9/11: 3000 Americans for Three Saudi Princes

New details about the Troubling Omissions of Saudi Arabia's wealthy from 9/11 Commission Report

Walid Shoebat and Ben Barrack

What is a Saudi prince worth? The answer is one Saudi prince is worth 1000 Americans. Evidence suggests it's a simple mathematical equation involving a deal being struck between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia that included the deaths of three Saudi princes who met very suspicious ends in July of 2002, within days of each other.

In a *Vanity Fair* article, a former C.I.A. operative was cited as the source that identified those three princes as having been named by captured #3 man in al-Qaeda, Abu Zubaydah during interrogation sessions. Each of these three princes were said to have been financiers of 9/11. Many believe that the 9/11 Commission Report omitted the princes' involvement and that a 28-page, redacted chapter in a Joint Inquiry report – which remains classsified – confirms foul play by Saudi Arabia regarding these deaths.

With that as a backdrop, what we provide in this report are more details about the deaths of those Saudi princes, courtesy of Arabic sources, believed to have never been released in English until now.

We include the only eyewitness account and translated reports that could help provide more pieces to this complex puzzle.

To date, in English, we cannot find any testimonies, eyewitness accounts, details, or any official investigation that provides any evidence which brings closure to these mysterious deaths, aside from the typical few lines and obituary notices.

The first was the story of Prince Ahmed bin Salman bin Abdulaziz, the well-known horse racing enthusiast and owner of Kentucky Derby winner War Emblem. Less than one year earlier, bin Salman was allowed to fly out of the United States on 9/16/01. His cause of death was ruled a heart attack during routine abdominal surgery on July 22, 2002.

The United States still refuses to release the names of over 140 Saudis who were permitted to leave the country on several planes in the days after 9/11. Prince bin Salman was one of the few who was identified as such, in a 9/11 Staff Report published about one month after the Commission Report was released; the Staff Report focused on the issue of terrorist travel.

The second curious death is that of Prince Sultan bin Faisal bin Turki bin Abdullah al-Saud who mysteriously died on his way to bin Salman's funeral in a car accident one day later, on July 23, 2002.

The third is Fahd bin Turki bin Saud al-Kabir, who mysteriously got lost in the desert and died of thirst on July 30th, 2002.

Before we discuss the Arabic sources we examined, a crucial link is necessary between these three deaths and Abu Zubaydah, when he was captured in March of 2002.

In 2003, *TIME Magazine* published an article by Johanna McGeary that focused on Zubaydah, considered to be "the Rosetta stone of 9/11" who provided a wealth of information about the internal dealings between al-Qaeda and Saudi Arabia. According to McGeary, Zubaydah was a:

> "...leading member of Osama bin Laden's brain trust and the operational control of al-Qaeda's millennium bomb plots as well as the attack on the USS Cole in October 2000."

Subsequently, the U.S. depended largely on its allies to do some of the dirty work. Jordan – after an al-Qaeda attack on a hotel there – was asked to help get some of Abu Zubaydah's henchmen as they were rounded up in a Jordanian prison. It was my cousin – Jawad Younis – who took the case, defending Abu Zubaydah's terrorists to save some of the al-Qaeda operatives from facing the hangman. Abu Hushar (named in the 9/11 Commission Report on Page 175) and Abu Sammar weren't so lucky; both got sentenced to death by hanging.

As an aside, Jawad's brother – Kamal Younis – helped to plant seeds of doubt about my terrorist past to one gullible American named Eileen Fleming while his brother Jawad, the prominent lawyer, works with other Muslim Brotherhood activists to topple the Kingdom of Jordan and convert it to a Muslim Brotherhood state. Yet, people like Fleming give *them* credibility and attempt to impugn mine.

McGeary wrote that after Zubaydah was captured in Pakistan, he was transferred to Afghanistan. While in captivity, he was sedated with truth serum (sodium pentothal), then the two Arab American agents told him that he was in a Saudi prison facility, to induce fear and make him empty his memory bank.

Zubaydah's reaction "was not fear, but utter relief." Happy to see 'Saudi agents', he:

> "...reeled off telephone numbers for a senior member of the royal family who would, said Zubaydah, 'tell you what to do.' The man at the other end would be Prince Ahmed bin Salman bin Abdul Aziz, a Westernized nephew of the late King Fahd and a publisher better known as a racehorse owner."

It cannot be understated that this was the same Prince bin Salman who was allowed to fly out of the United States on 9/16/01 without being questioned or interviewed. This is a

glaring indictment of Bush administration policy relative to unfettered Saudis on American soil in the days after 9/11/01.

Abu Zubaydah mentioned all three royal-princes as intermediaries.

Yet, an examination of Arabic sources provides more reasons to suspect foul play. Take Prince Sultan bin Faisal bin Turki bin Abdullah al-Saud. There were four media reports that gave scant information about the circumstances of his death.

The official statements were provided to Al-Jazeera, to Okaz, to Al-Iktisadiyeh, and Asharq Al-Awsat, based in London. Only Asharq Al-Awsat preserved their version of the story in its archives; all the others purged their articles, which we had to obtain from other sources.

Okaz was a call-in by Faisal's half-brother Abdullah, who called the paper to issue a summary of the death.

There was only one eyewitness account, provided secondhand from Sultan's other brother. Prince Khalid relayed the testimony of an Ethiopian "Akhwiya" by the name of Muhammad Hassan. "Akhwiya" is a term used only in Saudi Arabia, for what they consider lower class, handpicked non-Saudi helpers who usually tag along and hang around Saudi royals in hopes of gaining special favors.

Al-Jazeera's exclusive interview by Abdullah al-Kathiri with Prince Khalid seems more like an attempt to portray Hassan as an alibi in an oddly created section subtitled, "Eye Witness Account" to answer the question about how the prince was the only one killed in the alleged accident, despite having several helpers with him.

The story goes – as told by Hassan – that Prince Sultan took off at 2:00 AM en route from Jeddah to Riyadh after he paid sums of money to the usual beggars who surrounded his castle. While it's unusual to have beggars two hours past midnight, more troubling were the number of conflicting reports about how many cars were trailing the prince during his trip to attend Prince bin Salman's funeral – after the latter had died of a heart attack a day before.

Al-Jazeera reported that "several cars" trailed the prince while *Asharq Al-Awsat* cited the prince's business manager Hamdan Khalil Hamdan as saying that "two cars" trailed behind. *Okaz* reported there was only "one car" trailing the prince and then finally produced merely one lone man – an Ethiopian named Muhammad Hassan – who was trailing the prince.

The story continues that when prince Sultan stopped in Ta'if to lead the group in morning prayers, one of the helpers (no name) offered to accompany the prince in his car and was shunned away by Prince Sultan, who loved to speed. As a gesture of self-sacrifice, the prince allegedly told him, "you are the only son of your mother".

After the prayers were finished, which would still be pitch dark (4-5 AM), they continued on the journey while the entourage followed the prince, who was speeding recklessly. Then all hell broke loose 70 miles before reaching Riyadh, in an area called Alhawmiyat. Hassan allegedly witnessed the tire explode while he was trailing directly behind prince Sultan. The vehicle (an Audi) then rolled several times in the air, crashing to the side of a mountain. As to the debris and how car pieces were strewn all over the place (an unexplained piece of the puzzle that had no source), Hassan assumed it was the result of the high rate of speed at which the prince was traveling. No reference was provided to the shattering of the vehicle or how this piece of information came about. But for Hassan to see a tire blowout, we must assume that he was traveling at the same high rate of speed as well. Why would the prince refuse passengers because he was a speeding fanatic while also expecting one of those would-be passengers – Muhammad Hassan (a name akin to Bob Smith) – to speed in order to keep up with him?

Hassan even relayed a miraculous ending to the prince's demise, saying that after his high-speed crash, Sultan died with his body hanging halfway out of the car while facing Mecca, and miraculously pointing his right index finger (a typical gesture Muslims make) to proclaim that Allah is the indivisible One God.

There was not a single firsthand account – no photos of the scene of the accident nor of the wreckage, no statements from police, nothing.

If foul play was involved, Alhawmiyat (where the death allegedly occurred) is an excellent place to claim an accident. A search of Alhawmiyat in Arabic shows the notoriety of this place for car accidents. Yet, how is it possible to find countless reports that include many photos of vehicles crashed by lay persons, as well as by several VIP's but nothing on prince Sultan? For example, Prince Muhammad bin Nay, while accompanying a Malaysian diplomat, had an accident and didn't even die. Nonetheless, several photos of the accident scene can be found, as can hospital photos, wreckage photos, etc. An ambassador from Bosnia even had a simple accident and a report with a photo can be found. Yet, a Saudi prince dies on his way to the funeral of another Saudi prince who died mysteriously one day earlier and there is nothing of the sort?

Prince Fahd bin Turki bin Saud al-Kabir's story about being lost in the desert is another unsolved mystery. What little detail of the story we found came from only a couple of purged media sources, which we got elsewhere. They relayed the testimony of "Brigadier Abdul Qadir Altalha" who can be verified and *does* exist as someone working for the kingdom's authority. The prince's death was issued in the form of a statement from Altalha that was more about being an official warning that communicated, "beware of wandering in the desert" than it was an announcement of the death of a royal Saudi. It was definitely a great idea for minimum circulation and the report only existed on a handful of sites. We translated the report verbatim:

> "An accident forced the death of three Saudis, including a Prince who died of thirst in the desert. Saudi authorities had issued a warning urging citizens not to hike in the desert during the hot summer days in order to preserve their lives. The Royal Court issued a statement in Riyadh yesterday which mourned Prince Fahd

> bin Turki bin Saud Al-Kabeer, aged twenty-five years, who died Monday afternoon as a result of thirst during a trip that was carried out in the desert of the southern province of Rumah near the Omani Centre, 90 kilometers east of the capital. The details of the incident as relayed by Brigadier Abdul Qadir Altalha were that three victims were on a picnic with two other colleagues in the Rumah area. While they were returning, the car fell into a ditch, which rendered it unusable, prompting three of them to move in an attempt to get rescued from the desert. The three lost the road and decided to return to the car and died beside it as a result of thirst. The other two were lucky and were able to guide a colleague to their place by using their mobile phone."

None of those stories add up. A man with a royal pedigree is stranded in the desert without fancy, sparkling water and leaves his vehicle on foot to get help while his other 'helpers' have a cell phone and were able to use it? The two who stayed behind got rescued while the royal prince lays dead by his car? Why are there no names of the eyewitnesses attached to the story except prince Fahd and an official named Altalha? The story seems like an alibi to answer how a body was found. How could the other two who died with the prince have no names or any mention of an obituary showing they died with a royal?

When it comes to any 'Al Saud' stranded somewhere, the Kingdom sends its best. The story of Princess Lawlawa bint Mashhur is a case in point. When the Jeddah flood of 2011 left an entire city stranded, a private chopper was sent at night not to rescue all or even some of the girls who were drowning at Dar al-Hekma College, but to pick up only one – Princess Lawlawa – while leaving the rest of the women stranded; those left behind can be seen getting rescued a day later by courageous civilians.

Countless people died in Jeddah and were buried under the mud and debris. This is a government that left girls to die in a fire, fearing that their rescue could lead to the possibility that some female flesh might be revealed while government officials sin in secret.

And why would a simple abdominal surgery cause a healthy young athlete like prince bin Salman a heart attack? These are accounts that remain highly suspect. While coverage by cameramen who visited the funerals was in abundance, none asked serious questions or took photos of the sites of these deaths; none provided any details apart from the fantastic, princely piety and self-sacrifice.

Consider the mathematical probabilities of the following events actually taking place:

- Three princes named by Abu Zubaydah as having helped plan 9/11 all die mysteriously within four months of Zubaydah's capture and within one week of each other.
- The stories of these three princes are not included in the 9/11 Commission Report or available in the original Arabic media sources.
- There are no photos or verifiable names of individuals present during these deaths.

- One prince dies in a car accident with his finger pointing toward Mecca, after his vehicle had flipped several times in the air.
- One prince dies after leaving behind a functioning mobile phone and walking through the desert without water, before dying next to the car he left to find help.

Perhaps a *Washington Post* article written by Douglas Farah in 2002 can provide some insight into what happened. In that article, Farah references a National Security Council task force that was making recommendations to President Bush about how best to hold the Saudi government accountable for cracking down on al-Qaeda's financiers.

Farah relayed what officials told him might happen if the Saudis didn't play ball:

> ...they said the United States would first present the Saudis with intelligence and evidence against individuals and businesses suspected of financing al Qaeda and other terrorist groups, coupled with a demand that they be put out of business. In return, one senior official said, the administration will say, "We don't care how you deal with the problem; just do it or we will" after 90 days.

This article was written four months after the mysterious deaths of three Saudi princes who had been outed by a captured Abu Zubaydah four months earlier than those deaths.

Farah reported another interesting assertion by these officials, who allegedly...

> "...said they would press the Saudis to act even if there was not enough information to convict someone in a court of law."

Three. Saudi. Princes.

Besides the mathematical impossibilities, mysterious deaths are not unusual when it comes to the Saudi Royal clan, though not without reason. A French-Jewish mother named Candice Cohen-Ahnine – in a high-profile custody battle with a Saudi prince – died after falling from a fourth-story apartment, amid suspicions of foul play.

The United States knows full well that Saudi Arabia is the main apparatus that brings the fundamentalists out of Pandora's box when needed. Yet, it relies on the same royal family to put those fundamentalists back in because it knows that its survival depends on keeping this beast locked up. George W. Bush himself, in an op-ed that appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, encouraged westerners to embrace the Arab Spring, even suggesting that the fall of Middle Eastern dictators is somehow equivalent to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

The United States seems to support the Arab Spring no matter where it springs up, except of course and God forbid, if it erupts in Saudi Arabia. That's when the U.S. will be deathly silent because it likely will have meant that 3000 Americans were sold for three princes and countless barrels of oil; the dealings continue.

Caveat emptor.

SAUDI NATIONALS FLOWN OUT OF U.S. SHORTLY AFTER 9/11

While the three Saudi Princes who met bizarre ends, almost certainly as a result of the capture and subsequent interrogation sessions with Abu Zubaydah, other members of the Royal family have escaped justice altogether. Indications are that had Zubaydah not been captured, Prince Ahmed bin Salman bin Abdulaziz, Prince Sulatan bin Faisal bin Turki bin Abdullah al-Saud, and Fahd bin Turki bin Saud al-Kabir would have as well.

Are we to believe that these men of royalty were the only ones who were involved in 9/11 and that justice was done through clandestine foul play? All is now well, right? If they were the only three, why weren't they arrested and tried publicly? Why weren't they handed over to U.S. authorities? Could it be that they knew far more than Zubaydah did?

Overwhelming evidence indicates that both the Bush administration and the 9/11 Commission decided not to target the source of al-Qaeda's funding and in instances when they appeared to be on the right track, they turned back. The Rabita Trust is a case in point. While it was designated a "Global Terrorist Entity" and had its assets frozen one month after 9/11, founder Abdullah Omar Naseef has escaped accountability; most American people don't even know who he is.

The story of Naseef's freedom today is anecdotal when one looks at how Saudi nationals were handled by the U.S. Government in the days and weeks after 9/11.

After 9/11, flights were grounded until no earlier than 9/13. However, this wasn't like flipping a switch; restrictions on certain flights were still in place. A simmering controversy that involved the flights of several Saudi nationals out of the United States in the days after 9/11 surfaced in the weeks leading up to the release of the 9/11 Commission Report.

In fact, in the 9/11 Commission Staff Report on Terrorist Travel after 9/11, it was conceded that the son of Prince bin Salman (the same bin Salman who would die from that mysterious heart attack) boarded a flight from Tampa, FL to Lexington, KY on 9/13/01, to rendezvous with his father. Both men were on a chartered flight from Lexington to London, England on 9/16/01.

In an article entitled, "The Great Escape," that appeared in the *New York Times* prior to the release of the 9/11 Commission Report, Craig Unger wrote:

> ...there were still some restrictions on American airspace when the Saudi flights began.

According to Unger:

> We knew that 15 out of 19 hijackers were Saudis. We knew that Osama bin Laden, a Saudi, was behind 9/11. Yet we did not conduct a **police-style investigation** of the departing Saudis, of whom two dozen were members of the bin Laden family.

Judicial Watch, a legal government wacthdog, obtained a list of passengers on various flights between 9/11/01 and 9/15/01 courtesy of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Again, according to Unger:

> According to newly released documents, 160 Saudis left the United States on 55 flights immediately after 9/11 -- making a total of about 300 people who left with the apparent approval of the Bush administration, far more than has been reported before.

If, as was ultimately learned through obvious omissions in the 9/11 Commission Report, the Bush administration was reticent to go after entities with ties to the Saudi Royal family in the months and years after 9/11, shouldn't the American people know about decisions that were made which benefited the Saudi Royal family *immediately* after 9/11?

Moreover, as Unger rightly pointed out, despite the 9/11 Commission's conclusion that Saudi nationals were on chartered flights out of the country, a significant number of those nationals left the U.S. while restrictions on air space were still in place. Had they not been Saudis, perhaps this could be explained away. The fact that so many Saudis *were* allowed to leave the country so soon after the attacks raises flags, especially relative to what we now know – and the Bush administration must have known at the time – about the involvement of the Saudi Royal family, in 9/11.

SAUDI PRINCE TURKI AL-FAISAL

According to documented 9/11 Commission staff statements, 34 members of the Saudi Prince Turki al-Faisal's party departed from Las Vegas for Paris, France on September 24, 2001. The document further stated:

> "...it appears that none of the 34 people on this flight was interviewed."

In 2004, as the 9/11 Commission was wrapping up its report, a post at the *Anger Management Course* blog included an excerpt from an article written by Margie Burns that appeared at the *Baltimore Chronicle*. According to the author of that post, the article reported:

> All together, the hijackers made at least six trips to Vegas. Yet, a few days after 9-11, 31 passengers were allowed to fly out of Vegas, including one passenger named Al-Hazmi. **One Saudi royal aboard was Prince Turki bin Faisal, famous as the head of Saudi Arabia's bloodstained and much feared intelligence service from 1977 until he was abruptly fired in August 2001.**
>
> Whoa; time out. What, exactly, was the longtime head of Saudi Arabia's secret police doing in the United States, while 15 young Saudis were carrying out their attacks? Prince Turki's brother was also on board the Vegas flight; another of their brothers is Saudi Arabia's foreign minister.
>
> Why, exactly, did the fired head of Saudi intelligence hotfoot it over to this country, right after getting the boot? Or was he in the US when he was fired? His

> replacement was officially announced on August 31, 2001. Did National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, or anyone in the White House national security office, even know that these persons were in the United States? Given Prince Turki's documented contacts with Osama bin Laden and Pakistan's Inter Service Intelligence, which propped up the Taliban, why did the White House let these persons leave?

Some time thereafter, the Chronicle scrubbed any mention of Turki in a revised report. The portion in bold above (as well as the two paragraphs beneath it) was replaced some time before May 30, 2004 with the following:

> The Saudi royals aboard were mostly adults, with only a handful of young people born in the 1980s and 1990s. **At least one of these passengers, Ahmed bin Salman, the notable horse race fan and owner of a Kentucky Derby winner, died in somewhat suspicious circumstances a few months after his return home.** Another passenger, **a British citizen,** was his longtime chauffeur and major domo, to whom Ahmed Salman gave a prize horse race in return for his services.

Based on confirmed reports, one of them from the 9/11 Commission Staff Report itself, we now know that Prince Turki flew from Las Vegas to Paris, France on 9/24/01. That squares with the first report from the *Baltimore Chronicle* but not with the second. The revised version (see the bolded portion) has Prince bin Salman flying out of Las Vegas too. How can this be? Bin Salman flew from Lexington to London on 9/16/01. Note that the revised report also says bin Salman flew with a British citizen. The Las Vegas flight went to Paris. This would seem to be another indicator that the Chronicle's first report was more accurate.

Naming bin Salman in 2004 – two years after his death – may have seemed a safer bet than naming Prince Turki, who would become the Saudi Ambassador to the U.S. one year later (more on this later).

The newer version continued...

> What were the Saudi royals and the others doing in Las Vegas? When did these officials and those connected with them go to Las Vegas, and how long did they stay there? What reason could the hijackers have had for trips to Vegas in the first place, other than to rendezvous with authorities, given that any extra movement increased their chances of getting caught? Is the White House really going to pretend that five skyjackers including the fervently devout Atta went to Vegas, separately and together at different times, only to fit in a little gambling? Was Las Vegas really just a convenient hub for the travelers? What other passengers on several other flights out were connected to these?

The removal of Turki's name from the *Chronicle's* article makes his presence in the U.S. immediately before and after 9/11 – which has since been confirmed – even more suspicious. *The Global Security* website made reference to Turki's flight out of the United States shortly after 9/11 as well.

Considering what was known about Turki at the time – he had recently ended his tenure as Director of the General Intelligence Directorat, Saudi Arabia's foreign intelligence service, after 24 years – it is at a minimum, curious that he was not interviewed. Later, Turki would become the Saudi ambassador to the United States and was welcomed to the Oval Office during the Bush administration in 2006. Turki would serve in that capacity from 2005 – 2007.

In January of 2012, Turki was given a platform by Amy Kellogg of *Fox News,* to express his views on Saudi Arabia's problems with Iran. This is noteworthy in light of Prince Alwaleed bin Talal's ever increasing influence over the "Fair and Balanced" network through his ownership in Newscorp.

The 9/11 Commission report itself spoke of dealings Turki had with Taliban leader Mullah Omar during the Clinton administration in 1998. Apparently, it was not deemed appropriate to revisit the former Saudi intelligence chief's dealings with the Taliban before allowing him to fly out of the country after 9/11 without being questioned. As was the case with various organizations found to have financed al-Qaeda, the portrayal of Turki in the report is one in which no complicity in 9/11 was found. Groups known to have financed al-Qaeda were painted as practically innocent victims of infiltration; Turki comes across in the report as an ally, not a foe, of the United States.

That portrayal is seemingly belied by facts and testimony.

In a 2009 *New York Times* article penned by Eric Lichtblau, it was reported that lawyers for the plaintiffs in a lawsuit that sought justice for the 9/11 victims, had come into possession of documents that implicated members of the Saudi Royal family, to include Prince Turki Al-Faisal. In fact, a link to many of those documents was posted in Lichtblau's piece.

In particular, one document that stands out is the transcript of a sworn deposition conducted by the plaintiffs of the 9/11 families in a civil lawsuit. The Muslim man who was deposed (name redacted) allegedly fought against the Taliban (presumably for the Northern Alliance); his testimony implicated none other than Prince Turki Al Faisal.

We begin with the account of the deposed subject in which he discusses the details of a prisoner exchange in 1998 that involved a man named Said Jalal as the negotiator:

> **Q:** Did - - was Said Jalal working for anyone from Saudi Arabia?
>
> **A:** When I - - when I had gone with him to Kabul during this mission that he starts about exchange of prisoners, I went with him in Kabul. There was a guest house concerned Mullah Kabir, he was the deputy - - the Deputy Prime Minister for Taliban and when I was there and I saw with him a cheque, money cheque, and the cheque was about a billion riyals, Saudi Riyals.
> And at that time I guessed that he is not a simple person, he is not at the low level. Maybe he is - - he is working with the - - **I believed at that time he was working with the intelligent service of Saudi.**
>
> **Q:** And who was the head of the intelligence service of Saudi?

A: At that time he was Turki Al Faisal.

A short time later, the deposed subject confirmed that the riyal is indeed Saudi currency. That, coupled with the fact that the cheque was for one billion riyals, indicated a very powerful person with access to Saudi money.

This is significant because of who this individual – according to the deposition – was meeting with:

Q: And - - did Said Jalal at any time ever talk to you about Mullah Omar?

A: Yes. Every time he - - he had came from - - from Mullah Omar directly.

The subject proceeded to talk about several prisoner exchanges coordinated by Jalal on Mullah Omar's behalf.

In perhaps the most revealing exchange, the deposed individual talked about the purchase of hundreds of trucks by Mullah Omar, courtesy of Saudi money:

Q: Did people from Saudi Arabia come openly and give money to Mullah Omar and the Taliban?

A: Yes.

Q: When Said Jalal said that he gave 500 pick-up trucks to the Taliban and that he said that he personally made sure that Mullah Omar came to power, was - - did Said Jalal buy these trucks with his own money?

A: No, because 500 pick-ups is not so little.

Q: It is not, right, it's not cheap?

A: Not cheap.

Q: Who was he buying - - who do you - - who was he buying these - - who gave him the money to buy these trucks?

A: When **I believe that Said Jalal may be working with Turki Al Faisal,** that the money, I believe that **the money is from that intelligence service.**

Q: And do you personally know that Said Jalal was working with Turki?

A: I guessed yes.

If this is accurate testimony, it means that another Saudi Royal prince was actively working – through an emissary – to aid the Taliban at a time when Osama bin Laden and the Taliban were working very closely together. Turki's dealings with Mullah Omar were known during the Clinton administration so again, why would this particular Saudi

prince be permitted to leave the United States less than two weeks after 9/11/01 without being questioned?

THIS IS NOT SECOND GUESSING

Those who make the claim that dredging these things up today is just second guessing run into a bit of a problem courtesy of William Murray, head of the Religious Freedom Coalition. One month after the 9/11 attacks, Murray, who had access to U.S. Congressmen, Senators, and powerful operatives within the Bush administration, published his post-9/11 diary.

Here is an excerpt from what Murray wrote about what happened on 9/12/01:

> By mid afternoon on Wednesday I was convinced that not only was the United States a victim of Islamic Jihad, but that the attack had been perpetrated by an organization controlled by a Saudi citizen and that most of those involved were Saudi, and that furthermore **the attack was financed for the most part by Saudi businessmen and members of the Saudi royal family.**

Murray then relayed what he said to his wife that evening:

> **"These attacks were planned, financed and carried out by Saudi nationals and as a result the real culprits will never come to justice. We will bomb some third world nation like Afghanistan and our government will say our "moderate" Islamic friends with all the oil were not involved.** Worse, we will put a handful of people in jail like we did the last time the World Trade Center was bombed. The Islamic fanatics will think a trade off of four or five in jail getting three meals a day, versus thousands of Americans dead, is a great deal.

Perhaps one of Murray's most salient points came one day later – on 9/13/01 – in response to a Senator who defended the Saudi Royal family's financing of Osama bin Laden by saying they were "coerced" into doing so.

Said Murray in response to the Senator:

> **"Maybe those millionaire Saudi businessmen should be more fearful of us than they are of Bin Laden."**

Sadly, defending the Saudis against those who believed the truth should win out, would become a central theme of the 9/11 Commission Report – and ultimately, the U.S. Government.

ABLE DANGER

While stationed at Bagram Air Base in October of 2003, Lt. Col. Anthony Shaffer was informed that members of the 9/11 Commission were on base. Shaffer, who was a key member of a program known as Able Danger, which he – along with other team members – says identified lead hijacker Mohamed Atta one year before the attacks and well before the program was shut down in October of 2000. Shaffer met with the

Commission's Executive Director Philip Zelikow at Bagram and briefed him on Able Danger's findings.

In his book *Operation Dark Heart*, Shaffer explains how after briefing Zelikow and other Commission members, the Executive Director was noticeably shocked and handed Shaffer his business card while telling him to contact his office upon returning to the United States, saying, "What you said today is very important." [1] The treatment Shaffer received subsequent to that briefing was contemptible on the part of his own government.

Upon Shaffer's return to the U.S. in January of 2004, Zelikow's interest in Able Danger seemed to do a 180; Shaffer faced significant consequences for bringing it to the 9/11 Commission's attention. Those consequences included the revocation of his security clearance. Shaffer learned upon his return to the states that the Inspector General of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) was investigating him. The reasons given stemmed from three claims against him that involved misuse of a government phone ($67); filing a false voucher ($180); and undue award of the Defense Meritorious Service Medal. Shaffer later learned that DIA was searching for a way to rescind his Bronze Star as well.

Shaffer had the following to say about treatment he received from DIA, in sworn testimony before the House Armed Services Committee just a few short years later:

> In my specific instance, DIA has been allowed by DoD to make an "example" of me to try and intimidate the others from coming forward by spending what we now estimate $2 million in an effort to discredit and malign me by creating false allegations, and using these false allegations to justify revocation of my Top Secret security clearance.

Incidentally, in the weeks after the 9/11 attacks, one of Shaffer's Able Danger teammates —Dr. Eileen Preisser—informed him in real time that she was meeting with Scooter Libby, Vice President Dick Cheney's assistant about the details of Able Danger. [2] This account confirms that Cheney's office was briefed on the program.

> *Able Danger received not one mention in the 9/11 Commission Report, which was released on July 22, 2004.*

RABITA TRUST

One month after the September 11th attacks, the Treasury Department froze the assets of an entity known as the Rabita Trust (RT), identifying it as a Specially Designated Global Terrorist Entity. RT was suddenly on a list of notorious actors and entities, along with 38 others. In an article published by the *Washington Post* at the time, it became obvious that political considerations were a priority:

> The list was the product of tense debate within the U.S. government, which is torn by potentially conflicting priorities: stopping the flow of money, protecting intelligence sources and methods, and avoiding affronts to key allies such as Saudi Arabia.

Perhaps the premise that Saudi Arabia is an ally of the United States should have been subjected to more critical analysis after the 9/11 attacks. Abdullah Omar Naseef, who founded Rabita Trust in 1988 escaped the 9/11 civil trials. As Andrew McCarthy points out, none other than Wael Hamza Julaidan—an al-Qaeda founder—was put in charge of Rabita.

The *Washington Post* article expounded on the stickling political battle over identifying Rabita as a terrorist entity:

> Government officials said federal agencies have argued for weeks about whether to publicly describe the Rabita Trust, a Muslim charity closely tied to the Saudi and Pakistani governments, as being affiliated with bin Laden. Ultimately, the Treasury Department listed the Rabita Trust, which top Pakistani officials helped establish to resettle refugees from Bangladesh. Pakistan's president, Gen. Pervez Musharraf, has had an official affiliation with the trust.

The *Washington Post* identified Julaidan as Rabita's "secretary-general" while also identifying the charity as an arm of the Muslim World League, an entity sanctioned by the Saudi Royal family. None other than Abdullah Omar Naseef – Rabita Trust's founder —served as MWL's Secretary-General. This would place him above an al-Qaeda founder in charge of the organization Naseef founded.

Moreover, in a 2003 *Washington Post* article by Douglas Farah, it was reported that radical Islamic charities which were allegedly shut down, remained open and that none other than al-Qaeda founder Julaidan, who had been designated a terrorist financier one year after 9/11, was not being held to account by the Saudis, as they promised.

Wrote Farah:

> A source with direct knowledge of U.S. actions said the "highest priority of the U.S. government is to get the Saudis to do what they said [they] would do and close down what they were supposed to close down." The source noted that, after agreeing to put him on the U.N. list, **senior Saudi officials publicly denounced Julaidan's designation.**

In another article by Farah, he quoted one of the officials who was angry about the situation:

> "We were livid at the disavowal of the Jalaidan designation," a senior U.S. official said. "The Saudi public statements in that case were nothing short of schizophrenic. Saudi Arabia is one of the epicenters of terrorist financing."

You read that right; the Saudi government openly protected an al-Qaeda founder. Perhaps more egregiously, however, are the subsequent omissions by the 9/11 Commission.

> *The 9/11 Commission Report identified Julaidan only in footnote #58 of Chapter 7 as having been in Tucson in the "1980's and early 1990's", hinting that his presence*

there may have had something to do with 9/11 hijacker Hani Hanjour spending so much time there in the mid-1990's. Despite this connection, neither Julaidan's Rabita Trust nor that entity's founder, Abdullah Omar Naseef, were mentioned in the 9/11 Commission Report.

MUSLIM WORLD LEAGUE (MWL)

As the Secretary-General of the Muslim World League (MWL) from approximately 1983 – 1993, Naseef headed an organization based in Saudi Arabia. The MWL is not just based there; it is funded and controlled by the Saudi Royal family. Additionally, the name Muslim World League is virtually synonymous with the term "Rabita". In essence, Naseef's Rabita Trust could have been named the Muslim World League Trust. Once one makes that leap, it becomes obvious how close the Bush administration came to identifying the Saudi Royal family as a Specially Designated Terrorist entity in 2001.

A little more than six months after the 9/11 attacks, the *Financial Times* reported on the operations of a task force that included the IRS, the FBI, and the Secret Service. Named Operation Green Quest (OGQ), the objective was to disrupt the sources of terrorist fundraising. In this case, the Bush administration seemed to be on the right track as the MWL was identified as a target. Here is an excerpt from the article:

> In northern Virginia they (OGQ) targeted, among others, the International Institute of Islamic Thought, the Graduate School of Islamic Social Sciences, the **Muslim World League** and the Fiqh Council of North America. These bodies were described by the Council on American-Islamic Relations (Cair) as "respected Islamic institutions" whose targeting "sends a hostile and chilling message to the American Muslim community and contradicts President Bush's repeated assertions that the war against terrorism is not a conflict with Islam".

In addition to the MWL, each one of the entities identified by the *Financial Times* had ties to the Muslim Brotherhood. Yet, political pressure applied by groups like CAIR – which has extensive Brotherhood ties of its own – seemed to be effective when it came to neutralizing any inclinations to pursue these avenues that the Bush administration may have had. In 2006, this dynamic was revealed when Bush referred to America's enemies as "Islamic fascists". After pressure was applied by CAIR, such words were never again uttered by the president.

The MWL was not named in the 9/11 Commission Report.

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC RELIEF ORGANIZATION (IIRO)

The IIRO was spawned by the MWL and is not only funded by the Saudi Royal family but in 2003 it was led by Osama bin Laden's brother-in-law. The Anti-Defmation League (ADL) wrote the following:

> In July 2003, **during the 9/11 Commission hearings, numerous analysts identified IIRO as a major radical Islamic institution in part responsible for fueling Islamic militancy around the world.** Testimony delivered at the commission attested to the fact that **Mohammad Jamal Khalifa, the brother-in-law of Osama bin Laden,** arrived in the

> Philippines in 1988 and became the founding director of the IIRO. He used the IIRO to funnel Al Qaeda funds to the Abu Sayyaf group and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front.

Front Page Magazine (FPM) reported on a 2002 $100 trillion lawsuit which "named defendants (that) gave contributions to charities directly linked to the Al Qaeda terrorist organization." Prince Sultan bin Abdulaziz al Saud of Saudi Arabia was one of those defendants. This lawsuit pointed to IIRO's Canadian branch director as having claimed that his organization was a "direct arm of the Saudi Royal family."

FPM had the following to say about Sultan's dealings:

> Sultan also has donated personal money to the al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, Muslim World League, and the World Assembly of Muslim Youth. All of these groups have been exposed by the brief of having sponsored, aided, abetted or materially financed al Qaeda.

Jonathan Schanzer cited a former FBI analyst as saying IIRO donated at least $280,000 to Hamas charities while also reporting that Israeli officials identified IIRO as an organization that implemented a program to compensate the families of Hamas suicide bombers.

The United Nations identified two IIRO branch offices – in the Philippines and Indonesia – as terrorist entities from as early as 2007 through 2011.

According to an article in *Front Page Magazine* by Paul Sperry, the President of the IIRO in the United States (IRO) shortly before 9/11 was a man by the name of Mohamed S. Omeish, who also shared an office with Abdurahman Alamoudi, a man eventually convicted on charges related to terrorism. Incidentally, Omeish served alongside Anwar al-Awlaki from late 2001 through early 2002; they were the only two Muslim chaplains on the board of George Washington University's Muslim Students Association, a Muslim Brotherhood front.

Omeish's brother – Esam Omeish – is credited by Sperry with hiring al-Awlaki as an Imam at the Dar al-Hijrah mosque that aided the 9/11 hijackers. That mosque allegedly received large donations from the IIRO.

In an article by Judith Miller for the *New York Times*, IIRO was identified as having been raided by the FBI in 2002. Miller also reported that MWL was a parental entity, saying further that MWL and IIRO were housed in the same office. This places the MWL—a group that Naseef once led—above the IIRO.

In a separate *New York Times* article written by Eric Lichtblau in 2009, it was reported that Treasury Department documents – obtained by plaintiffs in a case against alleged 9/11 perpetrators – identified the IIRO as a group that showed "'support for terrorist organizations' at least through 2006."

In 2009, the IIRO reopened in the United States. According to the *Global Muslim Brotherhood Daily Report (GMBDR),* the office is in Hialeah, FL and the president is Adnan Khalil Basha, who has also served as the Secretary-General for the IIRO in Saudi Arabia. According to the same report, another entity – Sana-Bell – which had originally been created to generate funds for IRO, shared an address with SAAR (mentioned later).

GMBDR reported in 2010 that the reopening of the IRO in the U.S. "seems designed to preserve the organization's ties to the Muslim World League (MWL), the IIRO's parent organization."

Moreover, the face of the then newly reopened IRO was Malik Sardar Khan, who shared an address with a Muslim World Congress front. According to the GMBDR report, none other than Abdullah Omar Naseef was listed as the President of both the MWC internationally as well as for its U.S. branch.

> *The IIRO was not named in the 9/11 Commission Report, despite "numerous analysts" (according to the ADL) who, during the 9/11 Commission hearings, identified IIRO as an entity that funded al-Qaeda. Also receiving no mention were Mohamed S. Omeish, Esam Omeish, Sana-Bell, or Abdurahman Alamoudi, who had been arrested on charges related to terrorism nearly one year before the release of the report.*

SAAR FOUNDATION

After 9/11, the FBI also raided the offices of the Sulaiman Abdul Aziz Rajihi (SAAR) Foundation. Interestingly, SAAR's offices were located across the street from a Muslim Brotherhood front group known as the International Institute for Islamic Thought (IIIT). It also shared an office with the aforementioned Sana-Bell. Abdurahman Alamoudi, who once served as executive assistant to the president of the SAAR Foundation, was convicted of charges relating to terrorism and given a 23-year prison sentence in 2004. At the *New York Times,* Judith Miller had the following to say about Rajihi after the 2002 raid:

> Officials said SAAR had been financed in large part by Suleiman Abdel Aziz al-Rajhi, a Saudi banker and financier who is said to be close to the Saudi ruling family.

SAAR was also implicated in the funding of another individual convicted of financing terrorism – Sami Al-Arian, who pleaded guilty to doing business with the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ).

> *SAAR was not named in the 9/11 Commission Report.*

WAMY AND AL-HARAMAIN

The World Association of Muslim Youth (WAMY) was the parent of the Muslim Minority Affairs program which was set up in the West by the Abedin family. WAMY is an organization that has worked extremely closely with the MWL and the IIRO. *Discover the Networks* reports that Osama bin Laden's nephew – Abdullah bin Laden – founded the organization. One of WAMY's aims that is similar to IMMA is to:

> Preserve the identity of Muslim youth and help overcome the problems they face in modern society.

It is important to understand this concept in the context of the goals of the Institute of Muslim Minority Affairs (IMMA), which seeks to turn Muslim minority lands into Muslim *majority* lands world wide as described in the Saudi Manifesto.

WAMY, like the al-Haramain Islamic Foundation, was mentioned in the 9/11 Commission Report (WAMY was identified by name once, al-Haramain twice) but in both instances, the two organizations seemed to be painted as victims of exploitation instead of as what they are – terrorist-funding entities.

In talking about al-Haramain, the Report seemed to blame al-Qaeda's reliance on:

> ...al Qaeda sympathizers in specific foreign branch offices of large, international charities – particularly those with lax external oversight and ineffective internal controls, such as the Saudi-based al Haramain Islamic Foundation. Smaller charities... had employees who would siphon the money to al Qaeda. [3]

Note the implication. Al-Haramain was not responsible for controlling its own finances; it had been taken advantage of by al-Qaeda operatives:

> Al Qaeda and its friends **took advantage of Islam's strong calls for charitable giving, *zakat*.** These financial facilitators also appeared to rely heavily on certain imams at mosques who were willing to divert zakat donations to al Qaeda's cause. [4]

When making its lone reference to WAMY, the 9/11 Commission report also painted that organization as being victimized by sneaky al-Qaeda operatives:

> While Saudi domestic charities are regulated by the Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare, charities and international relief agencies, such as the **World Assembly of Muslim Youth (WAMY)**, are currently regulated by the Ministry of Islamic Affairs. This ministry uses zakat and government funds to spread Wahhabi beliefs throughout the world, including in mosques and schools... **Some Wahhabi-funded organizations have been exploited by extremists** to further their goal of violent jihad against non-Muslims. One such organization has been the **al Haramain Islamic Foundation**...[5]

Americans were being told that groups like WAMY and al Haramain had essentially been infiltrated and deserved little more than wrist slaps. The notion that Wahhabists were being exploited by extremists was like saying Al Capone was exploited by his mobsters.

> *WAMY Founder, Abdullah bin Laden, was not named in the 9/11 Commission Report. WAMY and al Haramain were mentioned once and twice, respectively but only as innocent bystanders who had been unwittingly duped and infiltrated by al-Qaeda operatives.*

INSTITUTE OF MUSLIM MINORITY AFFAIRS (IMMA)

Abdullah Omar Naseef founded the Institute for Muslim Minority Affairs (IMMA) in the late 1970's with the full backing of the Saudi Royal family. As our writings on the Saudi Manifesto demonstrate, the IMMA was commissioned, in part, after a meeting between Syed Z. Abedin and Naseef in Gary Indiana. Abdullah Ghazi relays his experience thusly:

> "Later we shifted to Gary in Indiana State, 40 kms from Chicago. In 1976, I met Rabita (MWL) chief Dr. Abdullah Omar Naseef and Dr. Zainul Abedin of Institute for Muslim Minority Affairs. They encouraged me to take up this venture. The frst book to come out was Our Prophet, an assignment from King Abdul Aziz University, Jeddah at Dr. Naseef's behest..."

One of the people whom Naseef served with at the IMMA is Huma Abedin, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton. Abedin also served on the board of the Muslim Students Association's (MSA) George Washington Univeristy chapter in 1997 (a few short years later, both IRO President Mohamed S. Omeish and al-Qaeda terrorist Anwar al-Awlaki would serve on that same board as chaplains). The goal of the IMMA is to transform all Muslim minority lands into Muslim *majority* lands, including the United States of America.

Neither IMMA nor Abdullah Omar Naseef were mentioned in the 9/11 Commission Report.

NO JUSTICE FOR 9/11 FAMILIES

If one subscribes to the notion that the 9/11 attacks were an act of war comparable to Pearl Harbor with the Saudi Royal family assuming the role of the Japanese Empire by comparison, the attacks were not met with a warranted response. To take the analogy further, it would have been as if the United States decided to demand and expect that the Japanese emperor punish his fighter pilots for the attacks.

The only recourse left to the famlies of the fallen would be to file a civil lawsuit against the Japanese government.

The equivalent of just that happened when the families of 9/11 victims filed a lawsuit against Saudi Arabia and members of the Royal family for their alleged complicity in the attacks. After years of legal battles, the families were spurned by those who should have doggedly pursued justice on their behalf.

At one point, a district court cited the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act (FSIA) and ruled that it protected Saudi Arabia, that the court had no jurisdiction over a foreign nation. Isn't that what made the attacks an act of war? Using this logic, the families would be denied justice when the Bush administration failed to identify the enemy that attacked the nation he was charged with leading. Then, after deciding to pursue justice for themselves, those families would be told they had no right to do so.

In 2009, the *New York Times'* Eric Lichtblau reported, after the families had been through years of legal battles, that then Solicitor General Elena Kagan filed a brief with the U.S.

Supreme Court in which she agreed with the district court ruling and sided with the Saudis. The 9/11 families were justifiably livid and said, in part, the following in a statement:

> The Administration's filing mocks our system of justice and strikes a blow against the public's right to know the facts about who financed and supported the murder of 3,000 innocent people. It undermines our fight against terrorism and suggests a green light to terrorist sympathizers the world over that they can send money to al Qaeda without having to worry that they will be held accountable in the U.S. Courts for the atrocities that result.

Ultimately, the Supreme Court sided with the disctrict court and the Obama administration; it refused to hear the case.

A little more than one year later, Kagan was confirmed by the U.S. Senate as a Supreme Court Justice after having been nominated by President Barack Obama.

POSTCRIPT

In late 2005, it was reported by *Government Executive* that the data mined by Able Danger was destroyed by Army major Erik Kleinsmith. One of the reasons for doing so was that the program, identified as "intelligence on steroids" by Kleinsmith, gathered information on U.S. citizens:

> People's names and personal information litter the Internet. Data harvesting, by its very nature, is indiscriminate and sweeping. **Unavoidably, along with "Osama Bin Laden," an often-mentioned name like "Bill Clinton" will be harvested. That says a lot about the power, and the limits, of data mining,** and why Kleinsmith destroyed what he had; the military is not supposed to be gathering information on U.S. citizens.

The technology that was ultimately used in Able Danger was first used in an experiment with the Information Dominance Center (IDC) in early 1999 to look into any potential leaks of U.S. military technology to the Chinese. In the same article, *Government Executive* reported:

> During construction of those link diagrams, **the names of a number of U.S. citizens popped up, including some very prominent figures. Condoleezza Rice,** then the provost at Stanford University, appeared in one of the harvests, the by-product of a presumably innocuous connection between other subjects and the university, which hosts notable Chinese scholars.
>
> **William Cohen, then the secretary of Defense, also appeared.** As one former senior Defense official explained, the IDC's results "raised eyebrows," and **leaders in the Pentagon grew nervous** about the political implications of turning up such high-profile names, or those of any American citizens who were not the subject of a legally authorized intelligence investigation. Rumors still abound about other notable figures caught up in the IDC's harvest. **"I heard they turned up Hillary Clinton," the official said. The experiment was not continued.**

Ok, so based on this report, the China experiment was suspended. Yet, the technology was resurrected later that year to take the fight directly to al-Qaeda.

In late 1999 / early 2000, Able Danger was in full gear but Kleinsmith was told that because the harvesting had turned up the names of so many American citizens, he had 90 days to destroy them, which he did:

> By the spring of 2000, Kleinsmith said, the IDC had the list of 20 individuals whom Special Operations wanted investigated further under Able Danger. But in March, Kleinsmith was ordered to cease all work on the project. He believes the order came from outside the IDC's command. From May to June, Kleinsmith and his team destroyed the information, and possibly the linkages between Mohamed Atta, Al Qaeda, and convicted terrorists already sitting in U.S. prisons.

It's worth noting that *Government Executive* reported as a matter of fact that the names of Rice and Cohen came up during the China harvest; that Hillary Clinton's name came up is allegedly a matter of speculation and rumor.

However, what about the al-Qaeda harvest? If this technology was so sweeping that it uncovered tangential and innocuous relationships between the future National Security Advisor and the Secretary of Defense under Bill Clinton, why wouldn't it uncover a very tangible relationship between Hillary Clinton and Huma Abedin, a woman with distinct ties to both al-Qaeda and the Saudi Royal family through her boss, Abdullah Omar Naseef?

It's worth noting that Huma Abedin began working for Hillary Clinton in 1996, four years before the Able Danger harvest of al-Qaeda commenced. An important question remains:

> Did that harvest reveal the Hillary Clinton – Huma Abedin – Abdullah Omar Naseef connection?

Unlike the innocuous connections that might have come up elsewhere (between Bill Clinton and bin Laden, for example), Abedin's connection to both Hillary Clinton – as the first lady's employee – as well as to Naseef, the former Secretary-General of the MWL, founder of RT and IMMA, would not have been nearly as innocuous.

Based on the omissions of the 9/11 Commission Report, we are left to conclude that the Commission didn't just want to prevent the truth about Able Danger from coming out; it also wanted to avoid revealing the truth about those who were ultimately responsible for the attacks.

[1] Shaffer, Anthony, Operation Dark Heart, p. 178, St. Martin's Press, 2010
[2] Operation Dark Heart, p. 176
[3] The 9/11 Commission Report, p. 170; link is http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf

[4] Ibid
[5] Ibid, p. 372

Walid Shoebat is a former member of the Muslim Brotherhood and author of For God or For Tyranny.

Ben Barrack is a talk show host and author of the book Unsung Davids.