1	<u>RPTR HUMISTON</u>
2	EDTR HUMKE
3	
4	
5	SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI,
6	U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
7	WASHINGTON, D.C.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	INTERVIEW OF: BENJAMIN ISAAC FISHMAN
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	TUESDAY, JANUARY 12, 2016
18	
19	Washington, D.C.
20	
21	
22	The interview in the above matter was held in Room
23	HVC-205, Capitol Visitor Center, commencing at 9:54 a.m.
24	Present: Representatives Gowdy and Schiff.
25	

- 2
- 3
- 4 For the SELECT COMMITTEE ON BENGHAZI:
- 5
- 6 PHILIP G. KIKO, STAFF DIRECTOR AND GENERAL COUNSEL
- 7 DANA CHIPMAN, CHIEF INVESTIGATIVE COUNSEL
- 8 SHARON JACKSON, DEPUTY CHIEF COUNSEL
- 9 SHERIA CLARKE, COUNSEL
- 10 KIM BETZ, MEMBER OUTREACH LIAISON
- 11 SUSANNE SACHSMAN GROOMS, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR/GENERAL
- 12 COUNSEL
- 13 HEATHER SAWYER, MINORITY CHIEF COUNSEL
- 14 PETER KENNY, MINORITY SENIOR COUNSEL
- 15 DANIEL REBNORD, MINORITY PROFESSIONAL STAFF
- 16
- 17 For BENJAMIN ISAAC FISHMAN:
- 18
- 19 NICHOLAS MCQUAID, ESQ.
- 20 JIM WALSH, ESQ.
- 21 ALBERT SANDERS, ESQ.
- 22 WHITE HOUSE COUNSEL'S OFFICE
- 23 The White House
- 24 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
- 25 Washington, DC 20008

Ms. Jackson. Good morning, all. This is a transcribed 1 interview of Benjamin Fishman conducted by the House Select 2 3 Committee on Benghazi. This interview is being conducted 4 voluntarily as part of the committee's investigation into the attacks on the U.S. diplomatic facilities in Benghazi, Libya, 5 and matters related to that, pursuant to House Resolution 567 6 of the 113th Congress and House Resolution 5 of the 114th 7 8 Congress.

9 Mr. Fishman, could you give us your full name for the 10 record, please?

11

Mr. Fishman. Benjamin Isaac Fishman.

12 Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Okay. Mr. Fishman, on behalf of the 13 committee, thank you for your appearance today. We 14 appreciate your coming in voluntarily today.

Again, my name is Sharon Jackson and I am with the committee's majority staff. So that we have a record of these proceedings, I'm going to have everyone in the room go around and introduce themselves, and we'll start with the counsel that's accompanying you today.

20 Mr. <u>McQuaid</u>. Nicholas McQuaid, White House Counsel's 21 Office.

Mr. <u>Sanders.</u> Albert Sanders, White House Counsel's
Office.

Mr. <u>Walsh.</u> James Walsh, White House Counsel's Office.
Ms. <u>Betz.</u> Kim Betz with the majority.

1

3

9

Ms. Jackson. Sheria?

2 Ms. <u>Clarke</u>. Sheria Clarke, majority.

Mr. <u>Kiko.</u> Phil Kiko with the committee.

Ms. <u>Sachsman Grooms.</u> Susanne Sachsman Grooms. I'm with
 the minority staff.

6 Ms. <u>Sawyer.</u> Heather Sawyer with the minority staff.

7 Mr. <u>Kenny.</u> Peter Kenny with the minority staff.

8 Mr. <u>Rebnord.</u> Dan Rebnord with the minority staff.

Chairman <u>Gowdy.</u> Trey Gowdy, South Carolina.

10 Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Mr. Fishman, before we begin this morning, 11 I'd like to go over the procedures and the rules that we use 12 in conducting interviews. Generally the way the questioning 13 has proceeded is that a member of the majority staff will ask 14 questions for a period of time, usually up to an hour, and 15 then the minority will have the opportunity to ask questions 16 for an equal period of time.

For your interview, we've agreed that each side will be restricted to 90 minutes of questioning. So what we envision happening is that I will ask questions for an hour, then the minority will ask questions for an hour, I'll come back and do 30 minutes and then the minority will do 30 minutes, but if we find that shorter periods of time are needed, we're happy to do that also.

24 Questions may only be asked by a member of the committee 25 or a designated staff member. And unlike testimony in

Federal court, or a deposition, the committee format is not 1 bound by the rules of evidence. The witness or their counsel 2 may raise objections for privilege, which is subject to the 3 4 review by the chairman of the committee. If those objections cannot be resolved in the interview, the witness can be 5 required to return for a deposition or a hearing. Members 6 and staff of the committee, however, are not permitted to 7 raise objections when the other side is asking questions. 8 9 This is generally not an issue we've encountered in the past, 10 but I just wanted you to understand that that's the process that we follow in our interviews. 11

12 This session is in an unclassified setting. If any 13 question calls for a classified answer, please just let us 14 know, and we will either omit that question or reserve its 15 answer until we move into a classified setting. But let me 16 ask you this: do you have a current security clearance?

Mr. <u>Fishman</u>. I believe the White House put in for a
 discuss
 temporary clearance for -- to
 my previous role, but
 not for subsequent materials.

20

Ms. <u>Jackson.</u> Okay.

21 Mr. <u>Fishman</u>. And that was granted.

22 Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Okay. And do you know what level that was 23 to, secret or top secret?

24 Mr. <u>Fishman</u>. Well, I had TS/SCI, so I presume that was 25 what the materials were.

1 Mr. <u>McQuaid</u>. That's accurate. We haven't taken the 2 steps to pass that up for today, but could do so if that were 3 required.

Ms. <u>Jackson.</u> Okay. That's good to know.

4

5 Mr. Fishman, you are welcome to confer with the counsel 6 that are here with you today at any time throughout the 7 interview, but if something just needs to be clarified, we 8 ask that you ask us to rephrase or repeat a question before 9 doing so.

Again, we just want to make sure that you understand the questions that are being asked of you before you give us an answer. However, if anything needs to be discussed with your counsel that are here with you today, we will go off the record and stop the clock to provide you with this opportunity to do so.

16 As I said before, we started, we will take a break 17 whenever it's convenient for you. This can be after an hour 18 of questioning or sooner than that if you would like. Please 19 just let us know if you need anything during the course of 20 this interview, a glass of water, a cup of coffee, tea, use 21 of the facilities, an opportunity to confer with your 22 counsel. If you need any of that, we'll stop the clock, go 23 off the record and allow you to do that.

As you see, we have an official reporter taking down everything that is said today so that we have a written

record of these proceedings, so we ask that you give verbal responses to all questions, yes and no, as opposed to nods and shakes of the head. Also ask that we try and not talk over each other. Everybody has a tendency to do that, but I'm also going to give the reporter permission to feel free to jump in in case we're interrupting each other or she doesn't get a verbal answer to a question.

Do you have any questions about that?

9

25

8

Mr. <u>Fishman.</u> No.

Ms. Jackson. Okay. We want you to answer our questions in the most complete and truthful manner possible, so we'll take our time and repeat or clarify our questions if necessary. If you have any questions, as I've said before, do not understand any of our questions, please let us know, and we'll be happy to rephrase or clarify them for you.

If you honestly don't know the answer to a question or do not remember, it's best not to guess, but we do ask that you give us your best recollection if there are things that you can't remember. And we also ask that if you don't know the answer to a question, if you could inform us as to who might have that information and provide an answer to that particular question.

23 Mr. Fishman, do you understand that you are required to
 24 answer questions from Congress truthfully?

Mr. <u>Fishman.</u> Yes.

Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. And do you understand that this applies to
 questions posed by congressional staff in an interview?
 Mr. Fishman. Yes.

Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Do you understand that witnesses that knowingly provide false testimony could be subject to criminal prosecution for perjury or making false statements? Mr. <u>Fishman</u>. Yes.

8 Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Okay. Is there any reason that you would 9 be unable to provide truthful answers to today's questions? 10 Mr. Fishman. No.

Ms. Jackson. Okay. I believe that your counsel had
something that he would like to put on the record this
morning.

Mr. <u>McQuaid</u>. So I just ask that Mr. Fishman be able to put on the record his medical condition, because it's impacted the timing of the hearing -- timing of our -- time restrictions, and also I think it's relevant to the proceeding, so --

19 Mr. <u>Fishman.</u> So almost 2 years ago I was diagnosed with 20 an aggressive form of brain cancer. So through surgery and 21 subsequent treatment, a common side effect is aphasia, which 22 often means it may be taking a long time for me to recall 23 names or specific words, so my answers may reflect that in 24 the speed in which I deliver it, but otherwise, I'm here and 25 ready to participate.

Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Okay. Well, Mr. Fishman, you have the sympathy of the entire committee for what you're going through, and so we doubly appreciate the fact that you are here today and voluntarily answering our questions, so thank you very much.

6 That is the end of my preamble. I'm going to ask if the 7 minority has anything that they would like to add at this 8 time?

9 Ms. <u>Sachsman Grooms.</u> Yeah. I just wanted to thank you 10 for coming in, and just reiterate if you need a break, if you 11 need a minute or whatever, just ask for it, and I'm sure that 12 Sharon is ready to accommodate, and certainly we are as well.

Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Okay. All right. With that, we will begin the first hour of questioning. And I note that it is 10:03.

EXAMINATION
BY MS. JACKSON:
Q Mr. Fishman, it is my understanding that you worked
for the National Security Council or with the National
Security Staff from approximately July 2009 through

21 September 2013. Is that accurate?

A Yes.

22

Q Okay. And what types of matters did you work on for the National -- was it known as the National Security Staff or the National Security Council?

A I believe the National Security Staff. At the time, Susan Rice came in and changed the terminology to the National Security Council right about the time that I was leaving.

5 Q Are those two terms used interchangeably within 6 government circles?

A Yes, more or less.

7

Q And, again, what were your duties and
 responsibilities at the National Security Staff?

A So I had a few different positions. I initially was working with Dennis Ross, Ambassador Dennis Ross, who for the period of his tenure was overseeing a range of Middle East issues, and I was serving in a senior advisor type of role, executive assistant formally.

When the Arab Spring came about, obviously there were a lot more matters to deal with, so in February 2011, I began working on helping with the directors to deal with those issues, and as of April 2011, they assigned me temporarily the Libya portfolio. And I held that position through around 2012, where my responsibilities expanded to covering the rest of North Africa and Jordan.

Q So from the period of time from the spring of 2011 through some time in 2012, you were focused principally on Libya?

25 A Correct.

Okay. And when in 2012 did your portfolio expand 1 0 2 to include more of North Africa? 3 A I don't remember precisely, but --Was it before or after the attacks in Benghazi? 4 0 5 A I don't remember precisely, but certainly Libya was my principal focus. 6 7 Were you detailed or on loan to the National Q 8 Security Staff from any other Federal agency? 9 I was a direct hire from the NSC staff. А 10 0 Had you been at the State Department prior to going 11 to the NSC? 12 A Yes. 13 0 Okay. And how long were you at the State 14 Department? 15 A From March to July_s August 2009. 16 Okay. So once you went to the National Security Q Staff, you were paid by the White House and a White House 17 employee and not on loan from the State Department? 18 19 A That is my understanding. I don't know how they 20 managed it in the first couple months, but certainly 21 thereafter. 22 Mr. Fishman, could you tell us a little bit about 0 23 when you were working on Libya issues, who you worked with at the National Security Staff, who you reported to, and who you 24 25 interacted with in the interagency?

A I would segment those issues between the period of our intervention and -- which ended in October 2011, and where there were active military engagements going on, and the period post conflict, October 2011 through the end of my tenure.

6 Through the period of the intervention, I was working 7 with the entire interagency and my colleagues at the NSC 8 staff on such issues as economic issues with -- and UN issues 9 related to the sanctions, diplomatic issues with the State 10 Department on supporting the National Transitional Council, 11 as it was known at the time. Military issues with the 12 Pentagon and NATO and also the diplomatic issues surrounding the NATO coalition. 13

So a whole wide range of issues, that also continued in the post-conflict period, where we were actively trying to assist the Libyan interim authorities to build up their state and stabilize everything from their economy to their security forces and their oil wealth.

19 Q Who within the National Security Staff did you 20 report to in this first phase of, say, February of 2011 21 through October of 2011? Who was the person you directly 22 reported to?

A I think the senior director for the Middle East transitioned during that time from Dan Shapiro to Steve Simon, so I was reporting, technically reporting to both of

them.

1

Q Okay. Was there someone else that you had greater interaction with on the National Security Staff than them? I noticed that you said "technically" reported to them.

5 A No. For different aspects of the intervention, I 6 was working with different elements of the national security 7 bureaucracy. That means for our European engagements, we 8 were working closely with the European director. For all 9 issues related to chemical weapons, I worked closely with the 10 chemical weapons, or the WMD, director. For the 11 post-conflict planning, I worked with Derek Chollett, who was 12 working on any planning on post-conflict management. For the 13 sanctions issues, Mike Froman.

So it was a whole range of people who were involved, and it was a truly whole of government type of effort.

Q For the post-military intervention or post regime,
Qadhafi regime, did those persons or players change, so after
October of 2011?

A Not really, because all the issues were pretty much the same. So we interacted with the Europeans all the time, for example. The chemical weapons issue was still alive, less on the economic front but still on the oil sector, so that involved the energy people on the -- under the economic team, and, again, the strategic planning office on long-term issues.

Q Who were the people at the State Department that you primarily or principally interacted with on Libya matters in 2011?

4 My primary contacts were the Maghreb Affairs A I worked most intensively with who 5 Office. was the chief desk officer. She came in in the middle, I 6 don't remember what month particularly, but maybe in the 7 summer of 2011. And the deputy office director was 8 9 , and was the office director. And I interacted with them almost interchangeably, and less so with 10 11 the functional bureaus at the State Department, but if you count U.S., U.N., the United Nations office at State, I 12 interacted with people there, and the PM office, for example, 13 Political-Military Affairs had sort of an issue that they 14 were following and -- but primarily the Maghreb Affairs 15 16 Office.

17 Q Did you interact with Jeffrey Feltman or Elizabeth 18 Dibble or Janet Sanderson or Ray Maxwell, and if so, on what 19 issues and to what extent?

A Mostly by email with them. Liz Dibble was the key participant on our interagency efforts. I think Janet Sammerson -- is that her name?

Q Sanderson --

24 A Sanderson.

23

25

Q Sanderson, I believe.

1 A Sorry. I forgot her last name. She's since 2 retired, I think. Liz was the primary representative for the State Department during that period, I believe, on the 3 4 interagency. I would see Jeff Feltman occasionally, and he 5 was very good about forwarding read-outs of meetings to a 6 wide circle. And I traveled with Jeff Feltman in September 7 of 2011. 8 Q How do issues get raised within the National 9 Security Council? Is it sort of up from the agencies or down from -- or the White House identifies issues and matters and 10 11 sends it out to the interagency, or is it a mix of both? 12 A I would say a mix of both. 13 Q How did the Libya issue come to the National Security Council? 14 15 А During what timeframe? 16 0 In the spring of 2011. 17 A I'm not sure what you're -- I mean, like, the --18 Q Was Libya something that was an issue that was 19 brought by the State Department, or was it something that the 20 National Security Council said, this is an issue, therefore, 21 let's bring in our interagency to discuss it? 22 I think it was obvious that it was a significant A 23 development in the region. And in the context of the Arab 24 Spring, everybody was looking at the aftereffects of Tunisia 25 and Egypt, so it was raised in that context, not in any

particular agency-White House sequence.

2 Okay. Mr. Fishman, from the documents that have 0 3 been provided to us, we have seen many policy papers 4 discussing whether and how to topple the Qadhafi regime, but 5 from what we've reviewed, that is where the discussions ended 6 in 2011 or at least up until the summer of 2011. We have not 7 seen policy papers and discussions regarding the United 8 States' plan for assistance to the Libyans once the Qadhafi 9 regime was gone, and we've also read public accounts that the 10 President acknowledged that his administration failed to plan 11 for the day after the Qadhafi regime fell, and how a new 12 government would be instituted.

Do you agree with that assessment as to what was happening in the February to June, July 2011 timeframe?

A That's a long assessment, so is there more of anarrow focus?

17 Q Let me break it down for you, because it was a very18 long question.

We have seen many policy papers discussing whether the United States should intervene to force Qadhafi out, but we don't see corresponding papers that talk about what it's going to take to transition the Libyans into a new form of government after Qadhafi is gone. In the February to April, May, June timeframe, is that your assessment of what the policy papers were at the time?

1 So I can't speak to the February to April A 2 timeframe, because I just assumed that responsibility in 3 April, and our focus at that point was implementing the 4 mission that the President laid out in, I believe, early 5 March, I can't remember the actual date, based on his speech 6 at NDU where he outlined our three basic premises about the intervention, where we had to have local regional support, no 7 8 boots on the ground, and -- no U.S. boots on the ground, and 9 we would contribute our unique capabilities to a NATO 10 coalition-led effort. So our focus at that time -- or we were just ramping up to basically implement that force -- or 11 12 that, sorry, that mission with all its complexities that I 13 alluded to earlier.

During that April to June timeframe when I was privy to -- or I was working full-time on those issues. I recall some initial discussions about the post-conflict issues that would transpire, but that planning, I can't remember the precise time when that planning began to intensify, but it was certainly during the summer of 2011.

20 Q So the planning began and, in your words, 21 intensified in the summer of 2011? Is that correct?

A Yes, but, again, I can't speak to the period from February to 2011 for February 2011 to April and the decisionmaking -- I don't know the extent to which the post-conflict planning factored into the decisionmaking

process, such as Secretary Gates has made his opinions known
 about.

3 0 Well, let me ask this: when you assumed 4 responsibility for Libya matters in April of 2011, did you 5 inherit documents, or papers, or background information from 6 within the National Security Staff or the interagency to give 7 you a sense or give you a foundation for what had been 8 discussed and decided up and to that point? 9 Well, decided in terms of what precisely? A

10 Q Any planning that had been done for a post-Qadhafi 11 Libya.

A I recall -- like, military planning or - Q Planning to transition the Libyan Government into a
 legitimate democracy.

15 A I'm not sure I agree with that. Well, let me rephrase that. I don't recall any specific planning 16 17 documents, but I wouldn't necessarily have gotten read-outs 18 of high level decisionmaking discussions that transpired earlier, and we were working at a fast tempo to try to get 19 the actual intervention off the ground and our allies on 20 21 board, because, you know, we were in the process of trying to 22 genuinely protect civilians, which was the basis of the UN 23 Security Council resolution.

24 Q You wrote an article for "Foreign Affairs Magazine" 25 that I believe came out in April of 2015, so a little less

- than a year ago, and you wrote that article with Derek
 Chollett. Is that correct?
- 3

A Derek Chollett.

4

5

Chollett?

A Uh-huh.

0

Q Chollett. Thank you. And in that article, you write that a major problem that the United States faced in its intervention in Libya was a lack of people on the ground who could evaluate the situation, work with the Libyans, coordinate with the allies, and report back to Washington. Is that your opinion?

A I haven't looked at the wording of the article in some time, but more or less the problem that we were identifying was that in the period of our intervention and subsequently -- well, let me break it down between our intervention and then subsequently.

During the intervention, obviously we had no people in Tripoli and a very limited presence in Benghazi, so we definitely lacked the visibility.

Q And, Mr. Fishman, can I stop you to just clarify that we're still talking about the period of April of 2011 through October of 2011, when you say the period of intervention?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. Thank you. Please continue.

So during that period, we had a very limited 1 A 2 presence in Benghazi, as you know, and they were privy to 3 just a limited part of the country, and even that was imperfect. And then prio or subsequent to basical Ey 4 December, January of December 2011 to January -- and 5 6 January 2012, when we were reestablishing our embassy, the 7 embassy itself had a very -- in Tripoli, sorry, to just 8 clarify -- in Tripoli, the embassy itself was very limited in 9 its numbers and presence and vehicles to get to meetings and 10 host meetings and interact with Libyans, international 11 community, et cetera.

And that, I think, applies to many U.S. Missions abroad, was a significant challenge for us and just getting a clear sense of what was -- the clearest possible sense of what was transpiring on the ground.

Q So I guess that raises the question of why didn't we put more people in Libya either in Benghazi or in Tripoli to do the assessment, gather the information, interact with the Libyans, and report back.

20 Mr. <u>McQuaid</u>. Can we go off the record for just one 21 second?

22 Ms. Jackson. Sure.

23 [Discussion off the record.]

24 BY MS. JACKSON:

25 Q Mr. Fishman, let me rephrase the question. Were

1 there discussions within the National Security Staff or the 2 interagency about augmenting U.S. Government personnel in Libya, either Benghazi or Tripoli, in the period of time 3 4 between April of 2011 and January of 2012 to increase the 5 ability to work with the Libyans and assess the situation? А Yes. 6 Okay. And tell us about those conversations. 7 Q Sorry. Can you remind me the timeframe you're 8 A 9 looking at? 10 0 Let's divide it into your two timeframes. First if you could talk about the April to fall of 2011 and then fall 11 of 2011 forward, intervention --12 13 A Right. -- phase and post-intervention phase. 14 0 15 A Yeah. As you know, the Benghazi Mission was established, I think, in March or April. It was staffed with 16 17 the special envoy, ambassador -- subsequently Ambassador 18 Stevens, and eventually one junior officer and some Diplomatic Security that I can't remember the numbers. I 19 20 think there was not a significant discussion about increasing 21 that number basically because of the security situation in 22 Benghazi at that time, and those decisions were primarily left to the State Department, as is routinely held. 23 Starting in 2012, there were some decisions by the State 24 25 Department -- or discussions about -- within the interagency

1 about reestablishing the Embassy in Tripoli and how it should 2 be staffed. Even within the State Department, there were 3 conflicting views about who should get priority of access, 4 because they had a limited number of beds available. It was 5 a temporary facility, because, as you recall, the Embassy was 6 destroyed during the war, and so there were -- I don't even 7 think the Ambassador went initially, maybe the deputy chief 8 of mission went along with one, maybe, political economic 9 officer and several building management people to -- whose 10 priority was to reconstruct the facility and anything 11 associated with Diplomatic Security, et cetera, and maybe one or two individuals from USAID. 12

So even within the State Department, there were discussions about who and how many and all that stuff. Where the interagency subsequently got involved was naturally when -- in questions of timing, pace, and who else should be there, basically.

18 Q Was there a push from the National Security Staff 19 to increase the number of technical experts that needed to go 20 into Libya to help it transition to a government?

A It was a difficult -- difficult type -- or I should say sensitive instead of difficult, type of conversation, because we weren't on the ground and we deferred, naturally, to the people who were and the Diplomatic Security elements, who ultimately, with the Ambassador, had the right to --

literally had the right, as I understand it, to approve every
 visit and also permanent member of the staff. So we -- it
 was a process of -- it was an ongoing conversation,
 basically.

5 Q Okay. I know we've hit a half an hour. Are you 6 comfortable in continuing for another period of time or would 7 you like to take a break?

8 A Yeah.

9 Q Okay.

10 A Let's go.

11 Q Did the objectives or goals change between the 12 intervention period and the post-intervention period, the 13 objections of -- the objectives or goals of having a U.S. 14 Government presence in Libya?

A Yeah, naturally, because during the intervention, we were trying, as mandated by the Security Council, to protect the civilian population of the Libyan people, and once their regime collapsed, we were trying to, as we saw it, help the Libyans stabilize their country and support the interim authorities to do that.

21 Q And in particular with respect to Benghazi, in the 22 intervention phase, we only had personnel in Benghazi, but in 23 the post-intervention phase, we've re-opened Embassy Tripoli. 24 What were then the objectives and goals of why we kept 25 personnel in Benghazi?

A Principally because we saw it as an important part of the country and we wanted to both make them feel recognized, because they started the revolution, but also to ensure we had a diplomatic presence in that part of the region.

Q I want to take a step back to April of 2011 when Chris Stevens goes in as the Envoy, to that particular timeframe, and let me just ask sort of a couple of foundational questions. Was Chris Stevens appointed by the President or the Secretary of State, if you know?

A That's something I'm not aware of.

12 Q Okay. Do you know, is there a distinction between 13 being a Special Envoy and a Special Representative?

14 A Again, that's something out of my lane.

15 Q Okay, Would you know --

16 A I know --

11

17 Q -- who would know that --

A I know that, for example, General Allen recently on the counter ISIL, he had as his title Special Presidential Envoy, which means he's a Presidential appointment. I think you'd have to ask the State Department.

Q Okay. From the documents that we've reviewed, when Chris Stevens was getting ready to go into Benghazi for the first time in late March, early April 2011, there was an initial plan to have the military go in with him, and then 1 that plan was scuttled. Can you tell us about how that 2 decision was made to not send the military in with Chris 3 Stevens?

A Again, I think that was prior to my arrival -- or starting on that assignment, so I think the State Department would know best.

Q Did you learn subsequently that that was an issue?
A All I know was his story about going on the -- in
on the Greek vessel, so I don't know.

Q Okay. We also know that military assets went in when the Embassy in Tripoli reopened in September of 2011, a site security team accompanied the Diplomatic Security agents and assisted in the reopening of Embassy Tripoli.

During your tenure in 2011 and 2012, your tenure of working on Libya issues, was there any discussion of having similar military security in Benghazi?

17

24

25

During what period?

Q At any time there was a mission in Benghazi. So from the time Envoy Stevens went in in April of 2011 until the time of the attack in September of 2012, during that time period, was there ever a discussion that you were aware of. or participated in, regarding having military security in Benghazi?

A I don't recall.

A

Q Is that you don't recall at all or you recall that

1 there was no such discussion?

2

A Both.

Q Both. Okay. Is encouraging or ordering military security for embassy personnel something that the National Security Staff would be engaged in or could be engaged in?

A I mean, you're speaking very generally, so I'm not -- my scope of working on the NSC staff doesn't expand beyond my individual portfolio in the Middle Eastern, North Africa directorate. If there was a CT issue, that was a whole different directorate, so they may have been involved in such a discussion, but, again, just for Libya, I'm not --I don't --

13

Q Well --

A I'm not basically -- I think that's a question for
somebody else.

16 Q I guess what I'm trying to do is get a sense of the role of the National Security Staff in coordinating the 17 interagency. So if you get information from the State 18 Department that security is not sufficient to do the things 19 that you want to do, does the National Security Staff have a 20 role in saying, let's augment that security, let's look at 21 22 our military resources that we can bring to bear or add, and let's get these people talking to augment our security so we 23 can accomplish our mission? 24

25 A I think --

Q First, is that the role of the National Security 2 Staff?

A Well, what I was going to say is the Diplomatic Security has the principal role at the State Department for coordinating or assessing security information and security postures at our diplomatic facilities all over the world, including in very dangerous places like Iraq and Afghanistan or Africa or whatever.

9 I don't know their experience with coordinating with the military for requesting any augmentation. I do know that the 10 11 Marines are deployed to embassy facilities, not to provide 12 embassy security principally; they're there to protect classified information, and discussions are routinely held 13 14 between State Department and the Marine Corps or DOD, whatever the line is. So I would say typically the NSC does 15 16 not get involved in that process.

Subsequent^T to the attacks against Benghazi and also Tunisia and Cairo, the NSC launched an entirely new process for embassy security. I think that's been reported and repositioned some military assets to perform those duties. Because I don't know the extent that those are classified, unclassified, I'll just leave it at that.

23 Q But you said that they changed the process in the 24 wake of Benghazi and Tunisia and Cairo. How did that process 25 change?

A That they held regular meetings to assess security situations and DOD deployed certain assets that were -- well, it took a long time for them to train Marines to perform -or to train to perform certain tasks that they didn't have that capability before then, so that was a result of an interagency discussion.

Q Now, understanding that you came to work on Libya
matters exclusively in April of 2011 and you were not
exclusively working on Libya matters in March when the
decision was made to suspend operations at Embassy Tripoli,
did you subsequently learn, though, who made the decision to
suspend operations at Embassy Tripoli? Was that a White
House directive or was that a State Department decision?

A I don't know specifically if it was the Presidentor the Secretary.

Q Okay. What about the decision to send in Chris Stevens as the Special Envoy or Special Representative? Was that something that the White House directed or was it something that the State Department recommended?

20 A Chris Stevens as an individual or having a special 21 envoy?

22 Q Let's take each part of that. First having a 23 special envoy.

A I'm almost certain that the decision to send Chris was made at the State Department, but I don't know

specifically the process that was made to have an envoy. So
that could have been a result of a discussion I wasn't privy
to.

Q Do you know why Chris Stevens was picked as opposed to Ambassador Cretz or **Exclusion**, who was the deputy chief of mission, or somebody who had been evacuated from Tripoli?

I don't know specifically. I know that Ambassador 8 A 9 Cretz had previously received specific threats from the regime and was more or less PNG from Tripoli, so he was 10 probably an unlikely figure because of the security risks 11 against him. And Chris had served previously in Tripoli, 12 twice, I believe, maybe just once, but he was a qualified 13 candidate. But, again, I'm not familiar with the State 14 Department internal deliberations, and certainly not at that 15 16 time.

Q Okay. Was Chris Stevens, when he went in as envoy
 in early April 2011, aside from our military, the only U.S.
 Government presence in Benghazi?

A Well, I think he went in with a -- I can't remember whether he went in with a junior officer at the time or the junior officer came later.

23 Q Was there any agency personnel in Benghazi or in 24 eastern Libya in April of 2011 before Stevens went in?

25

A

I know the fact of the mission is unclassified now,

but I don't know the extent of the historical presence, so
 I'm not comfortable answering that question.

3

Q Okay.

I would note for the record that we have been joined by Congressman Schiff in the interview, so I just wanted you to know who has joined us and that the record would reflect that Congressman Schiff has joined us.

8 The documents that we've reviewed and our interviews 9 have revealed that when Chris Stevens first went in to 10 Benghazi in early April 2011, that his mission was to be for 11 up to 30 days, and we also know he ended up staying until 12 November of 2011 and then there were a series of principal 13 officers after him. And so my question is, what was his 14 objective in the first 30 days, and then what changed that required a presence after that 30 days? 15

16 I think the objective was always the same, to A 17 represent us in Benghazi, to engage with the NTC, the National Transitional Council. And the situation in Benghazi 18 was -- at the time in April 2011, was constantly changing, 19 and the -- I don't know. The 30-day timeline may have been a 20 21 bureaucratic thing that needed to be written. It's best for 22 me to not guess about why the State Department assigned that 23 timeline, but I know we collectively found his presence and 24 materials very useful, and as a result, his mission was 25 extended.

Q So if I understand your answer correct, and please elaborate if I don't, you were unaware that he was to go in for a period of 30 days initially?

A That didn't strike me as unusual. I don't recall any time limit that I -- in other words, it didn't strike me as an important detail. We were constantly evaluating the situation. He could have pulled out at any time short of 30 days or extended it beyond 30 days. So I don't know why the State Department set that day, and you'd have to ask them.

Q Okay. Were there any discussions about Envoy
 Stevens having to leave Benghazi for security reasons in that
 period of the intervention?

A I can't recall, other than that initial period when
 Benghazi was still under physical threat.

Q Were you aware that in the first 5 days after Chris Stevens arrived in Benghazi that there was a discussion about he would have to leave because the regime troops were advancing on Benghazi?

A I've learned that subsequently, but at the time, I'm not sure I was in the -- again, in the seat, so I wasn't necessarily following it as closely.

23

24

25

I RPTR KERR

2 EDTR HUMKE

4

8

9

10

11

3 [10:54 a.m.]

BY MS. JACKSON:

Q On June 1st, 2011, there was a threat credible enough to move Stevens and his expedition out of the Tibesti Hotel

into the first of the villas.

Was there any discussion about pulling his mission out of Benghazi all together due to that threat?

A I can't recall.

Q Okay. In the summer of 2011, when Stevens' mission and expedition moved into the villas, and then shortly thereafter, in July of 2011, our government formally recognized that NTC as the legitimate interim government of Libya, was there any discussion about formally recognizing Stevens' mission to the NTC?

A First of all, since I worked on this very closely, we recognized them as the legitimate representative of the Libyan people. So that was a technical term that was --<u>carrees a tot</u> -- it's a legalistic term so that I was quite involved in -- and thus, I remember it very closely because we were in the process of that debate, it took several months.

25 Q Well, can I just stop --

1 A I can --

2 Q Okay.

A -- get to your question.

4 Q Okay.

3

25

A And that had certain diplomatic implications with the NTC because of visa implications, specifically, and I believe travel issues and financial issues because we couldn't transfer funds to the Libyan Government because the Central Bank and I think other institutions, financial institutions, were frozen under the UN Security Council resolutions.

So by recognizing the NTC, as subsequently other countries did -- or previously and subsequently other countries did, we were able to engage in the process where we were ultimately able to create a temporary funding mechanism where we could release some assets to their -- not to them directly but to help defray their cost of running Benghazi.

18 0 I want to go back and ask some questions about 19 that. You said that there was a -- in July of 2011, we recognized the NTC, and I need you to give me the words 20 again, as the legitimate representative of the Libyan people? 21 22 A Yes. And that's as opposed to the Libyan Government? 23 0 24 Α Right.

Q What were the -- I guess I just want you to take us

1 through that discussion that was had as to what were the 2 options for recognition at that time and what each 3 recognition allowed or didn't allow to be done?

4

5

6

7

A So my legal colleagues may be more qualified to - Q We're just asking for your understanding.

A -- answer your question better, but -- other lawyers in the room, but -- and I'm not one, but --

Q And we're thankful that -- or you should be
9 thankful that you're not.

10 A As my understanding and my recollection, I try not 11 to recollect these issues because they were painful at the time. It involves -- it's the same figure as a -- the same 12 13 analogy with recognizing or not recognizing the Syrian 14 opposition. They had to demonstrate some control of 15 significant territory, and that was the principal one, and 16 had to have support of their people, an argument to -- a 17 significant part of the population.

18 And so the recognition argument came -- so it's different for different countries. International law is not, 19 20 as I understand it, not clear in these circumstances, so 21 France and Qatar, for example -- or the UAE, I can't 22 remember, recognized them, the NTC very quickly, in the 23 period of intervention, maybe even as early as April. We took a little more time because our lawyers were more 24 25 hesitant until they -- part of the argument is the Libyan

opposition needed to control more territory, so sorry I can't
 remember the earlier part of your question.

Q What were the consequences or what would happen with a recognition of the NTC as the representative of the Libyan people versus being the legitimate Government of Libya? Were there consequences to that decision as to which one you were going to recognize the NTC as being?

A Oh, the options.

9

8

Q Yeah, the options.

10 A So we could not recognize them, and that would --11 that was the option decided for up to 3 months. It was 12 legitimately debated in high-level discussions and in 13 preparation for meeting Libyan authorities or preparation for 14 the international meetings with the Libyan coalition. 15 basically was called the contact group or the Friends of 16 Libya meetings, and that was basically the longer the --17 basically I spelled them out earlier in terms of the 18 political and economic advantages of being recognized as an 19 international player.

Q In July of 2011, we did not formally recognize our diplomatic presence in Benghazi to the NTC. Is there a reason we did not do that?

A I don't know, and I think the State Department has rules about how these things are handled, so I'm not familiar with those.

1 Q Was that part of this legalistic discussion that 2 was ongoing as to whether we could do a formal recognition of 3 our diplomatic personnel to a government of the people as 4 opposed to the country's government? 5 Not that I recall. A 6 Ms. Jackson. Okay. In my remaining few minutes, Mr. 7 Chairman, do you have any questions that you would like to 8 ask --9 Chairman Gowdy. No, ma'am. 10 Ms. Jackson. -- the witness? 11 Chairman Gowdy. No, ma'am. 12 Ms. Jackson. Thank you. BY MS. JACKSON: 13 Q 14 Once we recognize the NTC as the legitimate representative of the Libyan people, was there any, to your 15 16 knowledge, formal diplomatic notice of Chris Stevens' 17 presence to them? 18 A I don't know. 19 I mean, I know they know he was there but was there 0 20 any --Right, I don't know. 21 A -- formal. Okay. Is there any discussion about 22 0 23 the privileges and immunities that would be bestowed upon him if his presence was formally noticed? 24 25 A I don't know.

Okay. With that, I see I only have a minute left, 1 0 so I'm going to go off the record. Let's take a break, and 2 3 we'll allow our minority colleagues to ask questions for the 4 next period of time? Okay. 5 A 6 Ms. Jackson. Thank you. Go off. 7 [Recess.] 8 Mr. Kenny. We'll go back on the record. The time is 9 11:23, by my reading. 10 EXAMINATION BY MR. KENNY: 11 Mr. Fishman, again, thank you for being here today. 12 Q On behalf of the Select Committee minority, I want to welcome 13 you, and reintroduce myself. My name is Peter Kenny, joined 14 15 here by my colleagues, Susanne Sachsman Grooms, Dan Rebnord. I appreciate your patience here with us today and your 16 willingness to come and answer the committee's questions. 17 Just at the outset here, I'll note we may return to some 18 of the discussions we were having in the last hour. I'll do 19 my best to help refresh your recollection about some of those 20 discussions. If at any point, when I'm moving from topic to 21 topic I lose you, please let me know and happy to take a step 22 23 back and make sure that we're both on the same page. Does that sound good? 24 25 А Sure.

Okay. So at the beginning of the last hour we had 1 Q 2 a discussion about your role as the director for North 3 Africa, the director for Libya on the National Security 4 staff, and you explained some of your responsibilities, which 5 was helpful for us in understanding what, at the staff level, 6 you did, you performed on that National Security staff. 7 I would like to ask some more targeted questions, if I could, about your roles and responsibilities. 8 9 First is, was it your job to determine security requirements for diplomatic facilities overseas? 10 11 Α No. 12 0 Was it your job to provide security resources for diplomatic facilities overseas? 13 14 А No. Okay. Did you have an understanding of where that 15 0 responsibility did lie within the interagency? 16 А Yes. 17 Okay. And what was your understanding of that? 18 Q The Diplomatic Security Agency within the 19 A Department of State. 20 Okay. And I know that there's a lengthy time 21 0 period, so I'll do my best to refer you to specific time 22 periods, but I'd like to step back and just ask during the 23 entire time that you served with Libya in your portfolio, 24 April 2011 through September 2012, did anyone ever request 25

your help in providing Diplomatic Security resources 1 2 specifically to Benghazi? 3 A You said September 2012? 4 0 Correct. 5 A Sorry. I'm confusing the dates. Could you just 6 repeat it. 7 Sure. Q 8 Α Because I served through September 2013. 9 0 So let's focus pre-attack. So from April of 2011 through the day of the attacks, before you received notice of 10 11 the attacks, had anyone ever requested your help in providing 12 Diplomatic Security resources to the Special Mission in 13 Benghazi? 14 A No. 15 More specifically, did anyone ever tell you 0 Okay. 16 they weren't getting the Diplomatic Security agents that they needed from Diplomatic Security headquarters and ask you to 17 18 step in and talk to senior management at Main State? 19 A No. 20 0 If someone had raised a request about needing more 21 Diplomatic Security resources, what would you have done? 22 A I think it would have depended on who was asking 23 and how they were asking. 24 0 Great. 25 А But I would probably have passed along the message

to my more senior officials within either the State
 Department or the NSS.

Q Okay. We had an extended discussion in the last hour about the early 2011 timeframe, some of which predates the time that Libya was in your portfolio, so I wanted to focus on that timeframe around when the U.S. made a decision to intervene in Libya, and if you could describe for us whether there was a concern, whether you had a concern of the risk that Qadhafi posed to the Libyan people?

10 A Certainly when he was threatening the Libyan people 11 and people of Benghazi with extreme brutal and graphic 12 language, I think not only I, but everybody was concerned 13 about that, implications of that.

14 Q And when you say "everybody," would you include 15 other participants in the interagency, for instance?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Would you include other countries --

18 A Yes.

19 Q -- having concerns?

20 A Definitely.

21 Q Would that include some of our Arab partners in the 22 region?

23 A Definitely.

Q And they all had concerns about the risk that Qadhafi posed to his people?

1 Yes. Some of our closest partners in Europe as A well. 2 0 We've heard the situation in Libya at that time 3 described as a potential human catastrophe. Did you share 4 that concern? 5 Yes. 6 A Okay. Can you explain why? 7 0 Because of those threats that I referenced before 8 A and the extent -- Qadhafi's track record of brutalizing his 9 10 own people and penchant for terrorism both at home and 11 abroad. There was a reference in the last hour to an 0 12 13 article you may have co-authored in Foreign Affairs in May, June, 2012. Do you recall that? 14 15 A The article. Do you recall our discussion about the article? 16 0 Yes. 17 A 18 Okay. 0 That's not the date of the article. 19 A I'm sorry? 20 0 А That's not the date of the article. 21 Oh, okay. We have the article, but it's a fairly 22 Q lengthy article, and I recognize you were asked some 23 questions about some characterizations in there. That 24 document wasn't put in front of you. 25

One thing I wanted to ask you about is an allegation that appears in that article. I believe it's articulated by Al Kuperman that relates to preintervention intelligence, and there's an allegation that the U.S. either fabricated or intentionally misrepresented the intelligence to make the case for the intervention in Libya.

And I'd just like to ask you, again, acknowledging that you may have some limits on your visibility at that particular time period, whether based on the information that you had at the time, whether the use of military force was necessary to protect Libyan civilians. I can --

A Yeah, sorry. It's -- do you refer --

Q I'll re-ask the question.

14 A I believe military force was necessary. I think15 that's how you phrased the question.

Q Yes. That's correct. Thank you. And to your knowledge, did anyone at the NSC fabricate or deliberately misrepresent intelligence to support the case for military involvement in Libya?

20

12

13

A No.

Q To your knowledge, did anyone at the State Department fabricate or deliberately misrepresent intelligence to support the case for military involvement in Libya?

25 A No.

Q There seemed to be some insinuation in the last hour that the decision for the U.S. to intervene in Libya was somehow a predetermined outcome. Can you respond to that allegation?

5 A I definitely wouldn't agree with that 6 characterization of predetermined. It was a deliberative 7 process, and again, it was, as senior U.S. officials had 8 publicly stated at the time, it was a very tough decision for 9 the President to make.

Q And we understand that as well, but was your sense that it was a decision that evolved over time that policymakers were grappling with limited information and time constraints?

A It was definitely a situation where we had limited information and time constraints, and -- I'm not sure -- I would say it evolved over time, but we had limited information to go on and had to make those decisions under very limited time constraints because Qadhafi posed an imminent threat to citizens of Benghazi and, you know, even waiting 24 hours could have cost tens of thousands of lives.

Q Okay. Thank you. I'd like to jump forward a little bit in our time period. We're talking just now about the March, April 2011 time period, the U.S. Government decision to intervene in Libya. We'd also talked in the last hour about the decision to reopen the Embassy in Tripoli in

1 the fall of 2011.

I would like to ask if you recall during that time period, so fall of 2011, do you recall whether then Special Envoy Stevens had any particular views about continuing the U.S. presence in Benghazi?

A He was in favor.

Q Okay. Do you recall if Ambassador Cretz had any
particular views about continuing the U.S. presence in
Benghazi?

10

6

A I don't recall specifically.

11 Q Did you have a sense of whether the opinions, the 12 recommendations, the thoughts of then Special Envoy Stevens, 13 whether those carried any particular weight back to 14 Washington, D.C. We can start at the National Security 15 Council?

A I think he, being on the ground, gave him the closest look to what was going on, and he was reporting directly through the State Department, and he was our, not only representative in chief but basically analyst in chief, and as a professional diplomat, we respected his views significantly.

Q We understand that in the fall of 2011 and continuing through 2012, then Special Envoy and soon Ambassador Stevens had supported continuing the U.S. Government's presence in Benghazi, the Special Mission 1 Compound. We've also heard that the recommendation to 2 continue to maintain a presence on a more permanent basis 3 there, meaning at the level of the Ambassador and those on 4 the ground in Libya, was developed at the ground level, so to 5 speak, rather than being a top down policy process driven by 6 Washington. Was that your understanding as well?

A In the sense that it came from the State Department and was handled within the State Department, yes. I'm not familiar with their internal processes about characterizing certain diplomatic missions and classifying them and timetables of some of the -- for example, but if that's what you mean by bottom up, I agree.

Q Okay. And I guess the flip side of that question would be, was the decision for the State Department to remain in Benghazi, was that one that was made by the White House and dictated to Ambassador Stevens?

17

25

A No.

Q You had touched just a moment ago on the discussion of the legal status of the Special Mission, and you were asked a series of questions about that in the last round. The implication to us seems to be that there is a relationship between the legal status of the Special Mission and whether the Libyans had some ability or willingness to provide security to the Benghazi Special Mission.

I'd like to ask, were you aware of whether Embassy

Tripoli had been notified to the Libyan authorities as a
 diplomatic post?

A Again, that is not my area of specialization, granting agrement, stuff like that, so I'm not -- I should answer more than I don't know the --

Q Okay.

A -- procedures involved.

Q Maybe a different way of asking would be to ask you did the legal status of the diplomatic facility in Benghazi, in your view, have anything to do with the level of support that the interim government provided in terms of security resources to the State Department?

13

6

7

A Not that I'm aware.

Q Again, moving forward in the time sequence here. I would like to first start by noting that the last hour we spent a fair amount of time discussing the 2011 time period. I would like to move in -- specifically to the summer, late spring, early summer 2012.

19 There were a series of security incidents targeting 20 Western interests at that time, including the June 6th attack 21 on the Special Mission Compound and the June 11 attack on the 22 British Ambassador in Benghazi. Were you aware of those 23 security incidents at the time?

A Yes.

25

Q Okay. Did you generally stay informed about

1

19

security developments in eastern Libya?

2 A Yes.

Q And again, to tie back a little bit to your discussion about your responsibilities, did you have a direct role with respect to responding to any security incidents? For instance, was it your role to reassess security posture at post following any of those incidents?

8 A No. That was done by the RSO at the embassy, the 9 regional security officer.

10 0 We understand that when security incidents would 11 happen, there would be a meeting at post that would pull 12 together various stakeholders, including the regional 13 security officer, and there would be discussion about the incident and about any possible changes to security posture 14 15 at post and whether any other recommendations might be made 16 that would affect security at post. We understand that those 17 meetings were referred to as Emergency Action Committee 18 meetings. Is that a term you're familiar with, EACs?

A Yes.

20 Q Did you participate in any EACs that Embassy 21 Tripoli with the Benghazi Special Mission held based on 22 security incidents based on the spring and summer of 2012? 23 A No.

Q Did you in any way direct the recommendations coming out of those EACs?

1	А	No .
2	Q	Did you place any limitations of any kind on the
3	recommendations of those EACs?	
4	Α	No.
5	Q	Did you learn about any of the recommendations that
6	came out	of EACs that were held in response to those security
7	incidents?	
8	А	They were published as normal cables, so I had
9	access to	them.
10	Q	Do you recall if any EAC in that timeframe had made
11	a recomme	ndation to leave Benghazi?
12	А	I don't think so.
13	Q	Okay. And if there had been such a recommendation,
14	would you	have deferred to the EAC?
15	А	Such a decision would have been not only a decision
16	for an EA	C, but as far as I know, handled at a higher level
17	within th	e State Department.
18	Q	Okay. We understand that during the summer of 2012
19	there was	a national election for a body called the General
20	National	Congress. Was the passing of that election viewed
21	generally	as a favorable development for the security
22	situation	in Libya?
23	A	Yes, because the elections in Libya were hadn't
24	taken pla	ce in 40 years, and you know, 40 years ago it was a
25	semi-mona	rchy and a much smaller population, and we spent a

.

1 considerable amount of time supporting the UN effort to 2 manage the elections, and across-the-board election monitors regarded 3 regard those elections as professionally done and full of 4 basically enthusiasm, and they had an extremely high turnout. 5 0 And although there were some reported security incidents at the time of the election, did the elections 6 largely occur without any significant security incidents? 7 8 A Yes. They occurred without. 0 0 I understand. 10 A Sorry. Let me clarify that for the record. 11 0 Please. 12 They occurred without any significant security A situations. 13 14 0 Sorry. I apologize for doing this to you, but 15 there is one question I would like to ask back in the 2011 16 time period, so I would like to return to that just briefly 17 for a second to clarify one response that you'd given in the 18 last round. I had written in my notes when you were asked if 19 you were aware of any post-conflict transition planning 20 documents, that you wrote that you weren't aware of any 21 specific documents, and I just wanted to clarify with you 22 that your testimony here today is not that there wasn't any 23 planning under way, but you just didn't recall any particular 24 documents with respect to post-conflict transition planning? Correct. 25 A

1 And I believe you had indicated also that there was Q a head or person who was responsible for post-conflict 2 planning. Is that your understanding? 3 4 A Correct. 0 And was your sense then that that person or persons 5 or office was responsible for post-conflict planning? 6 7 A We had an interagency process under way that included certainly the Defense Department, State Department, 8 9 and probably Treasury Department, U.S., U.N., and -- but timeline, and I believe suggest -- or -- I can't remember the 10 precise timeline, but he instructed us to begin that pretty 11 12 early on in the intervention. planning So it was your understanding that a plan in process 13 Q was under way during this time period? 14 15 A Correct. Ms. Sachsman Grooms. And that that planning process 16 17 started in 2011? Mr. Fishman. Correct. 18 Ms. Sachsman Grooms. And that the interagency was 19 20 actively involved in doing post-conflict planning for Libya? Mr. Fishman. Correct. 21 BY MR. KENNY: 22 So I would like to shift gears a little bit and 23 0 just ask for your patience as we move into this next section 24 of questions. At the outset, I'll just note that this is the 25

eighth congressional investigation into the Benghazi attacks, and we want to make sure that it's the last, so we're therefore asking questions of every witness about a series of public allegations that have been made since the attacks.

5 It's our understanding that even where some of these 6 questions may have been answered by other investigations, our 7 colleagues in the majority continue to pursue them, and 8 that's why we continue to ask about them.

9 While anyone can speculate about the Benghazi attacks, 10 and plenty of people have, only a limited universe of people 11 have the actual knowledge or evidence of what happened 12 before, during, and after the attacks. So what I'll be 13 asking for is not your opinion but whether you have any 14 firsthand knowledge or information.

15 If you don't, simply move on to the next allegation, and 16 there's, as I mentioned, a lot of them, so please bear with 17 me.

18 The first allegation is: It has been alleged that 19 Secretary of State Clinton intentionally blocked military 20 action on the night of the attacks. One Congressman has 21 speculated that, quote, "Secretary Clinton told Leon to stand 22 down," close quote, and this resulted in the Defense 23 Department not sending more assets to help in Benghazi.

24 Do you have any evidence that Secretary of State Clinton 25 ordered Secretary of Defense Panetta to stand down on the

1

2

6

7

night of the attacks?

A No.

Q Do you have any evidence that Secretary of State Clinton issued any kind of order to Secretary of Defense Panetta on the night of the attacks?

A No.

NO.

Q Move to the next allegation.

8 It's been alleged that Secretary Clinton personally 9 signed an April 2012 cable denying security to Libya. The 10 Washington Post Fact Checker evaluated this claim and gave it 11 Four Pinocchio's, its highest award for false claims.

Do you have any evidence that Secretary Clinton personally signed an April 2012 cable denying security resources to Libya?

15 A

16 Q Do you have any evidence that Secretary Clinton was 17 personally involved in providing specific instruction on the 18 day-to-day security resources in Benghazi?

19 A No.

20 Q It has been alleged that Secretary Clinton 21 misrepresented or fabricated intelligence on the risk posed 22 by Qadhafi to his own people in order to garner support for 23 military operations in spring of 2011.

24 Do you have any evidence that Secretary Clinton 25 misrepresented or fabricated intelligence on the risk posed

- by Qadhafi to his own people in order to garner support for
 military operations in Libya in the spring of 2011?

3

14

18

A No.

Q Next. It has been alleged that the U.S. Mission in Benghazi included transferring weapons to Syrian rebels or to other countries. A bipartisan report issued by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence found that, quote, "the CIA was not collecting and shipping arms from Libya to Syria," close quote, and that they found, quote, "no support for this allegation," close quote.

Do you have any evidence to contradict the House Intelligence Committee's bipartisan report finding that the CIA was not shipping arms from Libya to Syria?

A No.

Q Do you have any evidence that the U.S. facilities in Benghazi were being used to facilitate weapons transfers from Libya to Syria or to any other foreign country?

A

No.

A team of CIA security personnel was 19 Q Next. temporarily delayed from departing the Annex to assist the 20 Special Mission Compound, and there have been a number of 21 allegations about the cause of, and appropriateness of, that 22 delay. The House Intelligence Committee issued a bipartisan 23 report concluding that the team was not ordered to stand 24 down, but there were tactical disagreements on the ground 25

1 over how quickly to depart.

2 Do you have any evidence that would contradict the House 3 Intelligence Committee's finding that there was no stand down 4 order to CIA personnel?

5

No.

A

6 Q Putting aside whether you might personally agree 7 with that decision or think it was right, do you have any 8 evidence that there was a bad or improper reason behind the 9 temporary delay of CIA security personnel who departed the 10 Annex to assist the Special Mission Compound?

11 A Can you just repeat that?

12 Q Sure.

13 A I just want to make sure I --

14 Q No, absolutely.

15 A It's in the negative, right?

Q Do you have any evidence that there was a bad or improper reason behind the temporary delay of CIA security personnel who departed the Annex to assist the Special

19 Mission Compound?

20

A No.

21 Q Next. A concern has been raised by one individual 22 that in the course of producing documents to the 23 Accountability Review Board, damaging documents may have been 24 removed or scrubbed out of that production.

25 Do you have any evidence that anyone at the State

Department removed or scrubbed damaging documents from the
 materials that were provided to the ARB?

3

8

13

A No.

Q Do you have any evidence that anyone at the State Department directed anyone else at the State Department to remove or scrub damaging documents from the materials that were provided to the ARB?

A No.

9 Q I ask these questions also for documents provided 10 to Congress. Do you have any evidence that anyone at the 11 State Department removed or scrubbed damaging documents from 12 the materials that were provided to Congress?

А

No.

Q It has been alleged that CIA Deputy Director Mike Morell altered unclassified talking points about the Benghazi attacks for political reasons and that he then misrepresented his actions when he told Congress that the CIA, quote, "faithfully performed our duties in accordance with the highest standards of objectivity and nonpartisanship," close quote.

21 Do you have any evidence the CIA Deputy Director, Mike 22 Morell, gave false or intentionally misleading testimony to 23 Congress about the Benghazi talking points?

24 A No.

25 Q Do you have any evidence that CIA Deputy Director

Morell altered the talking points provided to Congress for
 political reasons?

A No.

No.

No.

Q It has been alleged that Ambassador Susan Rice made an intentional misrepresentation when she spoke on the Sunday talk shows about the Benghazi attacks.

Do you have any evidence that Ambassador Rice
intentionally misrepresented facts about the Benghazi attacks
on the Sunday talk shows?

10 A

3

11 Q It has been alleged that the President of the 12 United States was, quote, "virtually AWOL as Commander in 13 Chief," close quote, on the night of the attacks, and that he 14 was, quote, "missing in action," close quote.

Do you have any evidence to support the allegation that the President was virtually AWOL as commander in chief or missing in action on the night of the attacks?

18

A

Q It has been alleged that a team of four military personnel in Embassy Tripoli on the night of the attacks were considering flying on the second plane to Benghazi, were ordered by superiors to, quote, "stand down," close quote, meaning to cease all operations. Military officials have stated that those four individuals were instead ordered to, quote, "remain in place," close quote, in Tripoli to provide

1

security and medical assistance at that location.

A Republican staff report issued by the House Armed Services Committee found that, quote, "there was no stand down order issued to U.S. military personnel in Tripoli who sought to join the fight in Benghazi," close quote.

Do you have any evidence to contradict the conclusion of the House Armed Services Committee that there was no stand down order issued to U.S. military personnel in Tripoli who sought to join the fight in Benghazi?

10

16

No. Sorry. Can you repeat it again?

11 Q Of course. Do you have any evidence to contradict 12 the conclusion of the House Armed Services Committee that 13 there was, quote, "no stand down ordered issued to U.S. 14 military personnel in Tripoli who sought to join the fight in 15 Benghazi," close quote?

A No.

A

17 0 And this is the last one. It has been alleged that 18 the military failed to deploy assets on the night of the 19 attacks that would have saved lives. However, former 20 Republican Congressman Howard "Buck" McKeon, former chairman 21 of the House Armed Services Committee, conducted a review of 22 the attacks, after which he stated, quote, "given where the 23 troops were, how quickly the thing all happened, and how quickly it dissipated we probably couldn't have done more 24 than we did, " close quote. 25

Do you have any evidence to contradict Congressman
 McKeon's conclusion?

3

8

11

A No.

Q Do you have any evidence that the Pentagon had military assets available to them on the night of the attacks that could have saved lives but that the Pentagon leadership intentionally decided not to deploy?

A No.

9 Mr. <u>Kenny.</u> And with that, I'll conclude our round.
10 We'll go off the record. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. Okay. Just before we start, we are going to take our half hour, and then the minority may have just a few followup questions, and hopefully. I will not need more than 30 minutes, but with that, we'll go back on the record.

16

BY MS. JACKSON:

Q Mr. Fishman, we talked at the end of my first hour about notification of diplomats and diplomatic facilities in Libya to the transitional government, and you said that this was a topic that was hotly discussed, within the interagency. Is that correct?

A No, I think we didn't have that -- you were talking about -- we were talking about staffing of the embassy.

Q We were also talking about whether we asked for formal recognition of our personnel in our facilities in

Benghazi in July of 2011 when we recognized the NTC as you
 said then, the legitimate the legitimate representative of the Libyan people?

A So I would disagree with the characterization of hotly contested or discussed or whatever you said, but I don't actually recall the discussion of insisting on recognition from the Libyan authorities at the time. That was, I think, handled at the State Department level.

9 Q Well, then please tell me, we talked in my first 10 hour about an issue that you were very much involved in 11 involving a lot of lawyers and legalese. What was that 12 issue?

A That was how we could recognize the Libyan authorities as the legitimate representative of the Libyan people, which would -- in essence, derecognize the Qadhafi regime as the Government of Libya.

Q But did you draw a distinction between recognizing
 them as the representative of the Libyan people and
 recognizing them as the legitimate Libyan Government?

A I believe so, because they didn't have a government
at the time.

Q Okay. And this recognition that occurred in July of 2011 was the basis that was used to unfreeze assets and take other steps that you would take with a different government?

1 A Well, it led to this complicated process that allowed us to unfreeze some assets because the Central Bank 2 3 and other financial institutions were still -- still had 4 their assets frozen, but I can't -- what was the second part 5 of your question? BY MS. BETZ: 6 7 Q Well, I mean, I think, just taking a step back, 8 that trying to understand, as you talked about the legal 9 discussion surrounding the terminology used with respect to identifying -- or how you were going to identify this 10 11 emerging new government? 12 A Right. Which was not yet a government? 13 Q 14 A Right. Correct? 15 Q Correct. 16 A Correct. And so the question then becomes what 17 Q then is the relationship to the mission with respect to that 18 19 emerging government? Were you a part of any discussions with 20 regard to notifying this emerging government with respect to the mission that was present? 21 22 A Not that I recall. Was there ever any discussion when Embassy Tripoli 23 Q reopened about notifying, at that point in time, the 24 government that was in place, the presence of the Benghazi 25

Mission?

1

4

A That was handled by the State Department, so I'm not sure.

BY MS. JACKSON:

5 Q Was there a notification to this emerging 6 government that we were reopening Tripoli?

7 A I'm sure there was, but I don't know the timing of 8 that.

9 Q Okay. But it's your recollection that even though 10 we notified this emerging government of reopening our Embassy 11 in Tripoli, that there was not a corresponding notification 12 of our presence in Benghazi?

A You'd have to ask the State Department those
 questions.

Q So there was no discussion within the interagency of that decision and its ramifications within your office or interagency groups that you participated in?

So any formal demarches, as they're called, to the 18 A embassy of its status or the status of the mission were 19 handled by the State Department. I'm not -- the timing of 20 which, for example, the level which that happened, whether 21 it's under the management assistant -- or under secretary or 22 just within the NEA bureau, I just -- you should ask them. 23 Okay. I guess what we're trying to understand is 24 Q

24 Q Okay. I guess what we re trying to understand is 25 was there a discussion at levels higher than the State

Department, your interagency group about whether legally you 1 could notify this emerging government of an embassy, do they 2 3 have the authority to accept that notification? I don't recall. 4 А Okay. You talked about an interagency discussion 5 Q about this. Who all was involved in that? 6 7 What do you mean by "this"? A You described previously a discussion that there 8 Q 9 was a decision to make to represent -- to recognize the NTC as the representative of the Libyan people. 10 11 A Right. 12 0 Is that correct? Who was involved in that 13 decision? 14 A Oh, okay. The lawyers from both the State Department and the White House, the NSC lawyers. 15 16 0 Okay. 17 And policy professionals and the bureau, A 18 presumably, in NEA and the MENA office, and it rose to the 19 level of the deputies and the principles on the recognition 20 aspect. 21 0 All right. And are there documents memorializing 22 the decisions that the deputies committee made? I'd ask Nick about the process of the NSC. 23 A 24 Mr. McQuaid. You can answer by kind of generally how 25 the process -- can we go off the record, please? Go off the

1	record for 1 minute.
2	Ms. <u>Jackson.</u> Yes.
3	[Discussion off the record.]
4	
5	я.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 RPTR HUMISTON

2 EDTR HUMKE

3 [12:13 p.m.]

4

12

21

Ms. Jackson. Let's go back on the record.

5 Mr. <u>Fishman.</u> So typically any deputies committee 6 meeting, or principals committee meeting, would both have an 7 agenda item that would list this question about recognition of 8 the NTC or on recognition, and that would be memorialized in a 9 summary of conclusions, document written up after the meeting. 10 So if there are any such documents for any particular

11 meetings, that would be it.

BY MS. JACKSON:

Q Now, I believe you said that you believed that when the Embassy in Tripoli reopened, that it was notified to this emerging government?

A As part of standard diplomatic practice, I would
 imagine so, but, again, I don't have any specific knowledge
 of that fact.

19 Q Do you know whether Benghazi as a facility with 20 diplomats there was also the cognized at that time?

A I don't have specific knowledge of that.

Q When it was decided in December of 2011 to extend Benghazi through the end of 2012, do you know whether any formal notification occurred?

25 A Again, that would be a State Department question.

1 Q And then one final question in this area. When the 2 elections occurred in July of 2012 and there's this new 3 General National Council now, do you know whether 4 notifications were made to that entity? 5 I presume not, because there was no government yet. A They were still trying to form the government. That election 6 7 was for a legislative body, which determines -- that was 8 slated to vote on a government, the formation of a 9 government, more in the parliamentary system. 10 0 When my minority colleagues were asking you 11 questions in the last session, you had said that the White 12 House did not drive the decision to remain in Benghazi. Do you recall that question to you? 13 14 A Yes. 15 Okay. But would it be fair to say that the White 0 House was interested in a continued presence in Benghazi? 16 17 I personally supported that decision. I can't A 18 recall if -- that process was handled by the State Department and approved by the State Department, and I don't know if 19 20 any -- well, I'll just leave it at that. 21 Do you recall in or about February of 2012 that Q 22 Deputy Chief of Mission was back in the States 23 and she had meetings with you and others on the National Security Staff about the transition in Libya? 24 25 I don't remember the exact timing, but she probably A

was. And I can't remember if she had come from Libya or was
 going out.

Q Okay. Well, we've reviewed several documents that talk about her meetings with the National Security Staff and providing technical experts in Libya and her concerns that they did not have sufficient security personnel in place to support those technical experts coming into Libya. Do you recall conversations with her regarding that topic?

9 A I recall conversations, whether it was in person or 10 over email or even by phone, but I can't recall one specific 11 meeting.

12

Was the --

13 A Or -- sorry. Most frequently, we would communicate 14 through the Maghreb Affairs Office at the State Department. 15 So her direct lines through the NSC may or -- you know, I'm 16 not quite certain how they worked.

17QAnd I believe you stated earlier that one of your18contacts within the NEA bureau at State was

19 A Correct.

0

20 Q And did you have conversations with her either over 21 the phone, in person, or by email about the inability to get 22 people into Libya because we did not have sufficient security 23 personnel on ground me there?

A Well, it was a larger issue, not just security personnel. It was a question about the array of people who

were there and whether -- the decision to have, for example, a management officer who was responsible for, you know, anything that goes into budgets or issuing payments to local staff, was more important than a technical expert. We all knew and accepted the fact that security was a top priority, but the debate was more along the lines of who would get that limited space.

And not having served overseas in an embassy, I am not an expert on what is required for building up an embassy physically and producing the food at the embassy, for example, or the, you know, facilities. Because they were building it from ground up, I think they were using actually a previous compound that we controlled, the ambassador's residence or something like that.

But anyway, everybody accepted the principle of, you know, security and wanting the maximum security we can -- and by security, that also included vehicles, armored vehicles, and it didn't just entail personnel. So we definitely had those types of conversations and they were ongoing.

Q So in boiling that down, what I heard you say is that there was a resource issue in Libya to bring in the technical experts, both in facilities, security equipment, and security personnel?

A There were resource constraints in terms of how the -- let me try to put it this way. At the same time the

technical people had to be there to build up the embassy compound, we were trying to interact with a new government, and the pie was limited, so we were trying to do both at the same time and trying to use the best resources we could find and reasonably balance the situation.

6 Q And was this true with respect to both Benghazi and 7 Tripoli?

A More in Tripoli.

9 Q You traveled to Libya in late July 2012. Is that 10 correct?

A Yeah. I can't remember if it was late July or
 early August.

13 Q Okay.

14 A In that timeframe.

Q But in that timeframe. During your visit there, did you discuss with Ambassador Stevens his need for additional security personnel in Libya, both in Tripoli and/or in Benghazi?

19

8

A Not that I recall.

20 Q Do you recall any conversations with Ambassador 21 Stevens regarding the fact that he was going to lose the SST, 22 the military SST, right about that same time?

A I recall it was an issue, but I can't remember the exact timing and -- that it was taking place.

25 Q And do you recall whether or not you offered to

1 intervene with the military? 2 Α If it was an issue we discussed, I was generally 3 amenable to helping him in whatever respect I could, but I don't recall it specifically. 4 5 So if we have documents to that effect, those 0 6 documents would be true and accurate, if you made that offer? 7 A Presumably. 8 0 All right. Mr. Fishman, let me move ahead to the 9 night of the attack. Were you part of a SVTC at 7:30 on the 10 night of the attack? 11 А Yes. 12 Q Did you attend? 13 А Yes. 14 0 You attended that SVTC? Okay. And during that SVTC, was the nature of the attack discussed, I mean, how the 15 16 attack occurred? 17 A I believe so, with the available information we had at that time. 18 19 Q And was that information that it was a complex 20 unannounced attack on the compound? 21 Certainly that it was unannounced. And I don't A 22 know how to characterize complex or not. The only 23 information that we had was that the compound was overrun, 24 but at the time, I believe we had very limited information 25 about the nature of the attack.

Okay. Do you recall whether it was discussed in 1 Q 2 that first SVTC whether Ansar al-Sharia had claimed 3 responsibility for the attack? To the best of my recollection, I don't know if we 4 A 5 had any claims at that point. 6 0 Okay. In the one or two days after the attack, did 7 you ever have a conversation with regarding 8 the attack? I don't believe, or I can't remember. 9 A 10 0 Did you talk with anyone who had been in Tripoli or 11 Benghazi in the first couple of days after the attack? 12 A By email, phone? Any method of communication. 13 0 I believe probably I emailed Greg Hicks, who was 14 A the deputy chief of mission at the time. 15 16 And did you discuss the nature of the attack? 0 I was more offering him anything we could 17 A No. provide and expressing my sympathies for his situation and 18 the death of the Ambassador, obviously. And basically 19 offering support in any way I could provide it. 20 21 Going back to that first SVTC on the night of 0 September 11th, during that SVTC, was the issue of deployment 22 of military assets or State Department assets such as the 23 FEST discussed? 24 25 А Yeah. I believe so.

Okay. Do you recall what was decided or agreed to 0 1 with respect to deployment of the FEST and/or deployment of 2 military assets? 3 I can't recall any specific agreements other than 4 А 5 there were continuing to -- DOD was continuing to review available options. 6 7 Q On the night of September 11th, did you have any type of communication either by phone or email with President 8 9 Magarief's daughter? A Yes. 10 Okay. And what type of communication? Was that by 11 Q phone or by email or both? 12 A Email. 13 Email? And did you ask that she communicate to her 14 0 father that they provide any available resources to the U.S. 15 Government? 16 I can't recall the nature of the email. 17 A Did you have any conversation with her about having 18 0 military assets deployed to Libya? 19 Again, I can't recall. 20 A Okay. Did you have conversations with anyone else 21 0 22 in the Libyan Government that evening? She was the daughter of the president. She's not a А 23 member of the -- or wasn't a member of the Libyan Government. 24 So I can't recall anybody else. 25

Did you have conversations with any other Libyans 1 0 that evening, people who were in Libya? 2 One or two may have emailed me, and probably I 3 А responded, but I can't recall. 4 And what were the nature of those communications? 5 0 Was it providing information regarding the attack, the 6 attackers? Was it --7 Probably both. Sorry. Probably providing 8 A information, and I would pass that on to the State Department 9 as a rule. 10 And how would you pass that? Would you send that 11 Q 12 by email? A Yeah. 13 Okay. And who would you have passed that to? 0 14 My colleagues at the Maghreb Affairs Office. 15 A Would that be like 0 16 and other people --17 Yes. A 18 -- in that office? 19 0 A Typically. 20 In the 72 hours or so, 72 to 96 hours after the 21 0 attack, did you play any role in what has become known as the 22 talking points that were developed between the CIA and the 23 White House and other agencies? 24 The only reference I heard to them were at that 25 A

1 initial SVTC, and then the one that you referred to before. but I don't remember subsequently being involved. 2 3 0 You never reviewed any draft of the talking points 4 or saw them as they circulated with other members of the 5 White House staff? 6 No, not that I recall. A 7 Okay. And what did you hear in that SVTC, that Q first SVTC? 8 9 I think there was some brief conversation between A 10 Ben Rhodes and Denis McDonough and Michael Morell. 11 And I'm sorry. Who was the third name? Q 12 A Michael Morell --13 Q Oh. 14 A -- at the CIA, about the need to start working on 15 some kind of public statement or explanation, but then they 16 agreed to take that offline. 17 Q And you weren't part of any of those offline conversations or communications? 18 19 А No. 20 0 Okay. Do you know an individual by the name of Ethan Chorin, C-h-o-r-i-n? 21 22 A I've met him maybe once or twice. 23 Have you had any communication with him after the Q 24 day of the attack, after September 11th, 2012? 25 I can't remember when I met him exactly. А

1 Literally -- I mean, I vaguely remember meeting him once or 2 twice, but I can't remember the timeline. 3 Q During that time that you did meet with him, did vou discuss Ambassador Stevens? 4 5 A I can't remember what we discussed, really. I just want to circle back for a minute. You 6 0 7 talked about a post-conflict resolution interagency group 8 that Mr. Donelin directed be established to work on the 9 Libyan transition. Is that correct? 10 А Yes. 11 0 Okay. So there was an interagency group that dealt 12 with how the Libyan Government was going to transition, or 13 how the Libyan people were going to transition? It was not merely a state-driven enterprise. Is that correct? 14 15 A Well, there were different -- as is normally the 16 case, the State Department has various departments and 17 bureaus. So example, what was called CSO at the time, 18 conflict and --19 0 Stabilization? 20 Yes, correct. Thank you. And then they're called A 21 something else now, had its own team of -- but they're not 22 terribly well integrated with the rest of the State 23 Department for reasons that I can't explain. 24 So they had been doing their own stuff because they were also working with the U.N., which is also working on its own 25

1 stabilization effort.

2	Our stabilization effort was or I mean, our planning
3	presumptions were always that it would be an international
4	effort and we'd feed into the U.N. process, because the U.N.
5	had mandated it in the fall well, it was based on the
6	you know, the President's initial guidelines and also the
7	U.N. mandate to continue it as an international process.
8	So I think the State Department had their own
9	discussions, but we also augmented that in an interagency
10	process obviously involving experts from DOD, who are and
11	were involved in those discussions, also our diplomats in
12	NATO, for example.
13	Q Did Derek Chollett chair this interagency group?
14	A Either he chaired it or co-chaired it with Liz
15	Dibble at State. I can't remember precisely how we were
16	organizing it.
17	BY MS. BETZ:
18	Q What types of issues would the interagency group,
19	A, discuss, and then what decisions did they make, and what
20	recommendations did they make to whom? Would that be the
21	deputies, then?
22	A So it was sort of IC level, which is sort of
23	sub-deputies. We looked at the economic revitalization
24	issues, initially humanitarian issues, so USAID was part of
25	that process as well, and then security stabilization efforts

and whether or not it was viable to have a NATO-led sort of
 stabilization force.

Ms. <u>Jackson</u>. All right, Mr. Fishman. That's all the
 questions we have for you.

Did the minority have any quick follow-up questions?

6 Ms. <u>Sachsman Grooms</u>. Just a little bit. Do you want to 7 just stretch for a sec?

8 Mr. <u>McQuaid</u>. Yes. Two minutes, and then we'll come 9 back.

Ms. <u>Jackson.</u> Okay. So we'll go off the record.

[Recess.]

5

10

11

Mr. <u>Kenny.</u> We can go back on the record. The time is
12 12:41.

And, again, Mr. Fishman, I greatly appreciate your time here today. We just have a few remaining questions we can hopefully power through and then finish and send you on your way.

18 BY MR. KENNY:

Q I'd like to quickly return to the discussion we were having in the last round about the site security team, the Security Support Team referred to as the SST. It seemed to be a little confusing to us to track the questions and the answers that were given in that round. There seemed to be an implication or an insinuation that there was a request for the SST that went unheeded.

And, again, I think you had spoken that you don't recall 1 2 any specific conversations, but I was just hoping to make 3 sure that the record was perfectly clear on that point. So I'd like to ask if during the late July, early August, 2012 4 5 timeframe, did Ambassador Stevens ask you to weigh in in any capacity on the decision to extend the Site Security Team in 6 Tripoli? 7 I don't recall a specific request. 8 А 9 Okay. And do you recall general discussions about Q 10 that decision to extend in that timeframe? 11 А I think only the most general, because actually I 12 had forgotten about that issue until it was raised. 13 0 If there's anything you'd like to add on that point or --14 No. 15 A 16 0 Okay. 17 A That's it. 18 So shifting to the night of the attacks, there's a Q series of questions about what specific military assets may 19 20 have been available on the night to deploy. And I'd just like to take a little step back in that conversation and 21 22 first ask whether in dealing with the crisis response, on the night of the attacks, did you have an operational role? 23 24 А No. 25 Q In your discussions and observations from the night

1 of the attacks, did you ever get the sense that the National 2 Security Council wasn't taking the crisis seriously enough? 3 A No. 4 0 Did you ever get the sense that the President 5 wasn't taking the crisis seriously? 6 A No. 7 Q Did you ever get the sense that anyone in the 8 interagency wasn't taking the crisis seriously? 9 A No. 10 0 Okay. And focusing specifically on the SVTC, the 11 7:30 p.m. SVTC on the night of the attacks, I'd like to just 12 ask for your general understanding of the priorities that 13 were discussed during that SVTC and ask whether the safety and security of personnel in Benghazi was considered to be a 14 f priority? 15 16 A That was the number one issue. 17 Number one issue. Was it also a priority, in your 0 18 view? 19 A Yes, definitely. 20 Okay. And was the safety and security of personnel Q r in Tripoli also a concern or a priority? 21 22 Α Yeah, because we didn't know if anything would follow the attack. 23 24 And I think you touched on this a little bit in the Q last round. You described that there was some limited 25

79

information, but did you recall that there were conflicting
 reports coming in on the night of the attacks?

3

7

8

A Definitely.

Q Okay. We've heard the term "fog of war" used to describe information availability on that night. Was that your sense as well?

A That's a good way of describing it.

Q And --

9 A We had multiple reports coming from various 10 sources, so it was a confusing situation.

11 0 Okay. And in the SVTC, you had mentioned that 12 there was a discussion, a brief discussion that took place about a public statement. And just so that we understand, 13 14 you were asked if you had, or participated, or were aware of 15 a series of talking points that may have been developed in 16 the week after the attacks. We understand that there were 17 several talking points that may have been developed, but I 18 just wanted to understand, our sense was the question was 19 maybe directed towards the talking points that Susan Rice 20 ultimately used on the Sunday talk shows, but I believe your 21 response you were talking about just a general public 22 statement.

23 So at the time of the SVTC, did you have an awareness 24 that talking points were being developed for use on the 25 Sunday talk shows?

I mean, that was on a -- the attack occurred 1 A between Thursday and Friday if I'm not mistaken, so Sunday 2 3 felt like an eternity, so the short answer is no. Okay. And was that because the focus at the time, 4 0 5 you had mentioned what the number one priority was, but there 6 was this brief discussion about a public statement. Would 7 you --8 Right, because the President had to come out the A 9 following day to describe -- to speak about the -- what had happened. 10 11 Q That's right. And the President did in fact speak 12 in the Rose Garden, we believe, on the morning following the Is that your recollection as well? 13 attacks. 14 A Yes. 15 So is it possible, then, that the discussion that Q 16 night between Ben Rhodes, Denis McDonough, and Mike Morell 17 pertained to the President's public statement he was going to make the following day? 18 19 A Yes. 20 0 Okay. Can I ask --21 A Mr. McQuaid. Can we go off the off the record for one 22 second? 23 Mr. Kenny. Sure. Off the record. 24 [Discussion off the record.] 25

Mr. Kenny. We'll go back on the record.

2 Mr. <u>Fishman</u>. So I just wanted to clarify one thing that 3 I said in response to, I believe, the last question of the 4 last round on the security planning group about post-conflict 5 security and stability.

6 The discussions related to an international force 7 potentially deploying to Libya as part of a broader 8 international coalition that would provide security and 9 stability to the country, such as policing roles or training 10 for police. It didn't have anything to do with embassy 11 security directly. And that subject was, again, left in the 12 hands for the professionals at the State Department.

BY MR. KENNY:

Q Thank you. That's a helpful clarification. Returning, just if we could, just a final set of questions on some of the public statements in the week following the attacks. And there's been, as you may be aware, intense scrutiny of some of the administration's statements and specifically how they characterized the attacks, and I'd like to ask for your view.

21 Did you ever get the sense that anyone in the National 22 Security Council or the White House was trying to conceal 23 facts about the attacks for political advantage?

A No.

1

13

24

25

Q Did you ever get the sense that anyone at NSC or

- 1 the White House was trying to conceal the truth in order to 2 avoid embarrassment or to perpetuate a false narrative about 3 the attacks?
- 4 A No.

5 Q Were you ever pressured to conceal facts regarding 6 the Benghazi attacks?

A No.

Q Were you ever asked or pressured to conceal the9 truth about the attacks?

10 A No.

11 Q Were you ever asked to perpetuate a false narrative 12 about the attacks?

13 A No.

Q Okay. And do you have any reason to believe that anyone in the White House Communications Office, whether on the NSC staff or the White House Communications Office was doing anything other than their best good faith effort to determine the truth and convey that accurately with regard to what happened in Benghazi?

20

7

A Do you have any reason to --

21 Q Do you have any reason to believe that the White 22 House communicators were doing anything other than their best 23 faith effort?

24 A No.

25 Q No. Okay. And, finally, we understand that you

1	were interviewed by the Accountability Review Board. Is that
2	correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Were you able to be forthcoming with the ARB in
5	responses to their questions?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And did anyone ever pressure you not to share
8	information or to conceal information from the ARB?
9	A No.
10	Ms. <u>Sachsman Grooms.</u> That's all we have.
11	Mr. <u>Kenny.</u> Thank you.
12	Ms. <u>Sachsman Grooms.</u> We can go off the record.
13	Mr. <u>Kenny.</u> Off the record.
14	[Whereupon, at 12:52 p.m., the interview was concluded.]
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Errata Sheet

Select Committee on Benghazi

The witness' White House counsel on behalf of the witness reviewed the accompanying transcript and certified its accuracy by providing the following corrections. These corrections are reflected in the transcript as identified below.

PAGE	LINE	ALL CORRECTIONS MADE BY WITNESS' COUNSEL
5	18	Replaced "review" with "discuss."
11	15	Replaced "July, August 2009" with "July or August 2009."
17	23	Deleted "February to 2014 – or."
20	4	Replaced "prior – or subsequent to basically December, January of – December 2011 to January – and January 2012" with "December 2011 to January 2012."
21	23	Deleted "held."
21	25	Deleted "about."
23	18	Deleted "was."
27	17	Replaced "Subsequently" with "subsequent."
28	5	Replaced "capability before" with "capability to perform before."
23	21	Deleted "earned a lot."
49	3	Replaced "regard" with "regarded."
50	13	Replaced "plan in" with "planning."
59	2	Replaced "rulers" with "representatives."
64	20	Deleted "there."
64	20	Replaced "recognized" with "notified to this emerging government."
66	23	Deleted "in."
81	12	Replaced "to" with "of."