



Benghazi: Forgotten Scandal, Misplaced Debate

January 23, 2013

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton testified before Congress this week regarding the September 11, 2012 terrorist attack on the American consulate in Benghazi, Libya.

Remember the scandal surrounding this attack?

We'll forgive you if you don't ... it's difficult to recall considering the mainstream media put Benghazi on a shelf for several months pending the reelection of U.S. President Barack Obama (a favor it wouldn't have extended to just any president/ future president).

Anyway, Clinton – the odds-on favorite to follow Obama into the White House come January 2017 – told lawmakers she bore the ultimate responsibility for this fiasco, which resulted in four dead Americans (including a U.S. Ambassador).

“I take responsibility,” Clinton said. “Nobody is more committed to getting this right. I am determined to leave the State Department and our country safer, stronger and more secure.”

Yet while taking responsibility, Clinton testified she never saw a request from the consulate seeking additional security – and hotly disputed the contention her agency failed to properly identify the threat it was facing.

“With all due respect, what difference at this point does it make?” an exasperated Clinton told lawmakers. “We have four dead Americans. It's our job to figure out what happened and make sure it never happens again. People were trying in real time to get to the information.”

Reaction to Clinton's testimony broke down along familiar lines ... with liberals touting her performance and “conservatives” decrying it.

Of course the real questions went unaddressed ... questions like (1) what the fuck were we doing in Libya in the first place? And (2) Why are we now engaging in the same sort of “diplomacy” in Mali?

“The buck stops with Secretary Clinton – and it should,” writes Malou Innocent of The Cato Institute. “But members of Congress will focus on politically charged and distracting issues. The terrorist attack on the consulate was abhorrent. However, a broader discussion about the NATO-led regime change in Libya—and its unfolding political aftermath in Mali – would be a better use of Congress's time.”

We agree ...

America got sucked into Libya because NATO decided the country was “ripe for regime change.” Now the same thing is happening in Mali.

“On the course of supposedly demonstrating America’s selflessness in the promotion of democracy abroad, the administration compromised the integrity of our institutions at home,” Innocent adds. “In that respect, the Libyan adventure has added to the steady aggrandizement of America’s imperial presidency. Secretary Clinton probably won’t go into any of that, and pitchfork wielding senators likely won’t ask her about those far-reaching consequences.”

Bottom line? It’s impossible to get murdered someplace you ain’t ...