

BENGHAZI-GATE

Probe of Obama's Negligence Must Expose '9/11-Two'

by Nancy Spannaus

Oct. 10—When the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee convenes this morning to hear the abundance of testimony on how the Obama Administration's criminal negligence set up Amb. Chris Stevens and three associates for assassination in Benghazi, Libya, there will be more than that particular issue at stake. For the danger which Obama's remaining in office represents for the American people, does not just depend upon the particulars of that atrocity, but goes to the entire strategic alignment which this British puppet administration has made with the British and Saudi monarchies for the launch of what Lyndon LaRouche has called a 9/11-Two.

The facts of the Obama Administration's refusal to provide requested security in eastern Libya, known as a stronghold for al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda-related jihadists, and its coverup of that process, are damning in themselves, and we will document some of the most outrageous elements below. But the complicity of the Administration in permitting the assassinations has to be addressed in a broader context, specifically, by including the President's continuing coverup for the role of Saudi Arabia in the original 9/11, and his collusion with the British, French, and Saudi-funded extremists in the illegal war to depose Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi, and thus unleash the jihadist forces in the region.

This collusion, which is continuing in support for the anti-Assad armed opposition in Syria, is literally leading toward a thermonuclear war confrontation with Russia, in the very near term.

The "9/11-Two" alliance which Obama has forged, is the subject of a new 136-page Special Report by [EIR](#), which draws on *EIR*'s decades of definitive reporting on the British role in sponsoring international terrorism, specifically in connection with the House of Saud, and on the original 9/11 coalition. Entitled "Obama's War on America: 9/11 Two," the report—which has been made available to the relevant Congressional committee—provides an airtight case for removing Obama from office because of the danger his alliance with the British-Saudi terrorist sponsors represents for the very survival of the United States, and the planet as a whole.

First the Whistleblowers...

The first systematic picture of the substantial array of jihadi security threats to the Benghazi compound, and the Obama Administration's refusal to respond positively to them, was provided by an open letter to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, issued by Reps. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) and Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) on Oct. 2. The letter called for the convening of the Oct. 10 hearing "to consider the security situation in Benghazi leading up to the September 11 attack," and went on to provide a long list of attacks and events which took place during the six months prior to Stevens' murder; it asked for the State Department to respond as to its knowledge of this pattern, and its response to additional security requests that had been based on them.

The listing of incidents (the full text can be found in

the Special Report) includes numerous jihadi attacks on the Benghazi Consulate itself; attacks on the Red Cross (which ultimately shut its office); an attack on the British ambassador to Libya, which led to the shutting of the British Consulate in Benghazi in June; carjacking and attempted carjacking of Western personnel; and the final:

“Weeks Before September 11, 2012, Benghazi—The unarmed Libyan guards employed by British contractor Blue Mountain Group were being warned by their family members to quit their jobs guarding Consulate Benghazi because there were rumors in the community of an impending attack.”

Then, the Flood

In the wake of the Issa-Chafetz letter, the floodgates broke open. While it took the FBI until Oct. 4 to get to the scene of the crimes, numerous newspaper reporters had arrived well beforehand, and had gathered evidence that, on the face of it, incriminated the State Department for failure to provide adequate security. In addition, a former security guard in the area, Lt. Col. Andy Wood, who is scheduled to testify in the House hearing today, went public with a number of allegations about the scope of threats facing the compound, and the lack of response from Washington.

On Oct. 3, *Washington Post* reporter Michael Birnbaum reported on his visit to the Benghazi Consulate, which he found unsecured, and strewn with hundreds of official U.S. State Department documents, which could be dangerous to the official visitors and staff they identify—and copies of which are undoubtedly in the hands of terrorists who attacked it.

Most notably, Birnbaum wrote, “At least one document found . . . indicates that Americans at the mission were discussing the possibility of an attack in early September, just two days before the assault took place. The memorandum of Sept. 9 is from the U.S. mission’s security office to the 17th February Martyrs Brigade, the Libyan government-sanctioned militia guarding the



Amb. Christopher Stevens was killed in an attack on the U.S. Consulate in Benghazi Sept. 12. A Congressional committee is looking into whether criminal negligence on the part of the Obama Administration was involved.

compound, making plans for a ‘quick reaction force’, or QRF. . . . ‘In the event of an attack on the U.S. Mission’, the document states, ‘QRF will request additional support from the 17th February Martyrs Brigade.’”

The documents reveal the completely barebones nature of “security” at the mission. When the “principal officer”—Ambassador Stevens or the Head of Mission—was present, at least three militiamen were to guard the complex, a large compound with several buildings. When they were not there, only one militiaman was specified, along with unarmed Blue Mountain security guards.

Birnbaum and his Libyan colleagues found a number of Martyrs Brigade members and Blue Mountain guards who feared for their own safety, none of whom had been contacted by the U.S. or Libyan governments.

Strangely, Birnbaum reports that the State Department, when notified of the sensitive official documents found by his team, did not request that they not be published—in contrast to the strong earlier attacks on CNN by the State Department for using Ambassador Stevens’ diary as a source for its reporting.

A Professional Who Should Know

Interviews given by Wood to various news media, including CBS and ABC-TV over the last few days, fill out the picture of lack of security.

Wood, a Utah Army National Guard Green Beret, headed a special 16-member Site Security Team for the U.S. Consulate, until his team was compelled to leave in August, about a month before the attack.

Wood told CBS News that his departure came despite the fact that consulate officials wanted security increased, not decreased. He said that he and fellow security officials were very worried about the chaos on the ground, and that they tried to communicate the danger to State Department officials back in Washington, but those officials denied requests for additional security.

He specified that he had conferred *daily* with Ambassador Stevens on the matter as well.

“We tried to illustrate ... to show how dangerous and how volatile and just unpredictable that whole environment was over there,” Wood said. “So to decrease security in the face of that reality is ... it’s just unbelievable.” Sources told CBS that a total of 34 highly trained security personnel, including Wood’s team, were pulled out of Libya over a six-month period.

And the State Department?

Officially, the State Department is insisting that it will fully cooperate with the House inquiry—although Secretary Clinton did ask that no final conclusions be reached until the Department’s internal investigation, by the Accountability Review Board, headed by retired ambassador Thomas Pickering, is complete. Three State Department officials are scheduled to appear at the hearing today: Under Secretary of State for Management Patrick F. Kennedy; Regional Security Officer Erick Norstrom; and Charlene Lamb of the Bureau of Diplomatic Security.

The testimony by Kennedy should be particularly in-

teresting, in light of a Fox News report aired on Oct. 8 that Kennedy said, “in a briefing to be delivered the day after the deadly Sept. 11 attack in Benghazi ... [that] the killings appeared to be the result of a terrorist attack.”

The briefing was given “in an unclassified, half-hour conference call with staff aides to House and Senate lawmakers from relevant committees and leadership offices, on the evening of Sept. 12,” Fox reported.

Fox News gets to the point: Kennedy’s Sept. 12 briefing to Congress shows that the White House, U.S. Ambassador to the UN Susan Rice, and the intelligence agencies were lying about Benghazi.

“That a State Department official of Kennedy’s rank—one with direct oversight of the installations and people targeted in Benghazi—reached so swiftly the conclusion that the attacks were premeditated and coordinated stands in stark contrast to the opposing narrative pressed at that time, and for several days afterward, by other top officials at State, the White House, and the intelligence agencies,” Fox reported.

“Three days after Kennedy’s conference call, for example, Susan Rice appeared on five Sunday morning talk shows to insist that the attacks were neither coordinated nor premeditated, but were rather the result of a spontaneous mob action, inspired by an anti-Muslim video on the Internet.”

The lies by Rice and the White House are expected to be a major topic of questions from hearing today.

Scrambling

The scrambling by the State Department to cover its rear end, had reached almost comical proportions by Oct. 10. In a conference call with select reporters on the eve of the hearing, two senior State Department officials gave a detailed accounting of the events that led to the death of Stevens and three other Americans. The officials said that prior to the massive attack on the Benghazi compound, by dozens of militants carrying heavy weaponry, there was no unrest outside the walls of the compound and no protest that anyone inside the compound was aware of.

Pressure is also mounting from the Senate, and from the Presidential campaign of Republican Mitt Romney—pointing out the lies of the Administration.

But the avoidance of new disasters, born of the Obama Administration’s alliance with al-Qaeda, the Saudis, and the British monarchy, demands a lot more. The survival of the nation means defeating the entire 9/11-Two apparatus now.

10 Years Later

An LPAC-TV
Feature Film

Eight months before the September 11, 2001 attacks, Lyndon LaRouche forecast that the United States was at high risk for a Reichstag Fire event, an event that would allow those in power to manage, through dictatorial means, an economic and social crisis that they were otherwise incompetent to handle. We are presently living in the wake of that history.

<http://larouchepac.com/10yearslater>

