

Graham: Expose Saudi Role in 9/11 Attacks

by Edward Spannaus

Dec. 2—Former U.S. Senator Bob Graham (D-Fla./1987-2005) has made an important new intervention into the very dangerous current strategic situation—in which Saudi Arabia is not only pressuring the United States into military intervention in Syria on the side of the Saudi-sponsored terrorists, but in which an open alliance between Israel and Saudi Arabia has emerged in opposition to the P5+1 negotiations with Iran.

In a multi-part interview with Real News Network, partly posted on Nov. 28-29, Graham, who co-chaired the Congressional 9/11 Inquiry, stressed that if the role of Saudi Arabia in sponsoring and supporting the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks were to be exposed, it would have enormous consequences for U.S. policy today. Graham pointed to the “active role” of the Saudis in the Middle East, and how radically the U.S. view of the Saudis would be changed, “if there was an acceptance of the fact that Saudi Arabia was essentially a co-conspirator in 9/11.”

Graham’s striking comments mark an escalation in his campaign to obtain declassification and release of the censored 28-page section of the Joint Congressional Inquiry’s report on the 9/11 attacks, which reportedly deals with Saudi sponsorship and financing of the biggest terrorist attack ever on American soil. (For background, see “Bust the London-Riyadh Global Terror Axis,” in the Aug. 16, 2013 issue of *EIR*.)

Why Now?

Graham counterposed the current revival of interest in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, with the potential implications of exposure of the Saudi role in 9/11. He noted that there is a lot of discussion of the role of Lee Harvey Oswald in the JFK killing, and whether he was helped by the mob, or the Cubans, or somebody else. In his view, exposure of the Saudi role in 9/11 is even more important today:

“The issue of whether the 19 hijackers acted alone or whether they had a support network has enormous

current consequences. If in fact the Saudi government was the source of financial, logistical support, [and] provision of anonymity that allowed these people to stay in the country such a long time and go undiscovered; if they were part of the system that made that happen, think of what it would mean to U.S.-Saudi relations today. It would be a complete overturning of the premises upon which we have been dealing with Saudi Arabia, that it was a loyal ally of the United States, to now being seen as a country which was prepared to sell its soul to the worst in the world, even if that meant putting the United States in jeopardy and the loss of life of 3,000 people.”

Why Would They?

Graham was asked why the Saudis would do this: “What’s in it for them?” He answered as follows: “Well, I wrote a novel called *Keys to the Kingdom*¹ out of frustration that much of what I knew had occurred, had not been made available to the American people, because every time it was suggested, it was immediately classified and rendered out-of-bounds.” Graham related how a former high-level government official had gotten around this, “by writing exactly what he would have written in a nonfiction book, but [he] put the word ‘novel’ on it, and it got by the censors.”

In his own novel, Graham continued, “I suggest some answers . . . and I don’t think they are far-fetched or extreme.” He elaborated:

“One of those is that we know that at the end of the first Gulf War, [Osama] bin Laden was very angry at the [Saudi] royal family for having allowed U.S. troops, foreign troops of any nationality, to essentially occupy a portion of Saudi Arabia. His anger was deepened by the fact that he had offered to come to the defense of the Kingdom, using several tens of thousands of war-hardened troops that had fought with him in Af-

1. See book review, “Fact or Fiction? What Senator Graham Really Knows,” *EIR*, Jan. 18, 2013.



Former Sen. Bob Graham, co-chair of the Congressional 9/11 Inquiry, has issued a new call for release of the suppressed 28 pages dealing with the Saudi role in the 2001 terrorist attacks.

ghanistan against the Russians. That anger upset the royal family.

“And so I project: What if bin Laden had said to the royal family, ‘If you won’t deal forcefully with the Americans, we will do it, but we need your help in terms of being able to assist, support, maintain our operatives who are going to be in the United States, and if you refuse to give us that support, then I’m going to launch civil unrest inside the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and your monarchy will be under the same threat that the former Shah of Iran was, when he was toppled from power.’

“I’m suggesting that something like that may have been the motivation, the excuse, the rationale, that the Saudis looked to, to say, ‘All right, we will in fact provide assistance to the 19 hijackers, or at least significant numbers of them, in order to avoid this credible threat of civil unrest.’”

They Had To Be Confident

When asked how the Saudis could be so confident that the U.S. would not target them for sponsorship of the 9/11 attacks, Graham said that “they had a high, and what has thus far turned out to be credible, expectation that their role would not be exposed,” adding: “Everything that the federal government has done since 9/11 has had as one of its outcomes, if not its objectives—and I believe it was both outcome and objective—that the Saudis’ role has been covered.” They had to be confident, Graham said, that “they are immune, that the United States is going to take its vengeance out someplace else,” such as Iraq.

Graham said it would be speculation to assume that Prince Bandar bin Sultan, then-Saudi Ambassador to the United States, knew that the U.S. would go after Iraq, but, he emphasized, “I believe what we do know, or are capable of knowing, is: what was the full extent of the Saudi role.” And in this regard, he pointed to the Saudi protection of two of the hijackers in San Diego, the “very suspicious case in Sarasota, Florida,” where three of the hijacker/pilots were getting flight training, and at the same time, were closely connected to a Saudi family which were themselves close to the royal family. What we don’t know, Graham added, is what was going on in

Falls Church, Va., or in New Jersey, where there were substantial numbers of hijackers.

Graham concluded this portion of the interview saying that he had discussed this with the co-chair of the Congressional Joint Inquiry on 9/11, and the two co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission, and asked them: “What do you think were the prospects of these 19 people being able to plan, practice, and execute the complicated plot that was 9/11 without any external support?”

“All three of them used almost the same word, ‘*implausible*,’ that it is implausible that that could have been the case,” Graham stated.

Release the 28 Pages!

Regarding the Joint Inquiry report, Graham stated:

“There were 28 pages in the final report, out of over 800 total, which were totally censored.... That was the chapter that largely dealt with the financing of 9/11, who paid for these very complex and in many instances expensive activities that were the predicate for 9/11. I was stunned that the intelligence community would feel that it was a threat to national security for the American people to know who had made 9/11 financially possible. And I am sad to report that today, some 12 years after we submitted our report, that those 28 pages continue to be withheld from the public.”

Graham’s own campaign to publicize the Saudi role, has helped inspire a movement in Congress, led by Rep. Walter C. Jones (R-N.C.), to seek the declassification of the 28 pages.