

Benghazi-Gate: Stevens Warned of 'Guns of August'

by Nancy Spannaus

Oct. 23—As the Obama Administration blatantly prepares to carry out a “retaliatory attack” somewhere in North Africa, to show how tough it is against terrorists whose identities will never be verified, the information coming out about the scandalous lack of security for the Benghazi consulate in Libya threatens to explode in Obama’s face. The well-documented failure of the Administration to respond to requests for increased security for the Benghazi compound is one of the major topics on the agenda of November hearings being called by the chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.).

The decision-making process of the Administration in denying additional security was also the major subject of a letter sent to President Obama on Oct. 19, by House Oversight and Government Reform Committee Chairman Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) and National Security Subcommittee Chairman Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah). The Congressmen appended to their letter 166 pages of documents related to security threats and the process of “normalization” in Libya.

Most dramatic among those documents was a two-page cable by the U.S. Ambassador to Libya, Christopher Stevens, who was assassinated in Benghazi on Sept. 11, dated Aug. 8, 2012, and dated “The Guns of August: Security in Eastern Libya.” The cable cites a wave of terrorist attacks which had occurred in eastern Libya, and emphasized that “a security vacuum” existed in the country. Ambassador Stevens noted that in just a few months’ time, “Benghazi has moved from trepidation to euphoria and back as a series of incidents has dominated the political landscape.... The individual incidents have been organized,” he added, as a result of “the security vacuum that a diverse group of independent actors are exploiting for their own purposes.” He continued, “Islamist extremists are able to attack the Red Cross with impunity. *What we have*

seen are not random crimes of opportunity, but rather targeted and discriminate attacks” (emphasis added).

Despite this cable reaching Washington, a 34-person Site Security Team, headed by Lt. Col. Andy Wood, was pulled out of Libya in August, and the Benghazi consulate remained “guarded” by an unarmed British security team, and militias that are infiltrated by known jihadis, now supposedly turned “moderate.”

Stevens’ murder provided a bitter confirmation of his security assessment.

No Surprise

Those who understand the political pedigree of Barack Obama as a British puppet will not be surprised by this deadly security lapse. Obama has run a protection racket for the Saudi role in the 9/11/2001 attack on the United States—refusing to release documents that would lead to the exposure of the still-active Saudi-funded terrorist networks around the world, including Libya and Syria. Obama’s unconstitutional war on Libya itself, whether the demented President knew it or not, was conceived by the British imperialists and their Saudi sidekicks, as a step to unleashing global chaos, on the way to a showdown with Russia and China.

Once confronted by the devastating consequences of this policy for his ambassador to Libya, Obama did what he could be expected to do: run for cover. He continues to lie that his killing of Osama bin Laden has crippled al-Qaeda, even as the jihadists that fall under that umbrella kill Americans and instigate mayhem in Syria. He has “taken responsibility” only to the extent that he intends to launch new killer attacks—which, as many members of the military and intelligence community have pointed out, only recruit more forces into the terrorist ranks.

Targeting Obama and the NSC

The Oct. 19 letter from Representatives Issa and Chaffetz zeroes in on the role of the White House and the National Security Council in the decisions that led to the death of Stevens and three other Americans. Before asking a set of detailed questions, it argues as follows:

“Information supplied to the committee by senior officials demonstrates that not only did the administration repeatedly reject requests for increased security despite escalating violence, but it also systematically decreased existing security to dangerous and ineffec-



CNN

Blame for the murder of U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens and the destruction of the U.S. consulate compound in Benghazi, Libya, rests with President Obama. Once confronted by the devastating consequences of his policy, he ran for cover.



tive levels. We have been told repeatedly that the administration did this to effectuate a policy of normalization in Libya after the conclusion of its civil war. These actions not only resulted in extreme vulnerability, but also undermined Ambassador Stevens and the diplomatic mission. We are likewise concerned that your administration has not been straightforward with the American people in the aftermath of the attack.

“Without a full explanation from this administration about what it knew and when, we may never know the reasons why it blamed an internet video so quickly after the attack. Suffice it to say, however, that if administration officials indeed reviewed security reports on a daily basis, they would have seen the overwhelming evidence prior to the 9/11 attack that terrorists were actively targeting westerners in Benghazi.

“Multiple warnings about security threats were contained in Ambassador Stevens’ own words in multiple cables sent to Washington, D.C., and were manifested by two prior bombings of the Benghazi compound and an assassination attempt on the British ambassador. For this administration to assume that terrorists were not involved in the 9/11 anniversary attack would have required a willing suspension of disbelief.

“The American people deserve nothing less than a full explanation from this administration about these events, including why the repeated warnings about a worsening security situation appear to have been ignored by this administration. Americans also deserve a complete explanation about your administration’s decision to accelerate a normalized presence in Libya at what now appears to be the cost of endangering American lives. These critical foreign policy decisions

are not made by low- or mid-level career officials—they are typically made through a structured and well-reasoned process that includes the National Security Council at the White House. The ultimate responsibility rests with you as the President of the United States.”

Forget Partisanship

The Democratic leadership in Congress immediately responded to the requests by Issa and Chaffetz as “politicizing” the tragedy in Benghazi attacks. Such a dismissal ignores the very real *policy* questions behind the Obama Administration’s decisions on Libya, starting with the unconstitutional war—which most Republicans stupidly embraced—and going on to the support for “moderate,” Saudi-funded Islamist groups, which are being used by London to create the conditions for World War III.

As *EIR*’s recently released [special report](#) “Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two” makes very clear, the British imperial policy does not discriminate on the basis of party. It was “Republican” George W. Bush who was complicit in the British-Saudi execution and coverup of 9/11 One, and “Democrat” Obama is simply continuing large aspects of that policy. Either patriots within *both* parties wise up to the fact that they are being used by oligarchical forces bent on the destruction of the United States, and other obstacles to their plan for world domination and depopulation, or there will be a very “unpolitical” devastation of the vast majority of the human race.