

# THE ANONYMOUS COWARD CALLING HOLDER WEAK

Time has another one of those Rahm v. Holder profiles. It is notable from the slew of other ones for two reasons.

The anonymous source calling Holder a coward

First, the story features several main sources for this story: Lindsey Graham, speaking on the record.

Holder, issuing no-nonsense statements like this, on the record:

And it's Holder's experience in the law-enforcement system that makes him such a strong believer in its ability to put terrorists like KSM away forever. "We should have great faith in the resilience of our systems, the resilience of our people, the toughness that has always separated Americans from other peoples in this world, and that's what's made this country great," he says.

And at least one anonymous White House aide (AKA Rahm).

What I especially love about about that anonymous White House aide is that the guy who is too chicken to speak on the record seems to be parroting GOP attacks calling Holder weak on terror.

Republicans, meanwhile, were busy turning Holder into the poster child for White House weakness on terrorism, and some polls showed that most Americans agreed with them. "The only two people who still believe in civilian trials," says one of the meeting's attendees, "are Holder and the President."

Brave anonymous White House aide!!  
Singlehandedly fighting terrorism by hiding  
behind anonymity!!

Lindsey's July (?) meeting with Holder and  
December meeting with Obama

The article also provides a useful timeline for  
two meetings Lindsey had with the  
Administration, first an July (or August)  
meeting with Holder.

By July, Obama had asked Holder to  
decide whether it was feasible to  
prosecute KSM in a civilian court.  
Holder chewed on that question for  
weeks. Meanwhile, Obama's chief of  
staff, Rahm Emanuel, who opposed  
civilian trials, asked Holder to meet  
with Republican Senator Lindsey Graham  
of South Carolina, a key centrist vote  
on matters of counterterrorism. Graham  
told Holder he strongly opposed civilian  
trials for the alleged 9/11 conspirators  
and that they could affect his support  
for closing Guantánamo Bay prison, a key  
Obama goal.

And then a December meeting with Obama.

When Obama met with Graham in early  
December, the Senator laid out his case  
against civilian trials. But the  
President said he thought Holder had the  
better side of the argument. "I just  
agreed to disagree with the President on  
that issue," Graham told TIME.

Those meetings are interesting both for the way  
they match up to the timeline of the attacks on  
Holder and Greg Craig (which started in earnest  
around the time of the first meeting, and  
culminated in the December meeting after Craig  
had been ousted.

I'd really love to know the logic for the Obama  
meeting. After all, this was before the

Christmas day bombing, when the Administration was still basking in the success of the foiled Nazi plot. And it came at a time when the Democrats had 60 votes in the Senate.

So why meeting with Lindsey?

It sure suggests the push against civilian trials is more about politics than efficacy.

But we knew that.