

President Obama and Attorney General Loretta Lynch Have a “Terror Truth” Problem...


From the [on all five major broadcasts](#) for the Sunday news cycle (Topic Orlando Terrorism). You might well remember the last time a key administration official named Susan Rice met with an almost identical Sunday schedule (Topic Benghazi Terrorism).



General Lynch’s Sunday talk visibility is yet another example of the Obama administration’s risk management reference manual, The Obfuscation Playbook.

The difference between Rice’s 2012 appearance and Lynch’s 2016 version is: this time we know the play. We also know exactly what the administration risk is, even IF the media won’t discuss it, and we’ll explain below.

There is a transparent rift within the FBI community; an internal fight within our own systems of legal / investigative governance and the White House. The numerous leaks from within the FBI investigation of Orlando are highlighting the internal war. It takes a cabinet member to try and create the strongest position for the White House.

 FBI loyalists are transmitting a bat signal toward the U.S. electorate outlining the severity of the terrorist risk. DOJ cabinet member AG Lynch is rapidly dispatching her bureaucratic operatives to shoot out the light bulbs on the bat-signal beacons.

Using the Orlando Terror Massacre we can show you the best

example of that here.

By now almost everyone is familiar with the media reports of behavior from Omar Mateen in 2013 which led to a 10 month investigation by the FBI. However, few people are paying attention to the disparity within those media presentations when contrast against the reality of the 2013 event.

Here's a generic representation of the story as it has appeared. Most media use a similar version to explain. You've already read numerous accounts of this story, but pay very close attention to the part highlighted:

([link](#))

☒ Notice how many times the word “coworkers” is used. In almost every article written about that incident you will see this same portrayal and the same minds’ image it creates around “coworkers”.

Think about how you (yourself) picture that 2013 event in your own mind from those paragraphs above.

Remember, the outcome of this 2013 incident (and the series of investigative events) was Mateen being removed from federal courthouse duty, and being reassigned to a guard shack at a gated community.

Let's look at the situation from another angle; **from the angle of the “coworkers”** [link](#))

These were not just simply “coworkers”, these were Sheriff's deputies who are officially stationed at the federal courthouse. It was not some arbitrary internal courthouse employee who was concerned, it was LAW ENFORCEMENT.

See a difference?

The St. Lucie County Sheriff's Department was concerned about

Mateen and contacted the FBI to report his sketchy behavior. These were not the concerns of some untrained, arbitrary, antagonistic internal, line-level co-worker per se', these were the concerns of full duty police officers in charge of courthouse security.

Does that change the perspective a little?

It should.

This was not a citizen *seeing something and saying something*, this was law enforcement *seeing something and saying something* to the upper levels of the entire security apparatus where *seeing something and saying something* is supposed to make a difference.

Would it make a difference if a County Sheriff called the FBI as opposed to George and Sally Citizen who own the dry cleaning shop?... A person would think, why yes – it should make a difference.



*[FBI Director James] Comey said during the FBI's interview, Mateen admitted to making the statements his **coworkers reported**, but said "he did it in anger, because he thought his coworkers were **discriminating against him and teasing him because he was Muslim.**"*

Now you can see this media paragraph is actually Omar Mateen accusing the county Sheriffs Officers, not just ordinary coworkers, of discriminating against him and teasing him because he was Muslim.

...And the FBI did what?

?With that context, the severity of that 2013 incident begins to take on a new dimension. ?Within that new dimension you find the political risk to the White House.

The intellectually honest reality (as it appears) is that the FBI investigators were so frozen with political correctness, **even when law enforcement is the one reporting the risk** they still can't find a way to isolate and identify the risk appropriately.

That's a big effen' admission.

That would be too politically toxic an admission to make.

How do you tamp down the severity of such an explosive story? You attempt to twist the motive away from direct terrorism. How do you twist the motive? [\(link\)](#)

Easy peasy. Just remove the motive and presto – not Islamic Terrorism. See how that works?

The White House position is better situated if terrorism is removed and the victimization narrative is shifted toward homophobia. Hence, the FBI requesting anyone with knowledge of Mateen's sexuality to shut up. The shooter must appear homophobic if the ruse is to be maintained....



[...] Sitora Yusufiy, who was married to Mateen in 2009 for three months, made the shocking claim [on Brazilian television station SBT Brazil](#).

Her fiancé, Marco Dias, speaking in Portuguese on her behalf, said Yusufiy believed that Mateen had “gay tendencies” and that his father had called him gay in front of her. Dias also claimed “the FBI asked her not to tell this to the American media.” (