

Of Black Curtains and Shiny Objects

“CAPABLE OF JUST ABOUT ANY TREACHERY”

by Joseph DeMaio, ©2013



Have CIA employees been intimidated into silence by the Obama crime syndicate?

(Aug. 5, 2013) — Well, the “phony” Benghazi atrocity just gets more and more authentic. We now learn from CNN – of all sources – that there were dozens of CIA operatives on the ground in Benghazi on September 11, 2012, when four Americans were left to die while the usurper-in-chief jetted off to a fundraiser in Las Vegas. It is an extraordinary outrage for such an act of war to take place (yes, it was an act of war) and have as its only immediate consequence the head of state making sure he is not late for the campaign road.

Classy? Not. Typical? Very. Treasonous? Perhaps.

Make no mistake: when the truth comes out – as it *always* does – the cover-up and stonewalling now being orchestrated from regime headquarters on Pennsylvania Avenue will make the scandals of Teapot Dome, Watergate and Lewinsky combined look like kindergarten recess. Like an obsidian curtain of deception, with even blacker borders of treachery, the regime’s efforts to obscure the truth proceed apace.

And all the while, its principals and sycophants prattle on: “OOooo, look over there at the shiny, ‘phony’ IRS object;” “Oh, look over there at the shiny Zimmerman/Martin object;” “Ahhh, look over there at the shiny Fast and Furious ‘phony’ object...,” but whatever you do..., don’t try to see what objects might exist behind the black Benghazi curtain.

CNN reporter Jake Tapper [reports](#) that not only were there many CIA operatives on the ground in Benghazi, in the eleven months of black curtain stonewalling emanating from the “white” house, there has been unprecedented intimidation directed at CIA employees with knowledge of what really happened that night... to clam up.

Tapper reports that, since January of this year, CIA contract employees and operatives in Libya have been subjected to frequent, even monthly polygraph examinations to make sure that there are no leaks of the truth to the media or to members of Congress. Rumors of compelled non-disclosure statements being extracted from witnesses with first-hand knowledge of the truth abound.

Indeed, Congressman Trey Gowdy (R-SC) noted on [Fox News](#) that the CIA has gone so far as to create aliases for various of its personnel and has moved them to different duty stations in order to further frustrate congressional investigators' efforts to find and interview these people.

Seriously? Does the CIA and its new usurper-approved capo, John Brennan, not understand that all they are doing is incubating a *greater* likelihood that the Benghazi scandal will soon go supernova on them and dwarf all other authentic scandals rocking the presidency? Do the left-hand spooks not realize that it is dangerous to threaten and intimidate the right-hand spooks? And, by the way, is not what we are now witnessing the quintessential definition of "cover-up?"

What, pray tell, could be so damningly incendiary as to initiate a protocol of threats, polygraph tests and intimidation by the CIA against its *own people* to make sure that whatever happened that night – and more importantly, why it was *allowed* to happen – remains behind the black curtain?

One theory postulates that the regime, through the CIA, was involved in arms shipments from Libya through Turkey to rebels in Syria and that the CIA operatives were actively engaged in that arms trafficking when the attack [occurred](#). There seems to be a growing body of anecdotal evidence that this was, in fact, what was happening... but much of the actual trafficking was going on at the port of Benghazi, where a Libyan ship with weapons on board, disguised (of course) as "humanitarian aid," was [moored](#).

Yet if that theory were correct, why was Ambassador Stevens targeted at the U.S. consulate miles away? Moreover, if gun-running were the target, would it not make sense to try to repel the attack in order to keep the operation intact and "under the radar?" If such a "dicey" operation were being conducted, would not the natural reaction be to fight back to keep it secret? And, by the way, after the attack, was any cache of these weapons found? Why no effort to repel the attack? Too many loose ends to nail this one down as the underlying reason for the siege, but with the regime's black curtain concealing the truth, who knows?

On the other hand, there is another theory circulating which seems to be gaining more traction, because it answers a lot of the more difficult questions still obscured by the regime's stonewalling. That theory, previously noted [here](#) at The P&E, was that the attack was part of a botched attempt to kidnap U.S. Ambassador to Libya Christopher Stevens.

Under this theory, the kidnapping plot was going along smoothly until former U.S. Navy Seals Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods seemingly disobeyed orders to "stand down" and valiantly fought – to their deaths – to protect and save Ambassador Stevens from harm. They presumably got the memo to stand down, but they disobeyed it and – for hours and hours – fought back.... oh, and with *zero* assistance from the American military.... a military, by the way, ultimately under the command of you-know-who.

From reports thus far released, the only outside “presence” of American assets showing up *after* the attack began was an unmanned drone “monitoring” the situation on the ground and relaying the video back to Washington.... in real time. Who knows, maybe the video even made it out to Las Vegas.

The core premise of the theory is that Ambassador Stevens was to be kidnapped and held hostage until the regime agreed to the kidnappers’ demands for the release from federal prison of Sheikh Omar Abdel-Rahman, the “[Blind Sheikh](#).” Rahman, of course, is the Islamist now doing life at the minimum security federal correctional “medical facility” in Butner, North Carolina arising from his conviction on charges of “seditious conspiracy” concerning the 1993 World Trade Center bombing.

In this regard, it has been hypothesized (smoking gun yet to be discovered, but powder burns beginning to appear...) that the usurper’s comrade in arms, now-deposed Egyptian President Mohammad Morsi, was [behind](#) the attempt. Morsi has made little secret of his desire to have Rahman [released](#) from prison for “humanitarian reasons.” Moreover, the fact that a cell phone video from the night of the attack showing one of the attackers approaching the lens (presumably held by one of the U.S. compound’s Libyan “security detail” defenders) shouting in Arabic “Don’t shoot us. We were sent by Morsi” would seem to ratify that theory.

And, as noted [here](#), the security for the Benghazi U.S. compound was not through the military, but instead contracted through Hillary Clinton’s State Department. Specifically, the State Department hired the Libyan February 17th Martyrs Brigade to provide security. The F17MB has allegiances to both Al-Qaeda and one of the groups identified in a Libyan Intelligence document released after Libyan officials – not, significantly, the CIA or the FBI, despite the death of an American ambassador – arrested and interrogated various individuals suspected of participating in the attack.

With friends like Hillary Clinton, who needs enemies?

But now comes the conspiratorial – and, of course, hypothetical – twist: It is one thing for an Islamist head of state – and by the way, also head of the radical Islamist Muslim Brotherhood – to plot to kidnap a U.S. ambassador; it is quite another to conspire *with* the kidnappers to facilitate the kidnapping by minimizing the risk of resistance which would frustrate the ultimate goal. Stevens, of course, could not be told of the plot, because he would likely balk. But with guarantees of his safety from Morsi and the kidnappers, who would be the wiser?

What if – hypothetically speaking only, of course – there were a pre-attack “understanding” that Ambassador Stevens would be “peacefully” taken to a safe place somewhere (“kidnap” is, after all, such a harsh term...) to be secured and protected until, say, a week or so before the U.S. November 6 general election? For interim public consumption purposes, of course, and particularly for the editorial pages of Pravda on the Hudson and the Washington Post, the “peril” being faced by Ambassador Stevens at the hands of the “radical” and “unstable” Islamist kidnappers as the election drew near would

have to seem “real.” And the crisis, of course, would necessitate 24/7 coverage so that it would not go to waste. Perhaps even Chris Matthews could weigh in.

What if, as part of a “humanitarian deal” – surely there would be no hint of a political agenda... would there ...? – an exchange of Ambassador Stevens for Rahman just happened to come to fruition on, say, November 1? What if a newly-freed Stevens landed at Andrews Air Force Base on Saturday, November 3, and on the tarmac was warmly greeted and hugged by the usurper in chief? Stevens would naturally gush his thanks for being rescued.

Pravda on the Hudson and WaPo would go nuts with praise for the cool, steady statesmanship displayed by his eminence. The fact that Rahman had to be released would be a footnote: heck, he was old and not a big threat anyway. It’s a big win-win for everyone. Oh, and speaking of wins, the event could maybe... just maybe... improve the usurper’s chances at the polls next week, since at that point of the campaign, the actual outcome was very much up in the air and even trending away from the regime. The tingle running up Chris Matthews’ leg this time would power New York City for a year. Maybe more... Matthews has a big leg.....

Far-fetched? Maybe. But what other theory adequately explains why, despite Ambassador Stevens’ pleas *before* the attack for more security, his requests were disregarded? What other theory adequately explains why, *while* the attack was ongoing, no military aid was sent and those in a position to help were ordered to “stand down?” And what other theory adequately explains why, if CIA personnel on the ground that night saw and heard what was happening, they are now being threatened and intimidated into silence?

What would be worse: disclosure that the regime was funneling weapons to Syrian rebels through Libya and Turkey; or disclosure that a conspiracy existed between the regime and Morsi to allow the kidnapping of Stevens pending his release in exchange for the Blind Sheikh...., on November 1, 2012?

People believe what they want to believe. Hey, there are still a lot of people out there who still believe that, on the basis of the posting to the Internet of a computer generated image of a birth certificate (and likely a fraudulent one, at that), the usurper is actually a natural born citizen eligible to the presidency. He likely is not, of course, but that won’t stop a lot of people from believing it and rejecting any and all evidence to the contrary.

Moreover, we now have Fourth Estate so deeply intoxicated with the nation’s first non-white president (and despite propaganda to the contrary, he is not the first “black” chief executive) that it is willing to ignore, ridicule, denigrate and lampoon those who would demand more proof of presidential eligibility than a picture on the Internet. Having facilitated that bamboozling of the people, the potential for successfully pulling off a second mega-ruse, and then covering it up, would be... greater than zero.

But like all conspiracies, the inevitable “glitch” will always be a problem. Such a plan would have needed to be a super-duper-top-secret-need-to-know-encrypted-eyes-only plot. It would also have needed to depend on those tasked with defending Stevens to “stand down” and not try to save him... after all, the plan was to have him protected and safely released in time to make it back to Andrews AFB by November 3.

The whole kidnapping conspiracy theory is perhaps best addressed and summarized [here](#), where it is hypothesized that “if there *were* a deal between Obama administration officials and Morsi administration officials, to stage a kidnapping operation in which Stevens was captured and subsequently exchanged for the “Blind Sheikh,” which side would stand to lose more if the truth were to come out? While still president-elect, Morsi attempted to [sate his base](#) by pledging to have the “Blind Sheikh” freed; it was practically part of his platform. If there had been a deal that were made public, Morsi’s stock would most assuredly rise among his base. Conversely, if such a truth were to be made known, Obama would be finished.”

Finished. What a *great* word in this context.

Is this the stuff of spy novels? Sure it is. But given the CIA’s herculean efforts to silence anyone possessed of the truth; given the regime’s duplicity at the outset (the phantom “spontaneous protest” mime), followed by its opacity on what really happened in Benghazi; and finally, given the usurper’s unspeakably disgraceful and increasingly clumsy *pas de deux* over what he calls a “phony” scandal.... nothing should surprise anyone any longer. These folks are proving themselves capable of just about any treachery. And remember, they *never* let a crisis go to waste, particularly ones of their own making.

Again, there is no doubt that the truth will eventually come out. The real question now is: who will be the hero or heroine stepping forward with the truth? Will it be someone in the CIA? Will it be someone in the Pentagon? Or the FBI? Or the Secret Service? Who will it be? Even now, as this onion self-peels, that person knows who he or she is. The only question is: when to come forward?

From all appearances, the regime is pulling out all the stops to make sure the truth never... *ever*... escapes from behind the black curtain and that any hero or heroine who thinks otherwise should ... think again.

So, more power to the people in Congress who refuse to be intimidated by the regime; more power to those few remaining members of the mass media who seem finally to be awakening to the fundamental rot which now defines the executive branch; and more power to whoever the hero or heroine in this unfolding drama might be.

Who will twist in the wind and who will land on his feet? The smart money says that those who know the truth and have the courage to come forth will be the ones landing on their feet. Let us hope so, because the alternative is far more ominous than anything we have yet seen.

