

Official US Government Document Confirms That Saudi Government is Funding Al Qaeda

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, October 20, 2016

[Strategic Culture Foundation](#) 18 October
2016

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, USA](#)

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

As [Liz Goodwin and Michael Isikoff noted on 11 October 2016](#) regarding a recent wikileaks:

The Clinton email states: "We need to use our diplomatic and more traditional intelligence assets to bring pressure on the governments of Qatar and Saudi Arabia, which are providing clandestine financial and logistic support to ISIL and other radical Sunni groups in the region."

That email [from Hillary Clinton](#), was sent on 17 August 2014.

Any reference to the Saudi government is a reference to the Saudi royal family, who own the Saudi government — it's their fiefdom.

[I reported on 17 February 2016](#) that:

On 30 December 2009, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sent a cable (subsequently [released to the public by wikileaks](#)) to America's Ambassadors in Saudi Arabia, Qatar, UAE, Kuwait, and Pakistan, headlined, "Terrorist Finance: Action Request for Senior Level Engagement on Terrorism Finance."

She told those Ambassadors to make clear to the given nation's aristocrats that, under the new US President, Barack Obama, there would no longer be any allowance for continuation of their donations to Al Qaeda and other jihadist groups that attack the United States.

It opened, "This is an action request cable," meaning that the operations of the local US Embassy in the given nation would be monitored for compliance with the Secretary of State's "request."

Despite her assertion, there was no accountability; yet she has continued to complain to them in private about those royals' financing of terrorist groups.

On 11 February 2015, I headlined ["Al Qaeda's Bookkeeper Spills The Beans"](#) and reported, with links to the US courtroom documentation, that:

Zacarias Moussaoui was the bookkeeper and bagman (money-collector) for Al Qaeda, but the US intelligence services have been keeping this fact secret as much as they can, because what he knows about the crucial financial backers of Al Qaeda can be very damaging to the US aristocracy, which is heavily oil-based and closely allied with the Saudi royal family, which created Al Qaeda in

order to please the Saudi clerics, who are Wahhabist Muslims who constantly threaten the royals with exposure of their economic and sexual corruption unless the royals finance the spread of the Wahhabist sect (such as by Al Qaeda), and thereby finance the spread of those clerics' own international influence and power.

Or, so says the former bookkeeper of Al Qaeda, who was selected by Al Qaeda's military chief, Abu Hafz (also known as "Mohammed Atef"), to serve Osama bin Laden in that capacity: Zacarias Moussaoui. This is his testimony, in brief.

Moussaoui swore in court, that he collected multimillion-dollar cash donations to Al Qaeda from "*Waleed — Waleed bin Talal, Prince — Prince Turki Al Faisal Al Saud, Prince — Prince Bandar bin Sultan Al Saud, Prince Mohammed Al Faisal Al Saud*" and other Saudi royals. He was asked how important this was to Al Qaeda, and he replied: "It was crucial. I mean, without the money of the — of the Saudi you will have nothing." This courtroom testimony remains suppressed to the present day, virtually entirely ignored in the press — and without the 9/11 families having pushed the legal issue, this testimony never would even have occurred at all.

On 10 September 2016, [I reported on](#) 'the missing 28 pages', which were actually 29 pages, which till recently were kept secret, expurgated actually, from the congressional study on the origin of the 9/11 attacks, and noted that:

what that document actually showed, and proved (and cited FBI investigators who could then have testified in public, if requested), was the opposite of unimportant: that the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, Prince Bandar bin Sultan al-Saud (who was known in Washington as "Bandar Bush," because of his closeness to the Bush family), had secretly been paying the Saudi handlers of at least two of the 15 Saudis among the 19 9/11 hijackers, and that Bandar's wife and other relatives were also paying those hijackers-to-be, and their families — thus enabling the future hijackers to obtain the necessary pilot-training etc., for the 9/11 attacks.

Why, then did US President Barack Obama, who is oath-bound to the US Constitution and to the American people, veto a bill that Congress finally passed allowing the 9/11 families to sue the Saudi government — the Saudi royal family — for 9/11?

Whom is Obama protecting, and why? Does anyone publicly ask this question of him?

NOTE: This same person, Obama, who protects the Saudis, says as follows about the non-sectarian, separation-of-church-and-state committed, *anti-jihadist*, leader of Syria, Bashar al-Assad, whom the US and Saudi governments back Al Qaeda and other jihadist groups in Syria in order to overthrow: As the *Wall Street Journal* headlined on 19 November 2015, "[Obama Says Syrian Leader Bashar al-Assad Must Go](#)" and they reported his argument:

"It is because it is unimaginable that you can stop the civil war here when the overwhelming majority of people in Syria consider him to be a brutal, murderous dictator... He cannot regain legitimacy."

Obama says that Al Qaeda in Syria and other such jihadists (whom he calls 'moderate

rebels’) there should overthrow Assad (and would presumably be more ‘legimate’ there).

But, in reality, even Western-sponsored polls have consistently shown that Assad is the only person in Syria whom [more than 50% of the Syrian people actually want to be their leader](#), and that the US itself is loathed there because it is viewed by [82% of Syrians](#) as being to blame for the tens of thousands of jihadists who have been imported into Syria (paid for by the Saudis and militarily trained by the Americans) causing immeasurable misery there for the Syrian people.

Why are American Presidents impeached for extramarital sex but not for being traitors and for supporting America’s actual enemies, against the interests of the 9/11 victims and of the rest of the American people? Is America’s government against the interests of the American people? If so, [whom does it really represent](#)? And why?

The original source of this article is [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Strategic Culture Foundation](#), 2016

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of *They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010*, and of *CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity*.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca