

Coverup of Saudi Role in 9/11 Finally Begins To Crumble

by Edward Spannaus

Dec. 28—With a major ruling by a Federal Appeals Court, allowing the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) and related entities to be sued for damages over the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the lid is now coming off the 12-year coverup, perpetuated under both Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama, regarding what really happened in September 2001.

Combined with the burgeoning media coverage and public interest in Congressional efforts to declassify the 28 pages of suppressed Congressional findings that deal with Saudi financing and support of the 9/11 hijackers, it is now the case, as Lyndon LaRouche declared on Dec. 20, 2013, that the truth about 9/11 can no longer be suppressed.

The bombshell court ruling—ignored by most of the “mainstream” press—came on Dec. 19, when the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit overturned a 2005 Federal Court decision that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia was immune from civil lawsuits arising from the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, and at the same time, reversed its own 2008 ruling upholding that 2005 decision from the lower court. This now allows the 9/11 families and insurance companies to proceed with various civil actions against the Kingdom, after eight years of being stalled.

‘Collapse the Dam of Coverup’

“This is a very significant breakthrough that could collapse the dam of coverup which has kept information on the Saudis’ involvement from the American people,” former U.S. Senator Bob Graham (D-Fla.) told the Florida *Broward Bulldog*.

Graham also hinted that further moves are underway to declassify the suppressed 28 pages of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into the 9/11 attacks, in addition to the Jones-Lynch bill (H.Res. 428) in Congress. “Without being able to go into details, I can tell you that


there are some other channels that are also beginning to move on the 28 pages,” he told the *Bulldog* on Dec. 20. “I feel more optimistic about their release in the near term than I have in a dozen years.”

Representatives of the 9/11 victims’ families also hailed the importance of the ruling. “The appellate court’s decision is something I feared I would never see in my lifetime,” said Terry Strada, whose husband, Tom, died in the World Trade Center on 9/11, as quoted in the *Broward Bulldog* and the *Miami Herald*. “Our group, 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism, remains committed in our fight for the truth and justice. Only then will we be able to protect ourselves from future terrorist attacks and hold those accountable for the death, destruction, pain and suffering inflicted on us 13 years ago.”

But a lawyer for the Saudis was understandably chagrined. Washington, D.C., attorney Michael K. Kellogg called the decision “contrary to settled law,” and went on: “It is extremely unfortunate and burdensome that a sovereign nation and ally of the United States will continue to have to litigate this matter more than 10 years after it was filed. The government of Saudi Arabia will seek further review of this erroneous decision.”

‘Sovereign Immunity’

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, various Saudi royals, and the Saudi High Commission, a government-established “charity,” had been dismissed as defendants in 2005 by U.S. District Judge Richard Conway Casey, who said that the Saudi government and related individuals and entities were immune from civil suit under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act. He also held that the Saudi government’s support for Islamist “charities” that supported al-Qaeda did not make it responsible for 9/11.



EIR's cover story of Aug. 16, 2013 on the British-Saudi terror axis is available at <http://larouchepub.com/eiw/public/2013/eirv40n32-20130816/index.html>.

After the Second Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the district court ruling, the plaintiffs sought review from the U.S. Supreme Court in 2009. Continuing the coverup in place from the Bush Administration, the Obama Administration intervened in the case to support the Kingdom, filing a brief in May 2009, urging the Supreme Court to refuse to review the case, and strongly arguing for immunity for the Saudis. One of the self-serving arguments made by the Obama Administration, was that since Saudi Arabia has not been officially designated as a “state sponsor of terrorism,” therefore the “terrorism exception” to the sovereign immunity doctrine does not apply. The fact that the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism, cannot be admitted by the U.S. government, either, without blowing the lid off the 12-year coverup of 9/11, of which both the Bush and Obama Administrations are guilty.

What caused the Appeals Court to reverse its previous 2008 ruling, was another case, called *Doe v. Bin*

Laden, in which the plaintiff had sued the government of Afghanistan, among others, over the death of his wife in the 9/11 attacks. In that case, the Federal District Court in Washington, D.C., had ruled that another exception to sovereign immunity, known as the “tort exception,” could apply in that case, and that therefore the government of Afghanistan could be sued. That case was then transferred to the Federal court in New York, to be consolidated with the other 9/11 cases. Therefore when that ruling was appealed, the appeal came to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in New York. The Second Circuit upheld the right of the *Doe* plaintiff to sue Afghanistan—a ruling which contradicted its own previous ruling in the cases involving Saudi Arabia.

In its Dec. 19, 2013 ruling, the Appeals Court remedied this inconsistency, thereby allowing the cases against the Saudi Kingdom, various Saudi princes, and Saudi-controlled charities, to proceed.

Stating that “the circumstances of this case are extraordinary,” the Second Circuit reversed the district court ruling, and sent the case back to the lower court “for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.”

‘A Lot of Evidence’

The families reacted immediately to the ruling. “I’m ecstatic, because we have a lot of information and evidence,” said William Doyle, whose son was killed in the attacks on the World Trade Center. He was likely referring to the mass of evidence concerning the Saudi role in financing the 9/11 attacks which has emerged over the past decade. “These people are getting off scot-free,” Doyle added. “They didn’t even get a slap on the wrist, and to this day we still have terrorism running rampant. We have to hold accountable the people who finance terrorism.”

Included in the new evidence, would be the affidavits submitted last year by former U.S. Senators Graham and Bob Kerrey (D-Neb.), who co-chaired respectively the two major official investigations of the 9/11 attacks, stating that a Saudi government agent, along with other Saudi officials, had played a key role during the lead-up to the attacks. “I am convinced that there was a direct line between at least some of the terrorists who carried out the September 11th attacks and the government of Saudi Arabia,” Graham said in his 2012 affidavit, citing, among other things, the San Diego case of Saudi government agent Omar al-

Bayoumi, who provided direct assistance to two of the 9/11 hijackers.

Will Obama Defend Saudis Again?

The Obama Administration is about to be put to the test on the Saudis again. The *Philadelphia Inquirer*, in reporting the Dec. 19 ruling, wrote: “On Monday, the U.S. Supreme Court asked the Obama Administration to weigh in on an appeal by Cozen [the law firm handling various 9/11 cases], asking for the reinstatement of another group of defendants, dozens of individuals and financial institutions accused of funneling money to al-Qaeda before the attacks. The request suggests that the court views the matter as having some importance and increases the odds that it may agree to hear the appeal.”

EIR has confirmed that the Supreme Court did indeed issue such an order on Dec. 16, in the case of *O’Neill, John P., et al. v. Al Rajhi Bank, et al.*, asking the U.S. Solicitor General to file a brief. John O’Neill was a former FBI supervisor who was killed at the World Trade Center; his family and estate have brought a class action suit against numerous Saudi banks and charities. The Supreme Court’s entry also states that “Justice Kagan took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.”

This is undoubtedly because Associate Justice Elena Kagan, prior to Obama’s appointing her to the U.S. Supreme Court, was Obama’s Solicitor General in the Justice Department, from which she filed the 2009 brief arguing that the Saudi Kingdom and Saudi princes are immune from lawsuit in the United States.

At that time, Kristin Breitweiser, a leader of the 9/11 Families, denounced the Kagan brief as “reprehensible,” and declared, “One would have hoped that the Obama Administration would have taken a different stance than the Bush Administration, and you wonder what message this sends to victims of terrorism around the world.”

Broader Implications

If the role of Saudi Arabia in supporting the 9/11 attacks were to be exposed, it would have enormous consequences for U.S. policy today, when Saudi Arabia is pressuring the United States for military intervention in Syria, and opposing the easing of tensions between the United States and Iran, declared Bob Graham, in an interview with the Real News Network, which posted it on Nov. 29, 2013.

The close alliance with the Saudis, notorious

while the Bush family was present in government, and continued under Obama, has been key in the whole series of U.S. foreign policy disasters over the recent decades—ranging from Afghanistan, to the illegal war in Libya, and now Syria. Ending the official protection of the Saudis would shift this situation dramatically.

A corollary would be the removal of one of the greatest frauds behind the implementation of police-state measures in the United States—which, under Obama and Bush, have virtually nullified whole sections of the U.S. Constitution. The reason that the FBI and other agencies didn’t find the 9/11 hijackers wasn’t because the National Security Agency lacked dragnet surveillance powers; it was because of the U.S. government’s “hands off” policies toward the Saudis—which continued after the 9/11 attacks.

The Saudis, however, are not a power in themselves, but rather, a junior partner in the larger British imperial system—which prefers to operate through useful fools such as Obama, Bush, and local potentates. A U.S. decisive break with the Saudis means a U.S. break with the British Empire—the long overdue precondition for getting the world off the road to Hell.

EIR Special Report

Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two

**NEW, UPDATED
EDITION**

A new, updated edition of the EIR Special Report, “Obama’s War on America: 9/11 Two” is now available from larouchepub.com.

The expanded report is an urgent intervention into the ongoing strategic crisis brought on by the British/Saudi/Obama alliance behind the overthrow of Qaddafi, and the subsequent explosion of jihadist uprisings throughout Africa and the Arab world.

Price **\$100** (Paperback or PDF. For paper, add shipping and handling; Va. residents add 5% sales tax)

Order from **EIR News Service** 1-800-278-3135

Or online: www.larouchepub.com

