

ADVERTISEMENT

4 Pinocchios | Barack Obama | 2016 Candidates | Political Ads | Congress | Issues | Full Archive



Search The Washington Post

# Issa's absurd claim that Clinton's 'signature' means she personally approved it

Posted by Glenn Kessler at 06:00 AM ET, 04/26/2013



(Mark Wilson/GETTY IMAGES)

*"The secretary of state was just wrong. She said she did not participate in this, and yet only a few months before the attack, she outright denied security in her signature in a cable, April 2012."*

— Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, on "Fox and Friends," April 24, 2013

House Republicans issued [a scathing report](#) this week on the Obama administration's handling of [the terror attack last year](#) on a U.S. diplomatic facility in Benghazi, Libya, in which U.S. Ambassador Chris Stevens and three other Americans were killed. The report — endorsed by five committee chairmen — has some interesting information in it, particularly in raising questions about how the [infamous talking points](#) on the incident were crafted.

One of the [headline items](#) in the report was the claim that an April 19, 2012, State Department cable acknowledged a request from the embassy in Libya for additional security assets but ordered that a planned drawdown would proceed as scheduled. "The cable response to Tripoli bears Secretary Clinton's signature," the report said, referring to the message as "the April cable from Clinton."

Clinton [told Congress](#) that the security issues in Libya "did not come to my attention or above the assistant secretary level." The State Department's [Accountability Review Board report](#) on the incident backs her up, saying that failure to provide proper security was the result of decisions made at senior levels within two bureaus of the State Department.

But Fox host Brian Kilmeade all but accused Clinton of perjury when he interviewed Issa, saying the report "sharply contradicts her sworn testimony.... [It] is in direct contradiction of what she told everybody, told the country."

In response, Issa asserted that "she outright denied security in her signature in a cable."

The Fact Checker [spent nine years](#) covering the State Department, and so these claims about a "signature" seemed rather odd. Let's explore what this really means.

## The Facts

ADVERTISEMENT

Paid for by the Center for Global Policy Solutions and PolicyLink.

### About the Blogger

Glenn Kessler has covered foreign policy, economic policy, the White House, Congress, politics, airline safety and Wall Street.

### Fact Check This!

Help us keep an eye on public figures by sending us statements to fact check in one of the following ways:

Tweeting with [#FactCheckThis](#)

Send us an [email](#)

Fill out [this form](#)

### Latest Tweet

[View All Tweets](#)

### Blog Roll

- [FactCheck.org](#)
- [RealClearPolitics](#)
- [PolitiFact](#)
- [OpenSecrets.org](#)
- [OnTheIssues.org](#)

### Fact or Fiction?

"The truth is, if the same share of people were participating in the workforce today as on the day the president got elected, our unemployment rate would be around

Cable is a bit of an old-fashioned word, but then the State Department — the nation's first Cabinet department — is a tradition-bound organization. These days, State Department cables in effect are [group e-mails](#), which are stored in a database and made available to people with the proper security clearances.

As part of that tradition, every cable from an embassy bears the "signature" of the ambassador — and every cable from Washington bears the "signature" of the secretary of state. The protocol is explained in the State Department's [Foreign Affairs Manual](#):

#### Signature

- a. The Communications Center (IRM/OPS/MSO/MSMC) will place the name of the Secretary on all telegrams to posts.
- b. Domestic telegrams originated within the Washington metropolitan area and transmitted through the 5th Floor Communications Center will bear the signature name of the Secretary at the end of the telegram. If a "signed by" line is used, it must appear as part of the text before the "End of Message" symbol.

Note that not even the drafter of a cable gets to put the secretary's "signature" on the cable; it is done by the worker bees in the communications center. Moreover, every single cable from Washington gets the secretary's name at the bottom, even if the secretary happens to be on the other side of the world at the time.

Because of this protocol, "Secretary Clinton 'signed' hundreds of thousands of cables during her tenure as secretary," said State Department spokesman Patrick H. Ventrell. "As then-Secretary Clinton testified, the security cables related to Benghazi did not come to her attention. These cables were reviewed at the assistant secretary level."

This antiquated system means that a slew of routine messages in theory bear the imprimatur of the secretary. Using the WikiLeaks archive of State Department cables, we turned up the following cables that were sent to the embassy in Tripoli with the "signature" of either Condoleezza Rice or Clinton during the first two months in 2009.

#### [Announcing the ratification of the U.S.-IAEA Additional Protocol, Jan. 3, 2009.](#)

This detailed the talking points for diplomatic missions regarding the Bush administration's signing of a nuclear agreement. Signed RICE.

#### [Travel Alert for Israel, West Bank and Gaza, Jan. 6, 2009](#)

This was a routine travel alert issued during the Israeli operation in Gaza in 2009. Signed RICE.

#### [Shortage of Hotel Rooms in Monrovia, Jan. 15, 2009](#)

"Embassy Monrovia advises travelers that due to numerous events scheduled by the Government of Liberia, hotel rooms during March 1-10, 2009 will be extremely limited and only Mission essential country clearance requests will be approved." Signed RICE.

#### [Executive Orders on Closing Guantanamo, Jan. 24, 2009](#)

This provided an explanation of the executive orders signed by President Obama ordering the (never-happened) closure of Guantanamo detention center. Signed CLINTON.

#### [Talking Points on Chad-Sudan Relations for Embassy Tripoli, Feb. 3, 2009](#)

"Department requests that Embassy Khartoum and Embassy N'Djamena urge the Governments of Chad and Sudan to cease support of opposing rebel groups and continue to work toward normalized relations." Signed CLINTON.

#### [Managing the E-Mail System, Feb. 9, 2009](#)

This cable provided tips on using the e-mail system, including:

— "Do not send electronic greetings (e-cards); multimedia files that are not business related; chain letters; letters or messages that offer a product or service based on the structure of a chain letter, including jokes, recipes, or other non-business related information; or conduct any other activity that causes congestion or disruption of an intranet or the Internet are prohibited."

— "Do not use 'Reply to All' unless the response is indeed applicable to all addressees."

— "AVOID USING ALL CAPITAL LETTERS - IT IS PERCEIVED AS SHOUTING!!! It can be seen as offensive to the receiver."

— "Unless confirmation of receipt is requested, avoid sending gratuitous 'Thanks' replies."

Signed CLINTON.

#### [Brazzaville -New Key Office Telephone Numbers, Feb. 17, 2009](#)

This short cable provided new phone numbers of key offices of the U.S. Embassy in Brazzaville. Signed CLINTON.

11 percent."

- Mitt Romney

#### How accurate is this statement?



Choose a Pinocchio rating to Rate this statement. Graded this checker

Track all the Campaign 2012 fact checks >

#### Featured Advertiser Links

Looking to buy a home? Visit TWP Real Estate section for the latest open houses.

Wireless is Changing US healthcare

ADVERTISEMENT

#### Sponsored Links



#### Know Where You Stand

Monitor your credit. Manage your future. Equifax Complete™ Premier.  
[www.equifax.com](http://www.equifax.com)



#### LifeLock.com

LifeLock® Data Breach Notifications Help Protect Your Identity.  
[LifeLock.com](http://LifeLock.com)



#### Map Your Flood Risk

Find Floodplan Maps, Facts, FAQs, Your Flood Risk Profile and More!  
[www.floodsmart.gov](http://www.floodsmart.gov)

Buy a link here

You get the picture.

We also checked with former senior State Department officials, who agreed it would have been highly unlikely for Clinton to have even viewed the cable in question, or even known it had been issued.

"A very small fraction would be seen by the secretary of state," said [R. Nicholas Burns](#), a career diplomat who was undersecretary of state for political affairs under Rice.

Burns said he would only show a cable to Rice if it had very sensitive instructions for an ambassador and he wanted to be sure she agreed with his draft language. But generally he said the secretary is much too busy and would never see the cables. He added that sometimes even assistant secretaries would not view cables that are sent out under the secretary's "signature."

Burns noted that the confusion over "signature" is a common misunderstanding about State Department cables. He frequently has to correct historians from overseas who mistakenly believe the secretary's name at the bottom of the cable has much meaning.

"I can say that from being there with one secretary and reviewing the work of many other secretaries in my academic research, there are many, many cables the secretary never sees," said [Larry Wilkerson](#), who was chief of staff to Colin L. Powell. "From time to time, the deputy may 'chop' [approve], the undersecretary may 'chop', or the assistant secretary or office director may 'chop' — and the cable goes."

Wilkerson added that there is a way to learn who saw a cable before it was issued.

"Were I in my old job, I could tell immediately by going to the administrative section on the 7th floor [where the secretary's office is] and asking to see the coordination and approval sheet," he said. "That reflects all who saw it, complete with their initials, indicating they saw it. It also includes who approved it. If it did not get to the secretary, that sheet should be in the originator's bureau/office. In short, there is a very specific record who saw and 'chopped' on any cable, whether it got to the 7th floor or not."

Frederick R. Hill, spokesman for the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, defended Issa's claim that Clinton "outright denied security" because her "signature" was on the cable, in part because he says State has been uncooperative in explaining the circumstances of the cable. He noted that House Republicans have called on Obama to make the cable public:

This cable shows that resource denial decisions did not just occur informally — in phone conversations and e-mails amongst less senior officials — but were actually run up the chain of command and made through supervised Department processes sanctioned under the Secretary's authority.

Some of the names of those who participated in the process of clearing and approving the cable viewed by congressional investigators were inexplicably redacted by the State Department from the document. On multiple occasions, Congressional investigators objected to these type of redactions and requested unredacted documents, including this cable. State Department has still not complied with these requests.

## The Pinocchio Test

In his interview, Issa presented this as a "gotcha" moment, but it relies on an absurd understanding of the word "signature." We concede that there might be some lingering questions — such as whether anyone in Clinton's office saw this cable before it was issued — but that does not excuse using language that comes close to suggesting Clinton lied under oath.

Issa would be on much stronger ground if he didn't claim that Clinton signed it, but that it was fishy and he was seeking more information on who had crafted and approved the cable. The House GOP report also veers close to the edge with its phrasing about Clinton's "signature."

In some ways, one could argue this is worth Three Pinocchios because, after all, it is technically correct to refer to a "signature." But that ignores the fact that the State Department is a vast organization and even office directors can send out a cable that ends up with the secretary's "signature."

At this point, Issa has no basis or evidence to show that Clinton had anything to do with this cable — any more than she personally approved a cable on proper e-mail etiquette. The odds are extremely long that Clinton ever saw or approved this memo, giving us confidence that his inflammatory and reckless language qualifies as a "whopper."

## Four Pinocchios



(About our rating scale)

Check out our candidate [Pinocchio Tracker](#)

Follow The Fact Checker on [Twitter](#) and friend us on [Facebook](#)

Ad

Fact Checker

# Rep. Darrell Issa disputes his Four-Pinocchio ratings


By **Glenn Kessler** March 3   Follow @GlennKesslerWP

(Lauren Victoria Burke/Associated Press)

**CHRIS WALLACE:** *That brings up my final question for you, because you have come under fire both in the IRS and Benghazi and other investigations of your committee for political witch hunts. They point specifically to a speech you gave to GOP fundraiser in New Hampshire in February about the Benghazi terror attack. Here's a clip.*

**VIDEO CLIP:** *Why there was not one order given to turn on one Department of Defense asset? I have my suspicions, which is Secretary Clinton told them to stand down.*

Advertisement



**WALLACE:** *But the Washington Post Fact Checker cited that bipartisan report you mentioned, the Senate Intelligence Committee, that there were no stand-down orders, and there is also no evidence that Clinton ever spoke to Leon Panetta, then defense secretary, that night. And for the second time, they gave you four Pinocchios, which is their highest level of falsehood. How do you respond to that, sir?*

**REP. DARRELL ISSA:** *Well, first of all, the first one was for quoting something that was in somebody else's report, believing that it was true, which is an unusual way to get four Pinocchios. But in this case, the secretary of state was responsible for this normalization policy that existed in Benghazi. Witnesses have told us that they asked for help. The president himself implied that he told Leon Panetta, then secretary of defense, to use what efforts they could and what we know for a fact is not one aircraft, not one rescue of DOD was launched to get there in that 8 1/2 hours.*

**WALLACE:** *But to be honest, do you not have any evidence that Secretary Clinton told Leon Panetta to stand down?*

**ISSA:** *Well, the use in answering questions in a political fundraiser, that was in response to a question, the term "stand down" is not used in some sort of an explicit way, but rather the failure to react, the fact that only State Department assets and only assets inside the country were ever used, that members of the armed forces, gun carrying, trained people were not allowed to get on the aircraft to go and attempt to rescue. Those kinds of things*

through State Department resources represent a stand-down. Not maybe on the technical terms of “stand down, soldier,” but on what the American people believe is a failure to respond what they could have.

### – Exchange on “Fox News Sunday,” March 2

Politicians are never happy to receive Pinocchios from the Fact Checker. We understand that, and of course offer them a chance to dispute our reasoning.

On “Fox News Sunday,” host Chris Wallace brought up two Four-Pinocchio ratings given to Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, for remarks concerning the 2012 attack on a U.S. compound in Benghazi, Libya. He offered two rationales in arguing that our rating was wrong, so let’s review the issues again.

#### **The Facts**

The [first Four-Pinocchio rating](#) concerned this statement by Issa on “Fox and Friends” on April 24, 2013:

*“The secretary of state was just wrong. She said she did not participate in this, and yet only a few months before the attack, she outright denied security in her signature in a cable, April 2012.”*

The Fact Checker awarded Four Pinocchios because every single cable from Washington — hundreds of thousands of them a year, even the most mundane — automatically receives the secretary of state’s signature, per State Department protocol. Very few cables are ever shown to

the secretary before being sent, and there is no evidence that Clinton ever saw this particular cable.

Speaking to Wallace, Issa explained, “The first one was for quoting something that was in somebody else’s report, believing that it was true, which is an unusual way to get four Pinocchios.”

Hmm, someone else’s report? He’s apparently referring to 43-page [“Interim Progress Report”](#) issued on April 23, 2013, by five committee chairmen in the House: Reps. Howard “Buck” McKeon (Armed Services), Ed Royce (Foreign Affairs), Bob Goodlatte (Judiciary), Mike Rogers (Intelligence), and Issa.

Perhaps Issa has forgotten he signed the report? He certainly didn’t when he appeared on “Fox and Friends,” as this is the question that prompted his Pinocchio-worthy comment: “Chairman Issa, you’ve been on this from day one; you released a 43-page report. And in it, it says what about what the former secretary of state knew?” Later in the interview, Issa referred to “our report” and “our investigation.”

Advertisement

As we noted at the time, the report “veered close to the edge” with its phrasing but its language was not as objectionable as Issa’s comments. He also did not contradict the television host, who all but accused Clinton of committing perjury in her testimony before Congress.

In any case, politicians have an obligation to check the facts in reports before citing them. It’s not enough to

blame someone else's report — especially when it is your own.

As Wallace noted, the second Four-Pinocchio rating concerned Issa's recent assertion that he suspected that Clinton ordered Defense Secretary Leon Panetta to “stand down” troops during the effort to rescue Americans under attack. As Issa put it on Feb. 17:

*“Why [was] there not one order given to turn on one Department of Defense asset?”*

In his response to Wallace, Issa moves the goal posts. “We know for a fact is not one aircraft, not one rescue of DOD was launched to get there in that 8 1/2 hours,” he said. Here, he confirms our reporting that Panetta did issue a series of orders, but because of the location of assets, they didn't arrive until the next day.

(Issa does not mention that, separately, six U.S. security personnel left the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli for Benghazi, landed by 7:30 p.m. and “performed heroically,” according to [a report](#) issued by Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee. A bipartisan Senate Intelligence Committee [report](#) describes the group as a seven-person team: “A seven-person security team (consisting of two DoD personnel, four CIA personnel, and a linguist) flew from the U.S. Embassy in Tripoli to Benghazi and successfully helped evacuate the Americans from the Annex to the airport.”)

Issa then tries to redefine the term “stand down” as “the failure to react,” when in fact Panetta and DOD did react.

He also claims that “members of the Armed Forces — gun carrying, trained people — were not allowed to get on the aircraft to go and attempt to rescue.” He does not mention that the Special Operations commander in question later told investigators that the decision was correct in hindsight because his team otherwise would not have been in Tripoli to deal with the wounded arriving from Benghazi.

Advertisement

We will also note that he does not deny to Wallace that he has no evidence showing that Clinton gave Panetta a stand-down order. That lack of evidence was the key reason he earned Four Pinocchios.

### **The Pinocchio Test**

Issa’s new explanations do not pass scrutiny. It is especially strange that he would refer to a report he signed — and touted at the time as his own — as “someone else’s report.” We reaffirm our awarding of Four Pinocchios in both cases.

### **Four Pinocchios**

[\(About our rating scale\)](#)

**Send us facts to check by filling out [this form](#)**

**Follow The Fact Checker on [Twitter](#) and friend us on [Facebook](#)**

---

Glenn Kessler has reported on domestic and foreign policy for more than three decades. He would like your help in keeping an eye on public figures. Send him statements to fact check by [emailing him](#), [tweeting at him](#), or sending him a message on [Facebook](#).

---