

## The Muslim Brotherhood: How Did Its Influence Become So Powerful?

- The Muslim Brotherhood is an Islamic organization, founded by Hasan al-Banna in Cairo, Egypt in 1928, that is dedicated to restoration of the Caliphate and global enforcement of Islamic Law (shariah).
- Known as the *Ikhwan* in Arabic, the Brotherhood's motto is: "Allah is our objective, the Prophet is our leader, the Qur'an is our law, jihad is our way, and dying in the way of Allah is our highest aspiration."
- With a presence in over 80 countries worldwide, the *Ikhwan* pursues its dual objectives (Caliphate and shariah) by pre-violent *dawah* (proselytizing, or the "call to Islam"), "civilization jihad" (or "stealth jihad"), as well as violent jihad.
- "The Project" is a 14-page document dated December 1, 1982 that was seized in a 2001 raid on a Swiss villa belonging to Yousef Nada, the Muslim Brotherhood director of the Al-Taqwa bank that had funded al-Qa'eda.
- "The Project" outlines a campaign of progressive infiltration of the structures of Western society in order to achieve Islamic domination over the West.
- Among the tactics to be used are deception, infiltration and "[i]nvolving ideologically committed Muslims in democratically-elected institutions on all levels in the West, including government."
- The 2008 *U.S. v. Holy Land Foundation et.al.* was the largest terrorism financing trial in U.S. history, and brought to light extensive documentation about Muslim Brotherhood activities and plans in the U.S.
- A 2004 raid by the FBI on the home of Ismail el-Barasse discovered the archives of the U.S. Muslim Brotherhood, including a document called "An Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America."
- The Memorandum makes clear the Brothers are engaged in America in "a kind of grand jihad" whose goal is "eliminating and destroying Western civilization from within."
- An attachment to the Memorandum lists 29 groups under the heading "A list of our organizations and the organizations of our friends" among which are the Islamic Society of North America (ISNA), the Muslim Students Association (MSA), and the Islamic Association of Palestine (IAP—later to become CAIR, the Council on American Islamic Relations).
- Those and other Muslim Brotherhood organizations today are among the most influential, mainstream Islamic groups in the country despite their known allegiance to a jihadist ideology.

- Top officials of these *Ikhwan* groups advise, socialize with, and train the leadership of key agencies within the U.S. national security community.
- The Muslim Brotherhood has achieved information dominance inside the U.S. government about Islam, Islamic terrorism, and the nature and objectives of the Brotherhood itself.
- The 2011-2012 USG-wide purge of all curriculum training materials and instructors who taught the linkage between Islamic terrorism and its inspirational sources in the doctrine, law, and scriptures of Islam was undertaken under pressure from Brotherhood groups and neutralized U.S. national security efforts to counter Brotherhood influence operations.
- The disastrous consequences of this effort became evident in official U.S. backing for the 2011 Brotherhood- and al-Qa’eda-dominated Islamic uprisings known as the “Arab Spring.”
- U.S. official support for the Muslim Brotherhood political leadership and al-Qa’eda militias that ousted Libyan leader Muammar Qaddafi led directly to the 11 September 2012 attacks on our mission in Benghazi and the chaos that grips Libya today.

### **Additional Suggested Resources**

- “An Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America” Online at <http://www.txnd.uscourts.gov/judges/hlf2/09-25-08/Elbarasse%20Search%203.pdf>
- Lopez, Clare M., “History of the Muslim Brotherhood Penetration of the U.S. Government.” *The Gatestone Institute*, April 15, 2013. Online at <http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/3672/muslim-brotherhood-us-government>
- Poole, Patrick, “Blind to Terror: The U.S. Government’s Disastrous Muslim Outreach Efforts and the Impact on U.S. Middle East Policy.” *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Summer 2013). Online at <http://www.gloria-center.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Blind-to-Terror-The-US-Goverments-Disastrous-Muslim-Outreach-Efforts-and-the-Impact-on-US-MidEast-Policy.pdf>
- Poole, Patrick, “The Muslim Brotherhood ‘Project,’” *Front Page Magazine*, May 11, 2006. Online at <http://archive.frontpagemag.com/Printable.aspx?ArtId=4476>

## **Anatomy of the Cover-Up**

- “Innocence of Muslims” was a 14-minute video trailer about the life of Muhammad posted to YouTube on 2 Jul 2012 by “Sam Bacile.”
- In the aftermath of the 11 September 2012 attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi, Libya, the U.S. administration ignored facts in evidence indicating that it was an al-Qa’eda-linked terrorist attack not preceded by any demonstration or protest and publicly blamed the video instead.
- The coordinated nature of the international campaign by U.S. Muslim Brotherhood groups and member states of the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) presents the impression that condemnation of the film was used to further an agenda supportive of the OIC/Muslim Brotherhood objective to criminalize criticism of Islam and curtail American Constitutional free speech rights.

### **Demands for Release of the Blind Sheikh**

- During most of 2012, pressure for the release of Omar Abdulrahman (“The Blind Sheikh”) featured prominently in discussions between the White House and the Morsi Muslim Brotherhood government in Egypt as well as among *Gama’at al-Islamiyya* and Muslim Brotherhood figures, at least one of whom (Hani Nour Eldin) visited WDC to discuss the issue with National Security Council official Denis McDonough.
- 4 Sep 12: Film producer, an ex-pat Egyptian Coptic Christian, phoned *al Youm al Sabaa* (Seventh Day) daily newspaper in WDC area and emailed him a copy of the film trailer.
- 6 Sep 12: Gamel Girgis wrote a 3 paragraph article, calling the movie “shocking.”
- 8 Sep 12: “Other newspapers” began running the story; *al Youm al Sabaa* ran a follow-up.
- 8 Sep 12: *Gama’at al-Islamiyya*, Egyptian Islamic Jihad jointly issued a statement threatening to burn down Cairo Embassy unless the Blind Sheikh is released.
- 9 Sep 12: Arabic-language forum posted a statement inciting Egyptians [O, sons of Egypt!] to target the U.S. Embassy, indicating “U.S. Embassy shouldn’t remain in Egypt” until the Blind Sheikh was released.

### **Appearance of the YouTube Video**

- 9 Sep 12: al-Nas Egyptian TV host Khaled Abdullah aired a clip of “Innocence of Muslims” and invited viewer outrage.
- 9 Sep 12: The Grand Mufti of al-Azhar condemned the clip for “insulting the prophet.”
- 9 Sep 12: Facebook pages appeared, calling for 9/11 protests; callers asked U.S. Embassy in Cairo about the video, but they knew nothing about it at that time.
- 11 Sep 12: CNN Nic Robertson was outside Cairo Embassy interviewing protesters who wanted the Blind Sheikh released. Interviews included a one-on-one with Mohamed al-Zawahiri, brother of al-Qa’eda leader, Ayman al-Zawahiri. Violence broke out immediately afterwards.
- 11 Sep 12: CNN began to highlight the film narrative.
- 11 Sep 12 : Protests against the video broke out in over three dozen countries.
- 11 Sep 12: Military assault on the Benghazi mission began at 2140 local time that night. No demonstration or protest preceded the attack.
- 13-29 Sep: The YouTube clip eventually reached more than 17 million hits.

#### **Aftermath of the Benghazi Attack: Cover-Up Begins**

- 12 Sep 12: President Obama in the White House Rose Garden used phrase “no act of terror...” but did not specifically call the Benghazi attack an act of terror.
- 13 Sep 12: Jay Carney: "The protests we're seeing around the region are in reaction to this movie..."
- 14 Sep 12: Jay Carney said “protests were in reaction to a video.”
- Few days after 11 Sep 12: At Tyrone Woods’ funeral, Secretary of State Clinton assured father Charles Woods that they were going to "arrest and prosecute" the man that made the YouTube video critical of Islam.
- 28 Sep 12: Film producer “Mark Basseley Youssef” arrested, sentenced to 1 year in jail for “probation violations.”

- 16 Sep 12: Libyan President Mohamed Magariaf told Bob Schieffer on “*Face the Nation*”: “...this leaves us with no doubt that this was preplanned, determined—pre-meditated months ago, and they were planning this criminal act since their arrival.”
- 16 Sep 12: Amb. Susan Rice appeared on five Sunday talk shows, including “*Face the Nation*,” directly after Libyan president and said:
  - “We do not have information at present that leads us to conclude that this was premeditated or preplanned.”
  - “What happened in Cairo, in Benghazi, in many other parts of the region was a result – a direct result of a heinous and offensive video.”
- 18 Sep 12: Jay Carney said “...it was the video that caused the unrest in Cairo, and the video and the unrest in Cairo that helped--that precipitated some of the unrest in Benghazi...”
- 19 Sep 12: Jay Carney said “we do not yet have indication that it was pre-planned.”
- 19 Sep 12: Matt Olson, NCTC to Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Chairman Joe Lieberman, on whether the attack was a terrorist attack: “They were killed in the course of a terrorist attack on our embassy.”
- 20 Sep 12: Jay Carney admitted it was terrorism in Benghazi.
- 20 Sep 12: Obama at *Univision* townhall meeting said: "What we do know is that the natural protests that arose because of the outrage over the video were used as an excuse by extremists to see if they can also directly harm U.S. interests."
- 21 Sep 12: Secretary of State Clinton admitted the attacks were an act of terror and after that, except for UN speeches, the video narrative was abandoned.

### **U.S. Muslim Brotherhood Chimes In**

- 17 Sep 12: The American Muslim website published Tariq Ramadan comments <http://theamericanmuslim.org/tam.php/features/articles/an-appeal-to-the-conscience-of-muslims>
  - “...After the Danish cartoons, the Dutch video *Fitna* and several low-grade irritants, a short, crudely executed—and scrupulously insulting—film has inflamed deep-seated resentment. Several hundreds of furious

demonstrators gathered in front of the American Embassy in Cairo and the US Consulate in Benghazi, Libya. In the confusion and violence, a US Ambassador and three diplomats were killed.’

- ‘The violent reactions to the insults uttered against the Prophet [PBUH] have driven many Muslims to behaviours far removed from the principles of Islam.’
- ‘But behind the celebration of freedom of speech hides the arrogance of ideologists and well-fed racists who feed off the multiform humiliation of Muslims and to demonstrate the clear “superiority” of their civilisation or the validity of their resistance to the “cancer” of retrograde Islam. In criticising this ideological stance there can be no compromise either.’
- 20 Sep 12: The American Muslim website published a collection of statements by U.S. Muslim Brotherhood groups  
<http://theamericanmuslim.org/tam.php/features/articles/muslims-and-muslim-organizations-condemn-attacks-on-u.s.-embassies>
  - ISNA statement condemned “depicting Prophet Muhammad...in a very profane manner.”
  - ISNA “condemned the creation of such a hateful video, and we also call for an end to support for such mechanisms of hatred and bigotry.”
  - “...nothing justifies violent acts...”
  - MPAC condemned attacks on U.S. missions in both Cairo and Benghazi.
  - “The attacks come after a low-budget movie on YouTube called “Muhammad” incited anger by depicting Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) in a demeaning and degrading manner.”
  - CAIR issued a video aimed at demonstrators in Nigeria “*It is clear that the motive behind the film is to enrage Muslims and to display a hatred of Islam*” appealing for calm.
  - ICNA appealed for calm and added: “We also appeal to the larger American public to be wary of such attempts by individuals and groups, who in most cases have foreign ties, engaging in such hateful projects that not only endanger American and others’ lives overseas, but also incite hate attacks against minorities in America as well.”

- 17 Sep 12: Ahmed Rehab, Executive Director of CAIR-Chicago spoke on a local radio show about violence, anti-American protests resulted from anti-Muslim film. <http://www.ahmedrehab.com/2012/09/wbez-worldview-ahmed-rehab-talks-about-muslim-film-protest-violence/#more-3189>
- 19 Oct 12: University of Wisconsin-Madison scheduled an MSA event on “Islamophobia.”

### **UN Speeches**

- 25 September 2012: President Obama’s UN speech cited the YouTube film multiple times.
  - U.S. president bowed to Islamic Law on slander: “The future must not belong to those who slander the prophet of Islam”
  - “Voices of tolerance that rally vs....blasphemy”
- 25 September 2012: Pakistani PM Ali Zardari spoke.
  - "The international community must not become silent observers and should criminalize such acts that destroy the peace of the world and endanger world security by misusing freedom of expression."
- 26 September 2012 : Egyptian President Morsi’s UN speech explicitly rejected free speech, implied speech causes violence, emphasized UN responsibility to “address” speech that causes violence.
  - “UNGA as well as UNSC has the principle responsibility in addressing this phenomenon that is starting to have implications that clearly affect international peace & security”
  - “Egypt respects freedom of expression” but “one that is not used to incite hatred against anyone. One that is not directed toward one specific religion...”
  - “The obscenities that I have referred to that were recently released as part of an organized campaign against Islamic sanctities are unacceptable.” (YouTube video)
  - “We reject this. We cannot accept it,” Morsi said, his voice thin with anger. “We will not allow anyone to do this by word or deed.”

- “We have a responsibility in this international gathering to study how we can protect the world from instability and hatred.”
- 28 September 2012: Turkish FoMin Ahmet Davutoglu
  - “Unfortunately, Islamophobia has also become a new form of racism like anti-Semitism. It can no longer be tolerated under the guise of freedom of expression. Freedom does not mean anarchy.”
- 29 September 2012: OIC SecGen Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu spoke to OIC FoMins at UN Headquarters.
  - Annual Coordination meeting of OIC FoMins held on sidelines of UNGA session in NYC adopted declaration condemning the sacrilegious act of releasing the “defamatory video.”
  - OIC blamed the Benghazi attack on the film: “...serious consequences of abusing the principle of freedom of expression...”
  - Called for “adopting measures to criminalize incitement to imminent violence based on religion or belief.”
  - 29 Sep 12: During AP Interview. OIC SecGen spoke even more directly and issued thinly-veiled threats.
  - "If the Western world fails to understand the sensitivity of the Muslim world, then we are in trouble...Such provocations pose ‘a threat to international peace and security and the sanctity of life.’"
  - "You have to see that there is a provocation. You should understand the psychology of people who revere their prophet and don't want people to insult him."

## Material Support to Terrorism: The Case of Libya

Clare Lopez — April 22, 2014

<http://www.aim.org/aim-column/material-support-to-terrorism-the-case-of-libya/>



Libya in 2011 marks the place and the time that the United States (U.S.) and the Obama administration formally switched sides in the Global War on Terror (GWOT). A mere 10 years after al-Qa’eda (supported by Hizballah and Iran) attacked the American homeland in the worst act of terrorism ever suffered by this country, U.S. leadership decided to facilitate the provision of weapons to jihadist militias known to be affiliated with al-Qa’eda and the Muslim Brotherhood in order to bring down a brutal dictator who also just happened to be a U.S. ally in the GWOT at the time.

And the U.S. media were silent. The major broadcast, print, and Internet outlets said not a word about this astonishing turnabout in American foreign policy. To this day, they have not seemed even to recognize that the pivot to support al-Qa’eda took place. But it needs to be said. The American people deserve to understand that their most senior leaders, both elected and appointed, have violated their oaths to “preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.”

United States law is quite explicit about providing material support to terrorists: it's prohibited. Period. 18 U.S. Code § 2339A and 18 U.S. Code § 2339B address Providing Material Support to Terrorists or Designated Foreign Terrorist Organizations. Together, these two sections outlaw the actions of any U.S. person who attempts or conspires to provide, or actually does provide, material support to a foreign terrorist organization knowing that it has been designated a foreign terrorist organization or engages, or has engaged, in "terrorism" or "terrorist activity." Conspiracy means agreeing or planning to provide such support, whether or not such support ever is actually delivered. Penalties for conspiracy to provide material support to terrorism are stiff: imprisonment for up to 15 years and/or a fine of not more than \$250,000. Penalties for actually providing or attempting to provide material support to terrorism are even harsher: imprisonment from 15 years to life, with a life sentence applicable if the death of any person results from such crime. Aiding, abetting, counseling, or procuring in support of a violation of Section 2339B is punishable by the same penalties as for the offense itself.

The Arms Export Control Act is another law that makes it illegal for the U.S. government to export "munitions" to any country determined by the Secretary of State to have "[repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism](#)." While this provision applies specifically to those countries—Cuba, North Korea, Iran, and Syria—that are designated as state sponsors of terrorism, the case of Libya stands out nevertheless. Removed from the State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism in 2006, Libya by early 2011 was swarming with al-Qa'eda and Muslim Brotherhood militias and affiliates fighting to overthrow Muamar Qaddafi's regime.

The identities of those jihadis and their al-Qa'eda affiliations were well known to the U.S. Intelligence Community, Department of State, and Tripoli Embassy long before the 17 February 2011 revolt broke out against Muamar Qaddafi. As with other al-Qa'eda branches, the Libyan al-Qa'eda affiliates such as the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) trace their origins back to the Muslim Brotherhood in Libya, which was founded in 1949 when Egyptian Brotherhood members "[fled a crackdown in Cairo and took refuge in Benghazi](#)," according to a May 2012 study by the Brookings Doha Center. Colonel Muamar Qaddafi took over Libya in a 1969 coup d'état and showed little tolerance for Brotherhood activities. Brutal waves of repression kept the Brotherhood in check through the 1980s and 1990s when many Libyan fighters went to Afghanistan to join the mujahedeen in their battle against the Soviet Army. Some of those who fought there, like Abu Anas al-Libi and Abdelhakim Belhadj, would figure prominently in the revolt that ultimately ousted Qaddafi in 2011.

The LIFG was founded in 1990 by Libyan fighters returning from the Afghan jihad who were now intent on waging jihad at home. Qaddafi came down hard on the group, though, and crushed the LIFG's 1995-1998 insurgency. Some LIFG members had moved to

Sudan when Usama bin-Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri found refuge with Omar al-Bashir's Muslim Brotherhood regime in the early 1990s and others (including Belhadj) eventually fled back to Afghanistan, where both bin-Laden and al-Zawahiri also had relocated by the mid-1990s. Abu Anas al-Libi is alleged to have taken part in the pre-attack casing and surveillance of the U.S. Embassy in Nairobi, Kenya a few years prior to the 1998 al-Qa'eda attack there.

By 1995, things were becoming hot for the jihadis in Sudan and while bin Laden and al-Zawahiri returned to Afghanistan about this time, others such as Anas al-Libi were offered safehaven by the British. In return for political asylum in the UK, MI 6 recruited Anas al-Libi's support for a failed 1996 plot to assassinate Qaddafi. In all, Anas al-Libi lived in Manchester from 1995-2000—despite his known history of association with bin Laden, al-Zawahiri, and other AQ leaders, as well as willingness to participate in assassination plots against national leaders, as I wrote in an [October 2013 piece](#) at The Clarion Project. The U.S.'s British partners also provided asylum to Abu Abdullah As-Sadeq, the LIFG's top commander and allowed the LIFG to publish an Arabic language newspaper called *al-Wasat* in London. *By 2000, though, as the FBI and other Western security services began to close in, Anas al-Libi and others were on the move again, leaving behind a 180-page al-Qa'eda terror training manual that became known as the "Manchester Document."* In the run-up to the 11 September 2001 attacks, Anas al-Libi, Abdelhakim Belhadj, Abu Sufian bin Qumu, and other known LIFG members reconnected with bin Laden in Afghanistan. As John Rosenthal points out in a 10 October 2013 posting, "[The Inevitable Rise of Al-Qaeda in Libya](#)," in the immediate aftermath of 9/11, "the history of close cooperation between the LIFG and al-Qa'eda was so extensive that the Libyan group figured among the very first organizations to be designated as al-Qaeda affiliates by the UN Security Council." In fact, according to Rosenthal who cites former LIFG member, Norman Benotman, Belhadj was actually present with bin Laden at Tora Bora in December 2001. The LIFG was formally accepted as an al-Qa'eda franchise by Ayman al-Zawahiri, the AQ deputy at the time, in 2007.

In the years following 9/11, various LIFG members were detained: Abu Sufian bin Qumu was captured in 2002 and sent to Guantanamo Bay (GITMO) and in 2004, both Abu Anas al-Libi and Abdelhakim Belhadj were captured. By the mid-2000s, GITMO detainees were being released to their home countries. Abu Sufian bin Qumu, for example, was released from GITMO and returned to Libya in 2007. Beginning about 2005, Qaddafi was under pressure from both the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli and his own son, Seif, to begin what came to be known as "the reconciliation process," in which LIFG and other jihadist prisoners were released from Libyan jails. In this process, LIFG Muslim Brotherhood cleric Ali Mohammad Al-Sallabi was a key mediator. Abdelhakim Belhadj was released in 2008 (just as Christopher Stevens was appointed Deputy Chief of

Mission to Tripoli) and Abu Sufian bin Qumu in 2010, after which he returned to Derna to begin plotting the revolt against Qaddafi.

Even as this “reconciliation process” was underway and Christopher Stevens was preparing for his new posting, Libyan jihadis were flowing out of eastern Libya in droves to join the al-Qa’eda jihad against U.S. and coalition forces in Iraq. According to a June 2010 study compiled by the Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, “[Al-Qa’ida’s Foreign Fighters in Iraq](#),” coalition forces in Iraq captured a stash of documents in October 2007 which documented the origins of the foreign fighters who’d traveled to Iraq to join al-Qa’eda between August 2006 and August 2007. Termed the “Sinjar Records” after the nearest town where these personnel records were found, the data showed that by far the largest contingent of foreign fighters per capita came from Libya. Across the spectrum, the most common cities of origin for foreign fighters in Iraq were Darnah, Libya and Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Darnah is located in the eastern Cyrenaica region of Libya, long known as an incubator of jihadist ideology and the place which would become the cradle of the 2011 Islamic uprising against Muammar Qaddafi.

Nor was the new Deputy Chief of Mission (DCM) Christopher Stevens unaware of what was going on. A June 2008 cable from the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli that went out over Stevens’ signature was obtained by the London *Telegraph* from Wikileaks. The report was given the name “[Die Hard in Derna](#),” after the Bruce Willis movie, and described the determination of the young jihadis of this eastern Libyan town to bring down the Qaddafi regime. Because they believed the U.S. government supported the Qaddafi regime and would not allow it to fall after it had abandoned its Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) programs and begun to provide counter-terrorism support, and as documented in the West Point study of the “Sinjar Records,” the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) instead sent its fighters to confront the U.S. in Iraq, believing that was a way to strike a blow against both Qaddafi and his U.S. backers. A local Derna resident told the visiting Embassy officer that Libyan fighters who had returned from earlier battlefields in Afghanistan (1980s) and elsewhere sometimes went on for additional “[religious training](#)” in Lebanon and Syria; when they eventually returned to Libya in the late 1980s and early 1990s, they began the process of preparing the ground for “[the eventual overthrow by the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group \(LIFG\) of Muammar Qadhafi’s regime...](#)”

Career Foreign Service Officer [Christopher Stevens](#) was first posted to the American Embassy in Tripoli, Libya in June 2007 as the DCM and later as charge d’affaires until 2009. For his second tour in Libya, Stevens was sent to rebel headquarters in Benghazi, Libya, to serve as special representative to the Libyan Transitional National Council. He arrived on a Greek cargo ship on April 5, 2011 and stayed until November. [His mission](#) was to forge stronger links with the Interim Transitional National Council, and gain a better understanding of the various factions fighting the Qaddafi regime. His

reports back to Washington were said to have encouraged the U.S. to support and recognize the rebel council, which the Obama administration did formally in July 2011.

As is now known, under urging from Sen. John McCain and other Congressional members, the [White House endorsed Qatar's plan](#) to send weapons to the Libyan rebels shortly after Yousef al-Qaradawi, the senior jurist of the Muslim Brotherhood, issued a 21 February 2011 *fatwa* that called for the killing of Qaddafi. Seeking a “zero footprint,” no-paperwork-trail profile itself, the U.S. instead encouraged both Qatar and the United Arab Emirates (UAE) to arm the Libyan jihadis, according to a key [New York Times article](#) published in December 2012. Knowing full well exactly who those rebel militias and their leadership were, and how closely they were connected with al-Qa’eda (and perhaps even mindful of the legal restrictions on providing material support to terrorism), the U.S. sought to distance itself as the source of these weapons, which included small arms such as automatic rifles, machine guns, and ammunition. The *NY Times* piece noted that U.S. officials made sure to stipulate the weapons provided would come from elsewhere, but not from the U.S.

But the fact that from the end of March 2011 onward, U.S. and other NATO forces completely controlled Libyan air space and the sea approaches to Libya means that the cargo planes and freighters transporting the arms into Libya from Qatar and elsewhere were being waved through with full U.S. knowledge and support. The U.S. mission in Libya, and especially in Benghazi, ramped up in this period to facilitate the delivery of the weapons to the Libyan al-Qa’eda terrorists.

What followed should hardly have come as a surprise to anyone. After NATO air support cleared the way to Tripoli, the Qaddafi regime fell in October 2011 and the Muslim Brotherhood political leadership and al-Qa’eda fighters took over. Abdelhakim Belhadj was named Tripoli military commander. Chaos reigned, especially in the eastern regions, and now the weapons flow reversed—out of Libya, and into the hands of jihadis in West Africa, the Sinai, and Syria. Some of that flow was wildly disorganized and some of it was directed, with the U.S. mission in Benghazi once again playing a key role as its teams on the ground facilitated the weapons delivery, now destined for the Syrian rebels, dominated by al-Qa’eda and the Muslim Brotherhood, who were fighting to overthrow the Bashar al-Assad regime. In this endeavor, the U.S. was allied with its new Libyan partner, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and once again, with Qatar.

The next chapter in the U.S. jihad wars was underway, with a new Presidential Finding, and material support to terrorism firmly established as official policy. Congress and the media and the military remained silent. The American people barely noticed.

## Benghazi and the Politicization of Intelligence

Clare Lopez — March 11, 2014

<http://www.aim.org/aim-column/benghazi-and-the-politicization-of-intelligence/>



As we now know, within about 15 minutes after the start of the attack on the U.S. Special Mission Compound (SMC) in Benghazi on 11 September 2012, top U.S. civilian and uniformed officials were informed that it was a terrorist attack. The information was clear, unambiguous, and remained consistent over the chaotic hours that followed. It did not change. If anything, the exceptionally accurate final mortar strike on the CIA Annex that took the lives of former Navy SEALs Glenn Doherty and Ty Woods, and gravely injured others, provided conclusive evidence of a carefully pre-planned attack. There is simply no room for equivocation on this: it was a well-organized, military-style assault by terrorists armed with assault rifles, RPGs, and eventually a mortar.

Mike Morell, then-head of the CIA's Counterterrorism Center (CTC), had the task of helping to prepare talking points for then-U.S. Ambassador to the UN Susan Rice, who was slated to appear on five Sunday morning talk shows a few days later. Morell was personally responsible for "cutting some 50 percent of the text," including all "references to Al Qaeda" and the many earlier terror attacks against U.S. and other Western targets in Benghazi. When the Senate Intelligence Committee finally succeeded in prying loose the emails that had flowed back and forth to the CIA, State Department and the White House during the talking points editing process, it was clear that Morell not only had misrepresented his own role, but also had been less than forthcoming about the close oversight role played by the White House in ensuring that all references to al-Qa'eda

terrorism would be scrubbed. Morell also made sure to scrub from the talking points the honest assessment that “We cannot rule out that individuals had previously surveilled the U.S. facilities, also contributing to the efficacy of the attacks.”

With the President in a close re-election race and touting the obviously inaccurate meme that al-Qa’eda was on the run and close to defeat, it wouldn’t have helped to admit that Islamic terrorists, after what was likely weeks of planning and rehearsal, had just overrun a U.S. diplomatic post in North Africa and killed four Americans. Better to obfuscate until the election was safely behind them. Besides, “What difference does it make?” that the most senior officials of the U.S. government deliberately subverted the intelligence process as long as it helped ensure the President’s re-election?

Nearly as troubling as Morell’s misleading congressional testimony was the overwhelming silence from senior Defense Department officials, who also knew full well that Susan Rice’s talk-show narrative was false—and yet remained silent. Republican chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, [Mike Rogers \(MI\)](#) indicated on 27 February 2014 that Morell likely will be called back to clarify his testimony.

There is no doubt that top officials at the Defense Department knew almost immediately that the Benghazi attack was a terrorist attack—and given the stream of reporting about al-Qa’eda’s increasingly aggressive behavior during the months leading up to the 11 September 2012 final attack, also should have had few doubts about who was responsible. According to [closed door classified testimony](#) on 26 June 2013 before the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation, AFRICOM commander Gen. Carter Ham (who happened to be in the Pentagon that night) immediately told Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) Gen. Martin Dempsey about the attack, saying that it was unambiguously a terrorist attack. The two of them—Panetta, and Dempsey—then departed from the Pentagon together for a previously-scheduled meeting with President Obama at the White House.

Even as these Defense officials were briefing the President on what was happening in Benghazi, telling him that the U.S. Ambassador to Tripoli, Christopher Stevens, was missing, the same information about the attack was reaching the Pentagon and key combatant commands, all of which were told the same thing: it was a terrorist attack. Later that night, [Greg Hicks](#), the Deputy Chief of Mission (DCM) in Tripoli, spoke by phone with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and other top State Department advisors, telling them that he feared Ambassador Stevens might be in the clutches of terrorists at a Benghazi hospital and that he was concerned about the possibility of a terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli as well. He soon learned from the Libyan prime minister that Stevens was dead, and relayed that information to the State Department at around 9 p.m. Washington time. But there was still nothing about a video. Nothing at all.

Then came the 10 p.m. phone call from the President to Secretary of State Clinton—the person that almost no one (except [Andrew McCarthy here](#)) mentions. This was the 10 p.m. phone call that White House spokesman [Jay Carney](#) reluctantly mentioned on 20

February 2013 in response to questions from the press corps. According to CNS News, the President called Clinton “to get an update on the situation.” It was right afterward that Clinton released a statement linking the attacks to “inflammatory material posted on the Internet,” a reference to “The Innocence of Muslims” YouTube film trailer. As it turned out, that deliberately duplicitous initial reference to a video that had nothing to do with the attack on the Benghazi SMC presaged a full two weeks of false statements from President Obama, Secretary Clinton, White House spokesman Jay Carney, and others about the film clip.

Neither Morell, nor any other top Obama administration official, has any excuse for not knowing the attack was a terrorist attack, or for thinking somehow that a demonstration or protests had preceded it. According to FOX News journalist Catherine Herridge, a report from the CIA’s own senior officer on the ground in Tripoli, Libya confirmed in a 15 September 2012 email that the attack was “not/not an escalation of protests,” but rather a coordinated terror attack. That email was received by Morell, CIA Director David Petraeus, and other senior CIA officials a full day before Susan Rice was sent out to broadcast false information to the American people on the 16 September Sunday talk shows.

But Morell still wasn’t coming clean on everything. In November 2012, Morell was once again before the House Intelligence Committee, along with Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, and CTC Chief Matt Olsen. When asked who had been responsible for the talking points, Clapper said that he had no idea, while Morell remained silent. In another meeting that took place in late 2012, Morell again seemed to have trouble telling the truth. He and Rice met with Senators Kelly Ayotte (R-NH), John McCain (R-AZ), and Lindsey Graham (R-SC). Under questioning from the senators about the talking-points editing process, Morell tried to blame the FBI for cutting the reference to al-Qa’eda terrorism; he said the FBI didn’t want to compromise an ongoing criminal investigation. When Graham called the FBI and told them what Morell had said, “they went ballistic,” Graham said in an interview with Fox News. Confronted with this, Morell changed his statement and admitted that he, and the CIA, had been responsible after all.

Confusion in the early hours, and even early days, following a chaotic situation such as that which confronted U.S. leadership on 11 September 2012 would be understandable. But it is the certain knowledge that our most senior civilian, intelligence, and military officers deliberately and repeatedly lied, including before Congress, about what they knew at the time to be a terrorist attack on our mission by al-Qa’eda jihadis that so corrodes Americans’ trust in their leadership. This is particularly damaging because there is the appearance of a coordinated cover-up staged to ensure the re-election of a President who’d staked his campaign on the repeated assertion that al-Qa’eda had been “decimated,” or was on “the path to defeat.”

In July 2013, Mike Morell joined the consulting firm of Beacon Global Strategies LLC, which had been founded not long beforehand by four others with close ties to former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton: Michael Allen, Jeremy Bash, Philippe Reines, and

Andrew Shapiro (who was the Assistant Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs from 2009-2013, with responsibility for security relationships with U.S. Middle East partners).

*Clare M. Lopez is Vice President for Research and Analysis at the Center for Security Policy and a Senior Fellow at the London Center for Policy Research. She is also a member of the Citizens' Commission on Benghazi.*

## Obama and His Media Loyalists Still Spinning Benghazi

Roger Aronoff — February 6, 2014

<http://www.aim.org/aim-column/obama-and-his-media-loyalists-still-spinning-benghazi/>



The media and Obama administration are at it again, trying to defend their earlier actions on Benghazi. For weeks following the September 11, 2012 attacks, President Obama and his colleagues blamed them on a spontaneous demonstration inspired by protests in Cairo, a position that has been repeatedly found to be patently untrue.

But Obama would prefer that the American public ignore this and his other “phony” scandals. In fact, he told Bill O’Reilly in a recent pre-Super Bowl interview that scandals like the IRS controversy are the result of irresponsible reporting by Fox News. “These kinds of things keep on surfacing in part because you and your TV station will promote them,” he told O’Reilly.

In an effort to convince us that Benghazi is not a scandal, Obama, arguing with O’Reilly, once again attempted to defend his completely indefensible narrative that in fact he said from day one that it was a terrorist attack (or in his words, “an act of terror”), and that the decision to claim the attack was the result of a spontaneous demonstration, sparked by an anti-Islam video, was made with the best information available.

As Accuracy in Media has reported, General Carter Ham, head of AFRICOM, told

then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta on the night of the attacks that there was a terrorist attack, not a spontaneous demonstration, in Benghazi. When asked about that, Obama maintained that Secretary Panetta told him that evening that it was just a plain “attack.”

O’Reilly pressed the point. “Understand, by definition, Bill, when somebody is attacking our compound, that’s an act of terror, which is how I characterized it the day after it happened,” responded President Obama. “So, the question ends up being, who in fact was attacking us?”

It turns out, according to a recently released [Senate Select Committee on Intelligence report](#), that the attackers were a mix of low-level terrorists: “Individuals affiliated with terrorist groups, including [Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb], Ansar al-Sharia, [Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula], and the Mohammad Jamal Network, participated in the September 11, 2012 attacks,” states the report. Ansar al Sharia was recently designated a foreign terrorist organization by the administration.

But Obama still characterizes the attack differently. “What happens is you have an attack like this taking place, and you have a mix of folks who just are troublemakers, you have folks who have an ideological agenda, you have some who are affiliated with terrorist organizations, you have some that are not,” he said.

Indeed, the SSCI report classifies the attack as “not a highly coordinated plot, but...opportunistic.”

However, to claim that that they couldn’t classify it as a terrorist attack at the time is disingenuous. Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) recently revealed that the FBI interviewed witnesses to the attacks on September 15, 16, and 17, and “not one person ever mentioned anything other than a terrorist attack. No one mentioned a protest outside the consulate.” Sen. Graham is backed up by the findings of the bipartisan “Flashing Red” report of December 2012. Yet the myth of a spontaneous protest in Benghazi lives on.

And the debate could be seen on [MSNBC](#), when in a post-State of the Union segment that included an interview with Representative Tim Huelskamp (R-KS), Rachel Maddow was left babbling, seemingly trying to turn the debate into a “War on Women” issue by suggesting that the congressman was being sexist in calling her a cheerleader. Maddow had just finished asking the congressman whether he had voted for bills that slashed funding for diplomatic posts in response to his outrage about Benghazi.

But that is a phony issue, and Maddow must know that. State Department official Charlene Lamb had testified before the House that funding had nothing to do with the decisions surrounding Benghazi’s ongoing poor security.

**Maddow:** “Did you just call me a cheerleader?”

**Rep. Huelskamp:** “I don’t know, maybe you have that history. I’m saying—”

**Maddow:** “No, wait, wait. Hold on. Hold on.”

**Rep. Huelskamp:** “When you’re a cheerleader for the administration, you’re not being a journalist. When you’re not willing to look at the facts. If it was Bush, you would be jumping and screaming.”

**Maddow:** “You’re amazing.”

Rep. Huelskamp made it clear that he was calling Maddow a cheerleader *for the Obama administration*. And, given her history, who could deny that?

Then Mr. *Thrill-up-his-leg* Chris Matthews jumped in to claim that the SSCI report was a vindication of President Obama’s and Susan Rice’s position on Benghazi.

Clearly, Matthews either doesn’t know what’s in the report, or he’s just doing his usual defend-Obama-at-all-costs routine. “And also, by the way, the non-partisan—or bipartisan, Senate Intelligence Committee has completely verified everything that Susan Rice said, every point,” contended Matthews. “[The attack] was caused by a copycat attack coming from Cairo over to Benghazi, which was itself stimulated by all the evidence they have by that crazy movie guy making a movie out in Los Angeles,” he continued. “And the fact that the use of the term extremist rather than terrorist came from the CIA, and the non-reference to the al Qaeda was a decision by the sainted General Petraeus at the CIA. Everything was done right.”

But wait. Didn’t President Obama call it an “act of terror” from day one? If he knew it was a terrorist act, and not a spontaneous demonstration, why did Susan Rice, speaking on his behalf, say otherwise?

“Some intelligence suggests the attacks were likely put together in short order, following that day’s violent protests in Cairo against an inflammatory video, suggesting that these and other terrorist groups could conduct similar attacks with little advance warning,” states the report. This has been used by some to say that the spontaneous demonstration narrative is true.

However, the report does not call the attack a “copycat” attack, as Matthews does. In fact, the report says that “intelligence analysts inaccurately referred to the presence of a protest at the [Benghazi] Mission facility...” and didn’t rely enough on eyewitness statements in their data collection.

As stated before, the eyewitnesses called it a terrorist attack in their interviews with the FBI. Former Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya Gregory Hicks characterized the YouTube video as a “non-event in Libya” in his testimony before the House.

Clearly, some controversy remains over these points, and the difference in opinion appears to be between those sitting in their offices that night in the nation’s capital, who tried to spin the least harmful narrative two months before a presidential election, and those on the ground in Libya at the time. To suggest that Obama and Rice did everything right, and that they did not mislead the public, is also disingenuous on Matthews’ part.

*Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media, and can be contacted at [roger.aronoff@aim.org](mailto:roger.aronoff@aim.org).*

## New York Times Attempts to Blur Benghazi Scandal

Roger Aronoff and Bethany Stotts — December 31, 2013

<http://www.aim.org/aim-column/new-york-times-attempts-to-blur-benghazi-scandal/>



The New York Times' latest piece on Benghazi is a farce, and some media outlets are calling the paper on this agenda-driven reporting. The piece, by Times reporter David Kirkpatrick, argues that the attacks on the Special Mission Compound and CIA Annex last year were in reaction to a YouTube video, and that there was no involvement by al Qaeda. If the Times thought this article would be the final word, they were badly mistaken. The effect has been to bring Benghazi back front and center, where it is getting new, badly needed scrutiny.

Accuracy in Media has, time and again, disproven these points. But, given, the misinformation put forward by the Gray Lady, the facts bear repeating:

“Months of investigation by The New York Times, centered on extensive interviews with Libyans in Benghazi who had direct knowledge of the attack there and its context, turned up *no evidence that Al Qaeda or other international terrorist groups had any role in the assault*,” reported The New York Times (emphasis added). “The attack was led, instead, by fighters who had benefited directly from NATO’s extensive air power and logistics support during the uprising against Colonel Qaddafi.”

“I think, honestly, if you asked anyone in the U.S. intelligence business, they would tell you the same thing,” said Kirkpatrick on NBC’s Meet the Press. “There’s just no chance that this was an al-Qaeda attack, if, by al Qaeda you mean the organization founded by Osama bin Laden.”

AIM asked James Woolsey, former CIA director under President Clinton, about al Qaeda in a different context, for the documentary “Confronting Iraq.” “Al-Qaeda is both an organization and, in a sense, an ideology,” he told us. In either sense of the term used for “al Qaeda,” they were definitely involved in Benghazi.

But even if The New York Times were correct in its two main assertions, that would not exonerate President Barack Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton for the administration’s repeated decisions not to increase security at the Special Mission Compound despite the deteriorating situation in Benghazi. Nor would it address what is perhaps the biggest part of the scandal, the failure to send available forces to attempt to save the people under attack. That was what motivated many high-ranking military and CIA officers to come together to form the [Citizens’ Commission on Benghazi](#), and it has never been satisfactorily explained.

Matthew Vadum, writing for [Front Page Magazine](#), outlines this blurring of the lines on Benghazi for just what it is: a shameless attempt to find “wiggle room” for Hillary Clinton’s political career. Vadum argues that the “New York Times is attempting to rewrite the narrative about what really happened in Benghazi and afterwards.” He writes, “It is trying to resurrect the Obama administration’s original line of argument in order to create wiggle room for Hillary Clinton who has been scathingly criticized by Republican lawmakers and the occasional Democrat for bungling the Benghazi saga.”

The Times’ editorial page editor, Andrew Rosenthal, [pushed back](#) against charges that the Times’ was providing political cover for Mrs. Clinton and President Obama:

For anyone wondering why it’s so important to Republicans that Al Qaeda orchestrated the attack—or how the Obama administration described the attack in its immediate aftermath—the answer is simple. The Republicans hope to tarnish Democratic candidates by making it seem as though Mr. Obama doesn’t take Al Qaeda seriously. They also want to throw mud at former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who they fear will run for president in 2016.

Charles Krauthammer, on Fox News’ Special Report, responded to Rosenthal’s defense of Kirkpatrick’s piece, saying, “Well, I think he gave the game away. By being defensive about this, he’s making it quite obvious the reason that the Times invested all the effort and time in this, and put on the front page precisely a way to protect the Democrats, to deflect the issue, to protect Hillary, who is exposed on this issue as almost no issue in her tenure in the administration. It is obviously a political move.”

The Times piece virtually ignores the security situation in Benghazi at the time, instead focusing partly on a video and its supposed impact on the attacks. As mentioned above, Kirkpatrick believes that local militias who defeated Gaddafi

are responsible for the attack, not al Qaeda. “Some analysts argue that the White House, meanwhile, sought to play down any potential characterization of the assault as a Qaeda attack, because that would undercut its claims to have crushed Al Qaeda,” wrote Kirkpatrick very ironically in [October of 2012](#) for the Gray Lady. Is he serving that White House purpose now?

Even Democratic Congressman [Adam Schiff](#) (CA) said that “the intelligence indicates that al-Qaeda was involved, but there were also plenty of people and militias that were unaffiliated with al-Qaeda that were involved.” As for the Times report, it may “add some insights, but I don’t think it’s complete,” he said.

The article even contradicts comments from Hillary Clinton, as [reported in The New York Times](#) on September 26<sup>th</sup>, 2012, while the Obama administration was still trying to get its story straight:

‘Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb has long operated in the region,’ she [Sec. Clinton] said, and was now exploiting a haven in Mali to export extremism and terrorist violence to neighbors like Libya.

‘Now with a larger safe haven and increased freedom to maneuver, terrorists are seeking to extend their reach and their networks in multiple directions,’ Mrs. Clinton told leaders assembled at the meeting, including President François Hollande of France and the United Nations secretary general, Ban Ki-moon. ‘And they are working with other violent extremists to undermine the democratic transitions under way in North Africa, *as we tragically saw in Benghazi*’ (emphasis added).

Fox News’ Adam Housley was able to elicit statements from his sources about The New York Times’ reporting, [one of which was](#), “To say that it wasn’t tied to Al Qaeda is completely false. There is literal evidence in many forms and shapes, directly linking him [Ahmad Abu Khattalah].”

Other intelligence links al Qaeda to the attacks, including the CIA and FBI internal emails at the time. In an email sent on September 14, 2012 from the CIA, a staffer wrote “Thanks... Fyi FBI says AQ (not AQIM) was involved and they are pushing that theory.”

The New York Times uses Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb’s (AQIM’s) lack of stated involvement in a letter found in Mali by the Associated Press as further proof that al Qaeda was not involved in the attacks, when the email cited above demonstrates that intelligence sources were analyzing *core al Qaeda* involvement days after the attacks occurred.

Fox News correspondent [Catherine Herridge](#) points out that her news organization revealed that “A former Guantanamo detainee, Sufian bin Qumu, who is suspected of training some of the operatives who took part in the assault,

was in Benghazi on September 11, 2012, according to a knowledgeable source.”

“Fox News was told last fall that the intelligence community was trying to determine whether he played any role directing the attack and whether he was physically on or near the consulate grounds.”

Of Qumu, the Times says: “But neither Mr. Qumu nor anyone else in Derna appears to have played a significant role in the attack on the American Mission, officials briefed on the investigation and the intelligence said.”

So, contradictions still endure in this case, but we are supposed to take the Times’ unnamed official source as the gospel truth.

As for Ansar al Sharia, The New York Times actually quotes from a militia leader who likened it to the Boy Scouts, and also talks about all the charitable things that Ansar al Sharia does: “Ansar al-Shariah focused on charitable missionary work, including an antidrug campaign with local corporate sponsors, picking up garbage during sanitation strikes and offering exorcisms for those troubled by evil spirits.” Al Nusrah does charitable deeds in Syria; that doesn’t absolve it from its position as an al Qaeda-linked terrorist group.

Ansar al Sharia is connected to al Qaeda, and has been connected since before the attacks. As pointed out in a recent AIM column, an August 2012 government counterterrorism report stated that “Ansar al-Sharia (Supporters of Sharia), a militia group led by Sufian Ben Qhumu, a former Guantanamo Bay detainee, could be the *new face of al-Qaeda* in Libya despite its leader’s denial” (emphasis added).

“In a different direction, Ansar al-Sharia may become the new brand name under which jihadist groups in the Arab world seek to organize,” the report stated. These are not words describing a locally oriented group.

“But the Republican arguments appear to conflate purely local extremist organizations like Ansar al-Shariah with Al Qaeda’s international terrorist network,” reported Kirkpatrick in his controversial Times’ piece.

It wasn’t Republicans who wrote the August 2012 Library of Congress report we’ve cited.

As for the spontaneity of the attack, Kirkpatrick writes that “The attack does not appear to have been meticulously planned, but neither was it spontaneous or without warning signs.”

“The violence, though, also had spontaneous elements.”

Let's put aside, for a moment, that Representative Mike Rogers (R-MI), Chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, has said that he thought the operational phase of the attack lasted at least a couple of weeks. Libyan National Congress President Mohamed Yousef El-Magariaf estimated that they had been planning it for *months* when he appeared on CBS's Face the Nation on September 16, 2012. The Times mentions Susan Rice's talk show appearances, but not Magariaf's Face the Nation appearance—which took place immediately before Rice's.

The idea that the attacks were the result of the video—which the Times argues—is pure “baloney,” according to Aaron Klein writing for WorldNetDaily. After all, “A review of more than 4,000 postings was conducted by the leading social media monitoring firm Agincourt Solutions, reportedly finding the first reference to the film was not detected on social media until the day after the attack,” reports Klein. Former Deputy Chief of Mission in Libya Gregory Hicks, testifying before Congress, characterized the video as a “non-event” in Libya at the time.

“It was a coordinated attack. It is completely false to say anything else. ... It is completely a lie,” one witness tells Fox News.

“For this individual [Kirkpatrick] to insult the intelligence of the American people is offensive,” asserted former Congressman Allen West in a recent editorial. “To them, if some jihadist does not walk up, give them a business card, and say, ‘Hi, I’m from al-Qaeda and I’m here to kill you,’ then the threat isn’t real and can be pushed aside.” West is a member of Accuracy in Media’s Citizens’ Commission on Benghazi.

*Roger Aronoff is the Editor of Accuracy in Media, and can be contacted at [roger.aronoff@aim.org](mailto:roger.aronoff@aim.org). Bethany Stotts is a freelance writer, and former staff writer for Accuracy in Academia. She blogs at <http://bethanystotts.wordpress.com/>.*

***“There is, however, a limit at which forbearance ceases to be a virtue.”***

*~ Edmund Burke*

The Honorable John Boehner  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives  
The Capitol, H-232  
Washington, D.C., 20515

March 5, 2014

Dear Speaker Boehner,

Through the investigative journalism of *Fox News* reporter Catherine Herridge, a report of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and the investigation and litigation efforts of Judicial Watch, we now know that there is compelling evidence that former Acting Central Intelligence Director Michael Morell has made false and misleading statements to Congress. This issue demands your immediate personal attention.

We were pleased to see that our letter of January 6, 2014 may have persuaded you and your various committee chairs investigating the Benghazi attacks to make some limited efforts to promote information gathered through the uncoordinated work of the House.

But the establishment of the Internet website, “The House Republican Investigation of Benghazi” only highlights the inadequacies of House efforts to date. Most Americans, in addition to a large majority of your party’s caucus, demand a full and complete investigation of this terror attack. Mr. Morell’s statements and conduct appear to have materially contributed to confusing and misleading the Congress and the American people. Susan Rice’s latest rounds of lies about Benghazi on the February 23, 2014 edition of *Meet the Press* illustrate the contempt that this Administration has for your committees’ investigation to date.

Americans want facts and justice – not controlled leaks of heavily redacted interview transcripts. The latest polling shows, “Sixty-six percent of voters want Congress to keep investigating the White House’s handling of Benghazi. That includes 50 percent of Democrats, 68 percent of Independents and 83 percent of Republicans.”

Once again, we urge you to now create a House Select Investigative Committee on Benghazi – fully resourced with staff and subpoena powers – to conduct a thorough, coordinated investigation.

Mr. Morell must be compelled to appear before Congress and explain his statements and conduct. Even if he invokes his right not to testify under the Fifth Amendment, then the Congress must pursue, through a Select Committee, the many unanswered questions and apparent Obama administration cover-up of the terror attacks that cost the lives of Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens, Foreign Service Officer Sean Smith, and Security Officers Glen Doherty and Ty Woods.

In addition to these new concerns about potentially false and misleading testimony and information being provided to Congress, there are a host of *other* Benghazi-related questions that remain unanswered. Most troubling perhaps are the still unresolved questions about whether any Obama Administration officials prevented available military assets, especially in the African

Command (AFRICOM), from being used to protect and secure American personnel and facilities under attack in Benghazi. Indeed, Judicial Watch recently obtained new documents, first uncovered by a retired military officer, that dramatically highlight significant U.S. Navy assets that could have been deployed to assist and protect U.S. lives on September 11, 2012.

Gravely disturbing evidence of possible criminality and abuse of both public office and the public trust is now before you. **Mr. Speaker, you must act now.**

Sincerely,

**The Undersigned**

## “History of the Muslim Brotherhood Penetration of the U.S. Government”

Clare M. Lopez

Gatestone Institute – April 15, 2013

<http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/3672/muslim-brotherhood-us-government>

*As bad as these developments were, things became immeasurably worse for American national security under the administration of Barack Obama. Whereas President Bush and most of his administration insiders remained largely unaware that they had been manipulated by the Muslim Brotherhood, Obama and his close advisors proactively chose to reach out to the Brotherhood, its affiliates, and supporters for advice, training, and even administration appointments.*

....

*Another senior affiliate, Rashad Hussain, is the Obama administration's envoy to the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC). Hussain's background is replete with Muslim Brotherhood associations, including the American Muslim Council (founded by al-Qa'eda and Muslim Brotherhood operative, Abdurahman Alamoudi); the IIIT (which is on the Brotherhood's own list of "our friends and the organizations of our friends"); and the Muslim Students Association (MSA, the original Brotherhood front group in the U.S.).<sup>[82]</sup> In his official capacity, Hussain is responsible for providing advice on national security and Muslim outreach. He assisted in writing the President's June 2009 Cairo speech, in which Obama announced a new approach to the Muslim world and essentially declared war on his host, then-President Hosni Mubarak, by publicly signaling his recognition of the outlawed Muslim Brotherhood. Hussain also acts as point man for the Obama administration's cooperation with the Istanbul Process, the OIC effort to criminalize internationally any criticism of Islam. The current administration's weeks-long duplicity in the aftermath of the 11 September 2012 terror attack on the U.S. mission in Benghazi, Libya, when it repeatedly and mendaciously claimed that an Internet video trailer sparked a protest there that got out of hand, appears to have been carefully scripted not just with the OIC but Muslim Brotherhood organizations in the U.S., as well.*