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At 10 PM on June 25, 1996, a gigantic explosion struck the Khobar Towers housing compound for the U.S. Air Force in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. A tanker truck filled with several tons of TNT detonated on a nearby parking lot, killing 19 U.S. soldiers and injuring more than 200 people. The attack, the largest on a U.S. target since the 1983 Marine barracks bombing in Lebanon, prompted three official inquiries in the United States, as well as the relocation of most U.S. military personnel in Saudi Arabia from the Eastern Province to Prince Sultan Airbase outside Riyadh.

Despite its scale and repercussions, the Khobar bombing continues to be the subject of considerable speculation, not least concerning the identities of the perpetrators. In 2001, a U.S. court formally indicted a group of Saudi Shi`a allegedly linked to a militant group called Saudi Hizb Allah. In 2007, William Perry, secretary of defense at the time of the bombing, stated that he believed al-Qa`ida was responsible.

The then FBI director, Louis Freeh, claimed on the other hand that Iran had ordered the attack. Perhaps reflecting its bipartisan mandate, the 9/11 Report assigned blame to all of the above, by stating that the operation was carried out principally, perhaps exclusively, by Saudi Hezbollah, an organization that had received support from the government of Iran. While the evidence of Iranian involvement is strong, there are also signs that al-Qa`ida played some role, as yet unknown.

The issue of Iranian involvement is shrouded in so much secrecy and high level politics that any assessment based on open sources remains impossible. The question of al-Qa`ida’s involvement, on the other hand, can now be addressed because vast amounts of new information about both al-Qa`ida and Saudi jihadism in the 1990s have emerged in the past few years. This article will examine the hypothesis that al-Qa`ida alone was behind Khobar as well as the theory that Usama bin Ladin collaborated with Tehran.

Assessing al-Qa`ida’s Role

The principal reason to suspect al-Qa`ida’s involvement is the fact that Usama bin Ladin had a motive to attack. Since late 1990, Bin Ladin had expressed deep dissatisfaction with the U.S. military presence in his native Saudi Arabia, a presence he considered a violation of the sanctity of the “Land of the Two Holy Places.” In August 1996, he declared war on U.S. troops in the Arabian Peninsula. Although this declaration postdates the Khobar bombing, Bin Ladin had declared his readiness to attack U.S. troops several years earlier in informal settings.

Moreover, Bin Ladin applauded the Khobar operation in a number of interviews after the attack.

Many would also argue that Bin Ladin also had the operational capability. Al-Qa`ida-linked militants undertook several military operations overseas in the early 1990s, from an alleged assassination attempt on the former king of Afghanistan in Rome in November 1991, to the hotel bombings in the Yemeni port of Aden in December 1992, to guerrilla warfare in Somalia in 1993. There is also evidence that Bin Ladin sought to operate in Saudi Arabia from approximately 1994 onward. In mid-1994, Saudi authorities allegedly intercepted a shipment of explosives sent by al-Qa`ida from Sudan to Saudi Arabia. According to a declassified Iraqi document, Bin Ladin met with an Iraqi government representative in Khartoum in early 1995 and discussed “carrying out joint operations against foreign forces” in Saudi Arabia.

The Yemeni jihadist Nasir al-Bahri has also said that Bin Ladin “opened branches of the al-Qa`ida organization in Saudi Arabia” in 1996.

The third reason to suspect al-Qa`ida involvement is that prior to the Khobar bombing Saudi Arabia experienced two violent attacks by Saudi Arab Afghans. The first was the so-called al-Hudhayf incident in November 1994, in which Abdallah al-Hudhayf threw acid in the face of a police officer to avenge the
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militants had weakened his links to the Saudi Islamist scene, and many of his potential collaborators were imprisoned after the 1995 Riyadh bombing. 16 Third, the Khobar attack differed considerably from any operation undertaken by Sunni Islamists in Saudi Arabia both before and after 1996. The Khobar bomb contained between 20 and 100 times more explosives than the November 1995 Riyadh bomb. The expertise for such an operation does not seem to have existed in the Saudi jihadist community in the 1990s. Fourth, the report of the alleged congratulatory calls, apart from being uncorroborated by other sources, does not constitute evidence of direct responsibility. Bin Ladin himself did not initiate the calls, and presumably he did not explicitly admit responsibility in his response, as this would also have been reported.

More importantly, anyone arguing in favor of the al-Qa`ida hypothesis would have to explain two spectacular gaps in the record of evidence on Khobar. The first gap is the absence of any forensic or other direct evidence linking al-Qa`ida to the operation. This absence is all the more glaring when compared to the wealth of publicly available evidence on other al-Qa`ida operations and on other violent incidents, large and small, involving Sunni militants in the Saudi kingdom. Although secret evidence may exist, it is doubtful that it would be in large quantities. A former U.S. intelligence official has noted that in the course of reviewing the bulk of the evidence on the Khobar attack during 1996-1997, he never saw any reliable evidence of al-Qa`ida involvement. 19

The second gap is the silence on Khobar in the jihadist literature. The Saudi jihadist literature treats Khobar quite differently from other incidents in the kingdom in the 1990s, such as the Riyadh bombing, the al-Hudhayfah affair, or the 1998 Hijaz missile plot. While Abdallah al-Hudhayfah and the Riyadh bombers are hailed as martyrs and the Hijaz missile plotters proudly named, no reference has ever been made to the identities of the Khobar bombers. 20

In other words, it seems unlikely that Bin Ladin orchestrated the Khobar bombing. Did al-Qa`ida play an indirect and low-profile role in the attack?

**Al-Qa`ida-Iran Collaboration?**

Another hypothesis that enjoys support in certain U.S. government and intelligence circles is that al-Qa`ida secretly collaborated with Shi`a militants in an Iran-sponsored attack on Khobar. The 9/11 Commission, for example, noted that “we have seen strong but indirect evidence that his organization did in fact play some as yet unknown role in the Khobar attack.” 21 This hypothesis is part of a broader theory about a secret alliance between Iran and al-Qa`ida dating back to the early 1990s and facilitated by the legendary Hizb Allah operative Imad Mughniyeh. 22

The nature and full scale of the alleged evidence for this theory is difficult to assess because it has remained classified to this day. The principal open source information pointing to the existence of an Iran-al-Qa`ida alliance
is the testimony of former al-Qa‘ida member Jamal al-Fadl in the so-called Embassy Bombings Trial in 2001. Al-Fadl said that around 1993 Abu Hajir al-Iraqi, a prominent al-Qa‘ida ideologue, advocated cooperation between Sunnis and Shi‘a in the fight against the United States.24 Al-Fadl also allegedly witnessed a meeting between al-Qa‘ida leaders and an Iranian representative in Khartoum.25 Al-Fadl further said that a group of al-Qa‘ida members, including top al-Qa‘ida operative Sayf al-Adl, went to south Lebanon in the early 1990s to train with Hizb Allah.26 Some have interpreted Iran’s post-9/11 refusal to extradite top al-Qa‘ida leaders (among whom Sayf al-Adl) as an indication of Tehran’s fear of revealing its long-standing connections with al-Qa‘ida.27

From an outside vantage point, it is not difficult to challenge this hypothesis. As interesting as al-Fadl’s account may be, it is not corroborated by any other publicly available sources and thus hinges on one testimony alone. Moreover, there may be many reasons behind Iran’s refusal to extradite al-Qa‘ida leaders post-9/11. Needless to say, a number of al-Qa‘ida associates have categorically denied the existence of a link between al-Qa‘ida and Iran.28 Finally, this hypothesis still does not answer the question of the nature of al-Qa‘ida’s alleged contribution to the Khobar operation. Until significant new evidence to the contrary is made public, this must be considered a conspiracy theory.

Conclusion
Of course, conspiracies do occur, and nothing is impossible in the murky world of terrorism and espionage. Nevertheless, in the case of the Khobar bombing, the straightforward explanation is both more plausible and supported by more evidence.

Both the U.S. and the Saudi investigations concluded that the operation was carried out by a cell affiliated with the radical Shi‘a group Hizb Allah al-Hijaz (or Saudi Hizb Allah).29 The pro-Khomeini Hizb Allah al-Hijaz had never accepted the deal struck in 1993 between the pro-Shirazi Shi‘a opposition and the Saudi regime. Some have interpreted Iran’s post-9/11 refusal to extradite top al-Qa‘ida leaders (among whom Sayf al-Adl) as an indication of Tehran’s fear of revealing its long-standing connections with al-Qa‘ida.30

Al-Qa‘ida’s involvement in the 1996 Khobar bombing, however, can be ruled out until substantial new evidence to the contrary emerges. Bin Ladin welcomed the operation, but he was probably not responsible. In fact, his strongest link to the bombing may have been the involvement of his family’s construction company, the Saudi Bin Ladin Group, in the rebuilding of the Khobar Towers site.31
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