

Declare Saudi Arabia A Terrorism Sponsor!

by William F. Wertz, Jr.

March 25—Documentary evidence now exists that Saudi Arabia funded two terrorist attacks on the United States of America—9/11/2012 (Benghazi) and 9/11/2001. This evidence was presented in a memo, sent by former Clinton White House aide Sidney Blumenthal to former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, on Feb. 16, 2013, which was hacked and distributed to the media. This memo reported that French intelligence, Algerian intelligence, and Libyan intelligence all have evidence that Benghazi 9/11/2012 was funded by “wealthy Sunni Islamists from Saudi Arabia.” In respect to 9/11/2001, the evidence was restated last week in a hearing before the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals in Manhattan, on behalf of the families of the victims of the original 9/11, in a lawsuit brought against the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for its role in that attack.

The question that cries out from the victims of these atrocities is: Why are we allied with Saudi Arabia, a satrap of the British Empire, in supporting al-Qaeda in Syria today, a support which is bringing us to the brink of World War III, when it is Saudi Arabia which is responsible for killing American citizens?

Why is it that both the George W. Bush and Barack Obama administrations have refused to declassify the 28-page chapter of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11 on the role of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia? Why is it that no media in the United States have given coverage to the revelation in the Blumenthal memo to Hillary Clinton that the Saudis also funded the attack on the U.S. consulate in Benghazi, Libya? Why is it that supposedly patriotic Senators like John McCain and Lindsey Graham fail to mention Saudi Arabia when they demand that we get to the bottom of Benghazi?

Isn't it time that we end the coverup of the role of our so-called ally, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and designate it as a state sponsor of terrorism?

Saudi Funding of Benghazi

Russia Today has released the full text of four confidential memos on Benghazi sent from Blumenthal to Clinton. The memos had been hacked by someone with the alias “Guccifer” and sent to numerous media outlets.

The most explosive revelation is that, according to Algerian intelligence, the Benghazi 9/11 terrorist attack and the Jan. 25 In Amenas, Algeria, hostage-taking were carried out by al-Qaeda, and that, according to French intelligence, both attacks were funded by “wealthy Sunni Islamists from Saudi Arabia.” The memo further states that Libyan intelligence independently knew of the Saudi funding.

The memo of Feb. 16, 2013, reveals that following President Abdelaziz Bouteflika’s instructions, Algerian intelligence passed on information obtained from the interrogation of known and suspected supporters of Mokhtar Belmokhtar (MBM) in Algeria to Libyan government officials. However, the Algerian intelligence officials “informed Bouteflika’s senior advisors that they would not provide the Libyans with the most worrisome reports given to them by their liaison partners in the French DGSE [intelligence agency]. These Algerian officers also noted ironically that [Libyan intelligence chief] General Hassi and his staff did not realize that they had, for their part, provided the Algerian DGSE with intelligence that supported the French information.”

“Speaking on condition of absolute secrecy, this individual with sensitive access stated that the Algerians are keeping information received from the French DGSE confidential. According to the source, this information concerned the funding of the MBM operation and a possible link to the Ansar al-Sharia attack on the United States Consulate in Benghazi Libya on September 11, 2012, during which the U.S. Ambassador was killed. This individual adds that this information provided by the French service indicates that the funding from both attacks originated with wealthy Sunni Islamists in Saudi Arabia. During July and August 2012, these financiers provided funds to AQIM [al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb] contacts in Southern Europe, who in turn passed the money onto AQIM operatives in Mauritania. These funds were eventually provided to Ansar al-Sharia and its allied militias in the Benghazi region in support of their attack on the U.S. consulate. The money was used to recruit operatives

and purchase ammunition and supplies. This person adds that the same tradecraft was used to provide money used by MBM to organize the In Amenas attack. In a separate conversation, the Algerian DGSE officers note in private, that Libyan intelligence officers tell them that the Benghazi attacks were funded by these financiers in Saudi Arabia. They did not tell the Libyans that they had similar reporting from France.”

What this means, is that both French and Libyan intelligence, independently of each other (unless the French informed both Algeria and Libya), have information that both Benghazi and In Amenas were funded by Saudi Arabia.

Paydirt

Although the Drudge Report website provided a link to the Russia Today website which published the memos, neither Drudge nor any other news service in the U.S. or Europe, other than *EIR* and LaRouchePAC, have addressed the importance of this disclosure.

Since Feb. 16, 2013, when this memo was written, a number of important aspects concerning Benghazi have been revealed which confirm *EIR*'s and LPAC's published exposure of the role of the al-Qaeda-affiliated Libyan Islamic Fighting Group (LIFG) in the terrorist attack on Benghazi.

- On Feb. 18, Arabic media reported that an “Algerian security source” said his government had definite information that the former leader of the LIFG, Abdelhakim Belhadj, had prior knowledge of the attack on the gas production facilities in In Amenas, and Algerian Foreign Ministry spokesman Ammar Ballani declared that Belhadj was *persona non grata* in Algeria.

- On March 5, CNN reported that a phone call was intercepted from the site of the Benghazi attack from someone congratulating Belmokhtar. CNN reported that “Belmokhtar was in Libya for four months from December 2011 and that his visit was facilitated by the leader of a radical Islamist militia with influence in Benghazi and the East.”

- On March 15, the *Libya Herald* reported the arrest of Faraj al-Chalabi, a member of al-Qaeda and the LIFG, as a suspect in the 9/11/12 Benghazi attack.

It was the LIFG led by Belhadj that the U.S., U.K., Saudi Arabia, and Qatar allied with to topple Qaddafi in Libya, and are currently allied with to topple Assad in Syria.

9/11 Families Revive Saudi Case

At the same time that the hacked Blumenthal memo revealed Saudi funding of the Benghazi attack, on March 20, the 2nd Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals heard oral arguments from the law firm of Cozen O'Connor, representing the families of 9/11/2001 victims, and from the law firm Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, representing the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as to whether the lawsuit originally brought against Saudi Arabia for its support for al-Qaeda in the first 9/11 terrorist attack should be reinstated.

In 2005, U.S. District Judge Richard Casey in Manhattan dismissed the claims, finding Saudi Arabia immune under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) of 1976. The 2nd Circuit upheld the dismissal in 2008, and the Supreme Court denied a petition to take the case up in 2009. At that time, the Obama Administration had defended Saudi Arabia in an amicus brief, in which the Solicitor General stated that “the lower courts correctly concluded that Saudi Arabia and its officials are immune from suit for governmental acts outside the United States,” in short, arguing that since Saudi Arabia had not been designated a state sponsor of terrorism, it had sovereign immunity against prosecution.

However, in the meantime, a ruling was issued in November 2011, by a different 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals panel, that a similar suit (*Doe v. Bin Laden*) brought by Judicial Watch against the Taliban government of Afghanistan for its support of al-Qaeda's 9/11 attack, could proceed, thus contradicting the decision against Saudi Arabia in the same circuit. The 2nd Circuit acknowledged that its ruling was inconsistent with the same court's 2008 decision in connection with Saudi Arabia, and after circulating its opinion to other judges not on the panel (mini-*en banc* procedure), and receiving no objection, it overruled the earlier decision.

The decision in *Doe v. Bin Laden* is based on what is called the “noncommercial tort exception” of the FSIA, which stipulates that the case “(1) is noncommercial, (2) seeks money damages, (3) for personal injury or death, or damage to or loss of property, (4) that [it] occur[red] in the United States, and (5) that [it] was caused by the tortious act, (6) of [a defendant] foreign state or [its] employee . . . acting within the scope of his . . . employment.”

On Dec. 22, 2011, the plaintiffs suing Saudi Arabia filed a motion seeking to vacate the judgments favoring Saudi Arabia and the Saudi High Commission for Relief of Bosnia & Herzegovina (SHC), also named as a defendant.

On March 16, 2012, U.S. District Judge George Daniels denied the motion, giving rise to the appeal heard March 20. Daniels took over the case following Casey's death in 2007.

During the March 20 arguments, Circuit Judge Chester Straub asked, if the court were to agree that Judge Daniels abused his discretion in denying plaintiffs' request to vacate the judgments, whether the court could decide other issues in the case.

One aspect of the case "intrigues me," he said, specifically, "whether the entire tort occurred in the United States."

Cozen, the plaintiffs' lawyer, said that not only had the tort taken place in the U.S., as evidenced by the 2001 attacks themselves, but so did some of the conduct leading up to the attacks. In particular, he cited a Saudi intelligence officer who allegedly provided assistance to two 9/11 hijackers. "The whole tort did take place in the United States," he said.

The plaintiffs' appeal brief points out:

"In addition to the claims based on the conduct of the Kingdom's charity agents that was attributable to the Kingdom, plaintiffs alleged that several individual agents of the Saudi government directly provided support to the September 11th planners and hijackers. In particular, Omar Al Bayoumi, a Saudi intelligence officer, and Fahad Al Thumairy, a Saudi diplomat later stripped of his diplomatic visa and barred from the United States based on suspected ties to terrorism, allegedly provided direct assistance to two of the September 11th hijackers from within the United States. Plaintiffs also alleged that Muhammed Fakihi, the head of the Islamic Affairs Department of the Saudi Embassy in Berlin, provided material support to members of the Hamburg al-Qaeda cell that planned and coordinated the September 11th Attacks."

The appeal brief further argues that "given the allegations concerning the sponsorship provided by officials of the Saudi government to the September 11th plot participants, plaintiffs' pleadings allege a more direct role in the September 11th Attacks than those concerning Afghanistan in *Doe*."

In addition to Straub, the panel included Circuit

Judges José Cabranes and Ralph Winter. Cabranes was on both the 2008 panel that originally upheld the lawsuit's dismissal, and also on the panel that reinstated the Afghanistan case in 2011.

Cozen recently filed a new lawsuit in Pennsylvania, where hijacked Flight 93 crashed. He said he believes the new lawsuit stands a better chance in the Federal circuit court.

The lawsuit alleges that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia made charitable donations to Muslim groups that were then funneled to al-Qaeda. The defendants include Prince Salman, the Governor of Riyadh, the Saudi Joint Relief Commission and other charities, and Saudi banks and bank executives.

Implications

These two developments underscore the necessity of declassifying the 28-page chapter of the Joint Congressional Inquiry, that is devoted to the Saudi involvement in the original 9/11 attack. Clearly the key person of interest in both 9/11 attacks is Saudi Prince Bandar, who, as Ambassador to the U.S. in 2001, provided funds, through his wife Haifa (sister of Prince Turki, who was the head of Saudi intelligence at the time), to two of the 9/11 hijackers, and who, as the current head of Saudi Intelligence, would have been involved in the funding of 9/11/2012 in Benghazi.

Bandar has a long history of funding dirty covert operations, going back to the Contras in Nicaragua when the U.S. Congress cut off funding in the 1980s. As *EIR* and LPAC have also emphasized, Bandar has access to a slush fund from the BAE-Al Yamama deal. Today, it is widely known that Bandar is also funding al-Qaeda in Syria.

Those like Senators McCain and Graham who say they want to get to the bottom of the coverup of Benghazi, even as they are pushing for U.S. intervention in Syria in alliance with Saudi Arabia, the funders and facilitators of the murderers of our citizens, need to be asked: Will you support the declassification of the 28-page chapter of the Joint Congressional Inquiry on the Saudi role in 9/11? Will you demand an investigation of the French, Algerian, and Libyan evidence of Saudi funding of Benghazi? Will you demand that Saudi Arabia be declared a state sponsor of terrorism? If not, you are engaged in as big a coverup as you otherwise correctly accuse the Obama Administration of carrying out.