peter Juul; Benjamin Armbruster; NSIP Core
Cc: PR Core
Subject: RE: Should Libya pay us back?

Also, the menendez argument has the undertone of "we did this for them." I feel that's the most dangerous part. The primary mission should always be to advance our national security interests, and promoting Libyan democracy and protecting human rights seems generally aligned with that mission. If people start to think that our military is just for-hire to carry out the agendas of other people around the world, we've got a bigger problem.

From: Peter Juul
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 11:17 AM

Subject: Fw: Following Up
From: Neera Tanden <[REDACTED]@americanprogress.org>
To: Faiz Shakir <[REDACTED]@americanprogress.org>, Ken Gude <[REDACTED]@americanprogress.org>
CC:

Whatever my response is to this is going to get circulated widely amongst the groups.

Do either of you have an intern who could read what she's talking about and draft a reply?

From: ann lewis [mailto:[REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 09, 2011 09:34 AM
To: Neera Tanden
Subject: Following Up

I am technologically incompetent : trying to go back and forth from Think Progress archives to email turns out to be really hard (for me, I'm sure most people do it well.) So this will be more of my comments -and fewer direct quotes- than I thought I could do when I began, but I hope will convey why I have problems:

I was pleased to see the statements that Think Progress(I guess CAP) supports a two state solution in the Mideast , and effective sanctions on Iran. I don't think I would know that from reading the TP Security posts. On Iran sanctions , I read that they would hurt ordinary Iranians (11/9) ; "take food from ordinary Iranians" (10/12); is the kind of strategy that can lead to war; are "Iraq style" 8/8 . AIPAC's strategies in supporting sanctions "mirrors the run up to war in Iraq." Besides, there is no proof that Iran is determined to build nuclear weapons - although a TP post at the time of the IAEA report acknowledges that some of what they found is "nuclear weapons specific" - o references, in a Quinnipiac poll for example, to Iran's efforts to build nuclear weapons are "factually inaccurate."

As to a two state solution: I found one reference, 9/12, What Would a Two State Solution Physically Require ? which was not exactly what I would call an endorsement or positive vision. Ironically, David Makovsky, who is described in a different 9/12 post headline as a "neo-con" has actually come up with serious, detailed maps about what a two -state solution would look like; TP does says he is "less hostile" to the Palestinian state , I did not see any mention of his work. Maybe it was acknowledged earlier ? Througout the Mideast section there are regular criticisms of the Israeli government ; I saw no balanced recognition - even occasionally - that Israel might really have concerns for security (no mention of rocket attacks from Gaza ,for example ;did I miss it ?) .

Ambassador Michael Oren is called a liar in two posts, 9/19 and 10/14; once for saying Palestinians did not come to the table after Israel put a security freeze in place. As I recall, the freeze was for 10 months, PA began to negotiate after 9 months - could this be a little more complicated ? . Even when the US and Israel agree on a specific concern -for example, raising this ICC issue in arguing against a Palestinian state - the TP post says that Israel is "most outspoken."

There are a number of disconnected posts that I found to raised more quesitons than provide information: State to Fund "discredited neo-con organization (MEMRI) 8/11 :

Discredited ? There may be arguments about some of its work, but I think MEMRI has a lot of credibility , as does the State department apparently; 9/9 Israel's Foreign Minister "Reportedly" seeks meeting with anti-Turkish terror group (Did this happen ? if it was just a rumor, was it newsworthy , other than one more chance to criticize ?)

One more personal reaction: I found the news wrap-ups both more interesting and more balanced than the single posts ; almost everything that troubled me came in single posts, some quoted above.

So I had expected to be more detailed and professional ; sorry about that. But I hope this gives you some idea of my reaction. Happy to talk any time if it would be helpful.

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

From: Neera Tanden

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 09:07 PM

To: Faiz Shakir; Judd Legum

Cc: Ken Gude

Subject: Fw: For the love of god!

Is it wise to throw around the Israel issue in this?

Can we discuss tomorrow.

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

From: Howard [mailto:██████████@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 09:02 PM

To: Neera Tanden

Subject: For the love of god!

<http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/01/24/410003/donors-clarion-fund-third-jihad/>

Sent from my iPhone

From: Neera Tanden

Sent: Friday, January 20, 2012 10:00 AM

To: Faiz Shakir; John Podesta; Judd Legum; Tara McGuinness; Winnie Stachelberg; Tom Perriello; Ken Gude; Andrea Purse

Subject: RE: Post piece

Reporting in: I just got off the phone with Ann Lewis who continues to be adamant that a real problem is that our blog seems anti-Israel because - and I'm just reporting in - while it seemingly takes every opportunity to criticize Israel, it takes no opportunity to actually say Israel is doing the right thing. She said she went through even the last few weeks and saw this bias. For example, on the Palestinian aid situation, which Israel was helping - we wrote nothing (an irony given the c3's work in this arena). On Iran, we seem to take every opportunity to criticize the critics of Iran, but we don't regularly discuss the problems with a nuclear Iran. I went through our more recent posts on human rights.

She basically said we're going to continue to have a problem until our blog seems like it's not anti-Israel. I tried to discuss Israel, v. the Israeli govt.'s policies. But she for one was not really buying it.

She recommended I call all the groups I've met w/ - even ADL after today's post. And w/ ADL she said I should state I'm surprised but not get confrontational with them.. And she recommends calling AJC.

Ann is definitely old school, but she has been a voice for the center point in these debates.

From: Ken Gude

Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2012 1:18 PM

To: Neera Tanden; Tom Perriello; Winnie Stachelberg; Tara McGuinness; Rudy deLeon; Brian Katulis; Faiz Shakir; Judd Legum

Subject: Good meeting with Jeff Colman

I met Jeff Colman from AIPAC today and I would say it was very positive. It was a 'get-to-know-you' meeting, so I wasn't expecting fireworks, but he certainly expressed the view that he felt we were now moving in the right direction. From a very early stage I didn't feel like I had to be defensive at all – and it wasn't a frank exchange of views, we were just talking and mostly about how to move forward.

We talked for about an hour. We didn't have to rehash all that has transpired given he stipulated what steps we have taken. He reiterated the position that AIPAC was not pleased that all this was aired in public and that it has done harm that AIPAC does not want or support and their strong preference to keep disagreements private. He was very clear about distancing AIPAC from Block. Jeff is a big fan of Rudy and Brian and is very supportive of Tom coming on board and feel that CAP/AF is in good hands. I got the very clear impression that they want to move forward.

We talked a little about ADL – he said he has been in touch with Stacy Burdett recently. I told him that we were a little frustrated with Foxman's quote in the Washington Post and, while not exactly throwing him under the bus, Jeff said that there are organizations in which there is a boss and everyone else and then there is another kind of organization and you'll never have a 'left hand-right hand' problem with AIPAC.

He was very supportive of our effort to reach out to Jason Isaacson at AJC and said that he is in regular contact and would probably speak to him in the normal course of business before our meeting and I think he'll offer a good word.

He mentioned Brian's participation on a panel at their upcoming conference and I bet we get a lot of invitations to attend it. And it's very likely that I'm going to Israel on one of their upcoming trips.

Ken

From: Daniella Leger
Sent: Tuesday, June 12, 2012 2:13 PM
To: DC_Office
Cc: Tara McGuinness; Sarah Margon
Subject: Invite: Israel brown bag debrief

Hi CAP. Last week Tara, Sarah and I traveled to Israel with the American Israeli Education Fund. It was a most interesting trip of meetings and discussions on the current state of Israel and their various issues, both domestic and international.

A number of you have asked for a debrief, so we thought we would open it up to anyone who is interested in hearing about it. If you are interested, please join us on **Friday, June 15th in conference room D from 1-2 pm.**

Cheers,

Tara, Sarah and Daniella

Daniella Gibbs Léger
Vice President for American Values and New Communities
Center for American Progress

o:

m: