



THE PENTAGON'S NEW WORLD ORDER

A Review of Thomas P.M. Barnett's Book, *The Pentagon's New Map*
(Berkley Publishing Group, New York, NY, 2004)

By Tim Porter

America ultimately does not transform the Middle East to defeat terrorism, contain Islam, secure oil, or defend Israel. We seek to transform the region to end its disconnectedness, and if it is worth doing there, then it is worth doing everywhere it exists.

Thomas P.M. Barnett, *The Pentagon's New Map*

Epitomizing the entire text, the above quotation from Thomas P.M. Barnett's best-selling book *The Pentagon's New Map* goes a long way toward explaining why American troops remain in an open-ended conflict in the Middle East, more than seven years since President George W. Bush began offensive operations in Afghanistan, and over six since the invasion of Iraq.

Terrorism was the pretext to send American troops into the Middle East and Central Asia, but according to Barnett, terrorism is not the real reason our troops are staying in the region. Despite Barack Obama's campaign promises, troop deployments will continue to expand.

Barnett apparently has been in a position to know. He has had a successful track record as a military/foreign policy analyst and strategic futurist. As a Senior Strategic Researcher and professor at the U.S. Naval War College from 1998 to 2004, Barnett was also appointed Assistant for Strategic Futures, Office of Force Transformation, Office of the Secretary of Defense, during the intense mobilization period just after 9/11.

Moreover, the front pages of *New Map* display glowing endorsements from high-ranking representatives of the globalist [Council on Foreign Relations](#) and the Brookings Institution, with additional praise in the [National Review](#), the Washington Times, and the Wall Street Journal, among others. It is clear that Barnett's ideas have the support and approval of America's ruling establishment.

The book became a New York Times bestseller with help from its [favorable media coverage](#), including C-Span broadcasts of Barnett's brash [PowerPoint presentations](#) with audiences full of military/foreign policy wonks. Several "main stream" media reviewers described Barnett and his militant globalism as "controversial." Odds are the controversy was with some in Washington, concerned that such blunt presentations may cause conservative Americans, who have largely supported the current military campaign, to awaken and become opposed to its true mission.

Several of the forecasts in *New Map* are already proving accurate. For example, in a time of relative prosperity for the dollar, Barnett foresaw globalization's demand that the dollar's days as the world's sole reserve currency would be numbered. Seeming unlikely at the time the book was first released, that scenario is increasingly appearing inevitable today.

Barnett also wrote that American armed forces would not be coming home from the Middle East after those responsible for 9/11 are defeated, despite the public perception. There would continue to be a military presence in the region, he wrote, "to end its disconnectedness." That phrase appears enigmatic, but is clearly explained within the text, albeit to the chagrin of those of us who oppose America's role as global police for, in Barnett's words, "what George H.W. Bush dubbed the 'The New World Order.'"

As a hawkish proponent of this grandiose military mission, Barnett, at first glance, appears to display all the characteristics of the neo-conservative George W. Bush administration. However, the book faulted Bush for not being candid with the American people that the American military would not be coming home. He also believed that Bush should have openly conveyed the fact that the "war on terror" was in reality a war to enforce globalization.

On his [new map of the globe](#), Barnett reveals this conflict as a struggle between two major groups of nations or regions. The bloc that the United States belongs to (as part of "North America," mind you) is what Barnett describes as the "Functioning Core" of globalization. It consists of North America, Europe, Russia, Japan, China, India, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile.

Resisting this globalized power structure is a group of "Non-Integrating Gap" regions, composed of the Caribbean area, most of Africa, the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East, Central Asia, and the southern corners of Asia. "The Gap" refers to its appearance as a large gap between areas of the Core, stretching around the globe at approximately the mid-latitude regions.

Core Beliefs

A nation or region's integration into the Functioning Core denotes acceptance of certain Core beliefs of globalization, as Barnett explained:

[N]othing in the global system should be allowed to prevent the flow of any of the resources from regions of surplus to regions of deficit. In effect, labor, energy, money, and security all need to flow as freely as possible from those places in the world where they are plentiful to those regions where they are scarce.Over time, these essential transactions engender further connectivity among nations and regions, reflected in the rise of more complex and suitably entangling rule sets that moderate the behavior of not just nation-states but likewise firms and individuals. The desired security end state of this integration process is a community of states within which rule-set transgressions find certain-if not immediate-resolution through universally agreed-upon legal means.

If the phrase, "suitably entangling rule sets" raises red flags, it means the reader likely is also aware of Thomas Jefferson's admonition that the U.S. should always guard against entering into "entangling alliances" that would dissolve American national *independence* into international

interdependence. However, such entanglement is precisely, and unashamedly, Barnett's intention, advanced globally with the force of our own military.

Barnett here also answers the question of why America's borders are not being secured, despite logic dictating that any "war on terror" should surely include protecting a country's own borders. Barnett's answer is that porous borders are no inadvertent oversight due to higher priorities in a "war on terror" – they are a major *objective* of this war for globalization.

Neither have presidents Clinton, Bush and Obama perpetuated open borders and illegal immigration simply for the Hispanic vote or for cheap labor, but for the greater goal of advancing Barnett's Functional Core, and G.H.W. Bush's New World Order.

Porous borders allow for Barnett's "free flow" of resources, including cheap labor for the feudal lords of big business. This "free flow" is synonymous with amalgamation of the continent and eventual elimination of all borders. Indeed, the elimination of borders is precisely what Barnett envisions:

Perhaps all this qualifies me as a dreamer, but I do believe that all meaningful borders can be erased, and all religious differences rendered harmless as sources of mass violence. I believe the end of war is within our historical grasp, and that I will live to witness this achievement.

There is perhaps nothing more frightening on this earth than utopian dreamers with guns, who are determined to force Americans to sacrifice their self-evident, God-given rights upon the altar of globalism. Our rights can then be determined by big-government, elitist bureaucrats, who consider themselves the rightful heirs of the old feudal lords from whom our forbearers fled Europe and the world's other repressive regimes.

Barnett's willingness to compromise free human rights for globalism is evident in his list of allies that includes what he calls the newest "pillars" of the Core: China, Russia, and Mexico, countries with long histories of corruption and human rights violations. According to Barnett, a government's feudal mindset toward human rights is immaterial so long as it pledges allegiance to "integration" and "connectivity." Of course, Russia and China were for "connectivity" in the days when they were openly expanding the Marxist empire.

Fundamental Differences

Most of America's Christian conservatives have been convinced to support the current war under the guise of an aggressive "war on terror." However, under the globalist definition, as evidenced by recent [Homeland Security memos](#) that warn against any who openly support gun rights, the Constitution or national sovereignty, a "terrorist" could be any person who has the gall to object to his globalist lords' plan for international integration. That would – or should, if they are true to their faith and the U.S. Constitution – include every conservative Christian in America.

The irony of all of this is that there are essentially only two large groups of people on earth that are fundamentally opposed to globalist integration – fundamentalist Islam and conservative Christianity. Although there are irreconcilable differences between them and they are not

compatible with one another in any way, neither are they conformable to the compromised, integrated framework of globalism. A number of other religions are characterized by universalism and pantheism, such as Hinduism and its “all is one” philosophy that is tailor-made for world integration, but these two are defined by their exclusivity. They will not compromise into a global religious system.

The first phase of the war for globalism – or the so-called “war on terrorism” – pits these two exclusive groups against each other in what amounts to a prolonged canceling-out process. The forces of globalism then intend to, in Barnett’s words, “moderate the behavior” of those individuals and groups who remain.

If that seems like an exaggeration, let’s see if the following passages from *The Pentagon’s New Map* could reference both fundamentalist Moslems and conservative, patriotic American Christians, according to Barnett’s elitist mindset:

But as we have seen with al Qaeda, there are also groups of individuals within societies that reject the notion that their "homeland" should join this larger community of states that define globalization's Functioning Core.... [T]hese nonstate actors committed to hijacking their societies from globalization's creeping embrace will come to define the dominant security threat across the system as a whole.

Our war against individuals will occur not only in disconnected states where Special Operations forces lead the way; but likewise in advanced states...

America's use of military power in this war has to be guided toward strategic ends: the destruction of those who would wage war against global connectivity and the freedoms it unleashes.... If disconnectedness is the real enemy, then the combatants we target in this war are those who promote it, enforce it, and terrorize those who seek to overcome it by reaching out to the larger world.

Those fellow Christian conservatives intent on a physical war with all of Islam will wake up one day to find that America’s traditional military has changed, and the new forces of globalism are coming at them as well. Barnett predicts the armed forces will be divided in two, leaving the standard military to fight the big wars “over there,” with a new “System Administrator” force to take the form of a global police force for “peacekeeping” duties, even in the United States:

The Sys Admin force will be its complete opposite, moving progressively from military law toward civilian law. It will eventually submit to the ICC's [International Criminal Court] oversight, and it will not be bound by Posse Comitatus restrictions on operating within the United States. It will be a far more police-like force....the Sys Admin force will attract foreign troops from the Gap as peacekeepers...

That’s right, there will be [foreign troops policing America](#) as “peacekeepers,” because many of America’s sons and daughters in the military will be tied up “over there.” If you are one who believes in national sovereignty as the ultimate check and balance against global tyranny, you will be targeted as a “security threat.” There will be forces policing you who have no knowledge

or tradition of human rights as recognized by the U.S. Constitution, and their loyalty will be to the International Criminal Court, not to the Constitution of the United States.

Some readers may get the notion that this implies all those fighting the “war on terror” are less than noble in their pursuit of those responsible for 9/11. However, it is not the intent here to impugn the motives of those who have been willing to give their lives to this effort, to which many of them enlisted just after 9/11. But as noble they are, they are not the ones setting policy.

Their globalist political leaders and high commanders are giving them a classic “bait and switch” through the use of euphemisms and vague generalities. As America’s sons and daughters train to “fight terrorism,” they are being instructed on how to disarm populations who resist the “world community.” They are being told that it is right to preemptively strike populations who have not attacked America, but who have leadership that “the world would be a better place without.”

Psy-Ops

This strategy of “preemptive war” reverses our tradition of the “just war” – going to war only when attacked – that has been the stated policy of America since Lexington Green and Concord Bridge. For any population that won’t comply with Barnett’s world order, he encourages even more of this audacious, mafia-like thuggery:

In the case of a regime, you simply keep ratcheting up your demands for compliance, and when the regime cannot comply and cannot be provoked into a precipitating action by your constantly growing military pressure, you preempt.

...You may ask, What gives America the right to make such decisions? The simplest answer is that "might makes right"...

Here the militant utopian dreamer’s deranged mindset is confirmed. Barnett not only endorses preemption, but, if at first possible, provocation through a [Machiavellian](#), “end justifies the means” version of “[psychological operations](#).” “Psy-ops” can cause the targeted command to make, or appear to make the first strike, so that the attacking force can declare “justification” for a “response.” In his PowerPoint presentations, Barnett takes pleasure in comparing this action to law enforcement officers yelling out, “He’s gotta gun!” as they rush in.

This manifests an elitist, cavalier disregard for the lives of foreign populations as well as American military personnel. It is the same arrogance that was displayed by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in 1964, when he and President Johnson concocted the [Gulf of Tonkin](#) provocation to start the Vietnam War.

Psy-ops are not only used on targeted military and government leaders, but also on their populations, as Barnett acknowledges:

We also engage in what are known as psychological operations to convince the civilian population that our goals in conducting any war will serve their long-term goals.

These psy-ops are designed to turn populations against certain factions of political and/or military leadership, and to rally support – or at least cause ambivalence – for the action being taken in their region. Examples are Cold War operations [Ajax](#) against Iran in 1953, and [Gladio](#).

The specter of psy-ops directed toward targeted populations raises the question: Have psy-ops ever been used upon a command's own population to generate a reaction of public support for that command's planned operation? Moreover, have such psy-ops ever been used by the U.S. upon America's own citizenry? The answers to these two questions are *yes* and *yes*.

Although history records numerous examples of the first scenario, the most notorious are Nero's burning of Rome in 64 A.D. and the Nazis' burning of the Reichstag building, the German parliament building, in 1933. Nero "fiddled while Rome burned" so that he could blame the Christians for the crime, and initiate a horrendous persecution of them with public approval. Using the same tactics, Hitler blamed communists and Jews for the Reichstag fire. He then used a "get tough on terrorists" message to get the parliament to pass the "Enabling Act," giving him the unprecedented, unchecked powers that brought about his dictatorship.

The 1964 Gulf of Tonkin provocation is an example of the second scenario upon Americans, as it proved to be a psy-op directed both upon the North Vietnamese military to start the war, and American public opinion to support a reprisal.

If it had been carried out, the [1962 Operation Northwoods](#) plan would have been one of history's most outrageous psy-ops upon America's own citizens. Approved by the U.S. Joint Chiefs and signed by then-Chairman Lyman Lemnitzer, it proposed committing acts of terrorism upon our own military and civilian targets, to blame Fidel Castro's Cuba and create public outcry for a war against Cuba. Only President John Kennedy's refusal prevented the plan's operation.

A 'Vaccination'

Since *New Map* brazenly acknowledges and encourages the use of Machiavellian psy-ops by the forces of globalism, it leads one to believe this next passage suggests a similar psy-op, related to the drug cartels' incursion over our southern border, to advance globalization in the Americas:

[T]he United States will stop its long-term policy of dithering on Colombia's slow disintegration as a state and finally commit itself to ending the nearly joint rule of the drug cartels and the rebel groups within that failed state. This will be an amazingly messy task, our embracing of which must go all the way if we are determined to succeed. My guess is that a 9/11-like trigger will have to occur to set the endgame in motion, something that the White House can rally support around (and, yes, I know that sounds like another Tom Clancy novel).

Barnett's bizarre reference here to Tom Clancy's well-researched fiction is an intrigue worthy of a Clancy novel itself. An exploration into Clancy's writings provides a clue to Barnett's reference, and peers into the deepest, darkest recesses of the militant utopian dreamer's Machiavellian mindset.

Clancy's *Line of Control* was published in June of 2001, three months before 9/11. It was one of the *Op-Center* series of novels that Clancy collaborated with former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and international crisis manager/psychiatrist [Dr. Steve Pieczenik](#), who is the main inspiration behind the Jack Ryan character. Centering on the continual Kashmir dispute between Pakistan and India, it depicts a bombing by Pakistani terrorists in Indian-controlled Kashmir.

It is discovered that a radical faction of Indian intelligence had been monitoring the terrorists all along, and had allowed the bombing to occur as a psy-op on their own people, to arouse fervor for a war the Indian radicals desired with Pakistan. They justify their role in the bombing with Machiavellian reasoning, calling it “a vaccination,” i.e., “giving the body of India a small taste of the sickness to prevent a larger disease from ever taking hold.”

Another Clancy novel is *Debt of Honor*, published in 1994, *seven years before 9/11*. It contains this chillingly prophetic passage:

....nosing down toward the south side of the American house of government....His last voluntary act was to select the point of impact, two thirds the way up the stone steps... Nearly three hundred tons of aircraft and fuel struck the east face of the [Capitol] building at a speed of three hundred knots. The aircraft disintegrated upon impact....one hundred tons of jet fuel erupted from fuel tanks, vaporizing from the passage through the stone blocks.

‘I Know Nothing’

Perhaps Tom Clancy should have been our national security advisor before 9/11 instead of Condoleezza Rice, who had no idea that terrorists would fly planes into buildings. That was her story despite anti-aircraft weapons guarding against [terrorist strikes from the air](#) that were installed for the [G8 Genoa Summit](#) that summer, and [on top of the resort hotel](#) where President Bush stayed in Sarasota, Florida the night before 9/11.

That was her story despite well-known attempts to fly planes [into the Eiffel Tower](#) and the [White House](#) itself not many years earlier, and the 1995 Operation Bojinka terrorist plot that included crashing a plane into the [CIA headquarters](#). That was her story despite the [numerous military training exercises](#) with scenarios of hijacking planes and crashing them, including [one on the very morning of 9/11](#) that confused air traffic controllers. The concept of suicide pilots crashing planes as weapons is at least as old as Japan’s kamikazes during World War II.

Add to this the [Visa Express scandal](#) that allowed 9/11 terrorists into the U.S. [from Saudi Arabia](#) after their outrageously inadequate and incomplete visa applications; the fact that two of the hijackers’ names were [kept off the terrorist watch list](#) given to the airlines, even though they had been [staying with an FBI informer](#); and [Operation Able Danger](#), the military intelligence program that identified and [monitored Mohamed Atta and his terrorist cell by name](#) a year before 9/11, but was prevented from passing the information to the FBI.

In addition, diligent, devoted FBI agents and employees such as [Robert Wright](#), [John Vincent](#), [Coleen Rowley](#), [Sibel Edmonds](#), [Harry Samit](#), and [Kenneth Williams](#) were, in the weeks and months before 9/11, frantically trying to notify their mid-level superiors of increased terrorist activities connected to al Qaeda and flying planes without landing them. Their warnings were not listened to, and some were even told to [“back off” investigations of Saudi suspects](#).

The FBI’s mid-level management became a black hole into which all this information disappeared, establishing an “I know nothing” [plausible deniability](#) defense for top officials. [None of those mid-level managers were disciplined](#) for their lack of action, and in fact [most have been promoted](#) since 9/11.

Also, then-U.S. ambassador to Yemen, [Barbara Bodine, denied FBI counterterrorism chief investigator John O'Neill's re-entry into Yemen](#), and thereby prevented his probe into the USS Cole bombing that [would have led to al Qaeda and several of the hijackers](#). Disgusted, O'Neill resigned from the FBI and became director of security for the World Trade Center. On 9/11, in his first official week on the job, O'Neill perished in the rubble. For her indefensible action, Bodine was not disciplined, but actually promoted, as [President George W. Bush named none other than Barbara Bodine](#) as the first governor over the Baghdad region in occupied Iraq.

When all of this is added up, given the globalists' established contempt for America's national sovereignty and the established history of Machiavellian psy-ops, [even Dr. Pieczenik](#) has concluded that U.S. defense intelligence before 9/11 was a real-world replay of India's in *Line of Control*. Truth indeed is stranger than fiction. *Shock and awe*.

'Sudden, Nasty and Traumatic Shocks'

Long-time State Department official and MIT Professor Emeritus [Lincoln P. Bloomfield](#), like Barnett, is a globalist, political scientist, and government policy analyst. In 1962, Bloomfield submitted [under contract](#) a research report to the State Department entitled "[A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations](#)." It examined the scenarios, events and processes that would bring about a world government.

Under normal conditions, Bloomfield wrote, the change would come about slowly, through a gradual consensus-building process. The European Union and NAFTA were only globalist visions in 1962 when Bloomfield stated that "regionalism" would be the process through which "ever-larger units evolve...until ultimately the larger units coalesce under a global umbrella."

This process could several hundred years, according to Bloomfield, unless the nations get a wake-up call that accelerates the process:

....I have suggested that an alternative road may bypass the main path of history, shortcircuiting the organic stages of consensus... This relies on a grave crisis or war to bring about a sudden transformation in national attitudes sufficient for the purpose. According to this version, the order we examine may be brought into existence as a result of a series of sudden, nasty, and traumatic shocks.... Thus a hypothetical model can be constructed, fulfilling the characteristics of "a world effectively controlled by the United Nations.".... We concluded that in theory it could come about in the short, medium, or long run by a brink of war – or a war – combined with the development of evolutionary trends that might favor it as the time span stretches out.

Bloomfield's 1962 report has become globalism's master plan. The trauma of 9/11 was the first in what Bloomfield described as a series of sudden shocks to change national attitudes, and the so-called "global war on terrorism" is that very war he envisioned to accelerate globalization.

Indeed, it is Bloomfield's war that Barnett advocates in *The Pentagon's New Map*, to expand his "Functioning Core" into "what George H.W. Bush dubbed the 'New World Order.'"

Pentagon's NWO – Additional Links

YouTube video - 2 Parts: 1-[CAMP FEMA: AMERICAN LOCKDOWN - MIAC Report](#) 2-[CAMP FEMA \(Pt 3 of 3\)](#)

[Why Does Interpol Need Immunity from American Law?](#) – National Review, Dec 23, 2009

YouTube video - Delta Force Hits Kingsville, TX (*POLICE STATE 2000*) [Part One](#) - [Part Two](#) - [Part Three](#)

YouTube video - Marines Patrol Hebron, MD (from *POLICE STATE 2000*) [Part One](#) - [Part Two](#)

YouTube video - "Operation Urban Warrior," Oakland, CA (*POLICE STATE 2000*) [Part One](#) - [Part Two](#) - [Part Three](#)

YouTube video - [San Antonio Police Chief Al Phillippus](#) (*POLICE STATE 2000*, May, 1998)

YouTube video - [Oath Keeper Sheriff Richard Mack](#)

YouTube video - [Clergy Response Teams to Help Government Enforce Martial Law](#) (KSLA-TV, Shreveport, LA)

[Rethinking Romans 13](#) - Greg A. Dixon, *WorldNetDaily*, 4/14/01 [Romans 13 Revisited](#) - Chuck Baldwin, 2/27/09

[LEX REX](#) ("Law [is] King") - Samuel Rutherford, 1644

[A CHRISTIAN MANIFESTO](#) Excerpts – [Francis A. Schaeffer](#), 1981, page 32: *Lex rex means law is king—a phrase that was absolutely earthshaking. Prior to that it had been rex lex, the king is law. In Lex Rex [Rutherford] wrote that the law, and no one else, is king.*

Therefore, the heads of government are under the law [of God], not a law unto themselves.

[ANGER WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NOT ENOUGH](#) – Chuck Baldwin, *NewsWithViews* 12/18/09:

Ladies and Gentlemen, freedom in America has only one hope: the resurrection of State independence and sovereignty... The last time I checked, some 38 states have introduced Tenth Amendment resolutions -- or some form of federal nullification proposals -- in their State assemblies. To follow the status of various states' rights initiatives, keep an eye on these two web sites: [Web site one](#) and [Web site two](#).

[NEO-CONNED!](#) - Speech by Rep. Ron Paul (R-TX) on the House floor, July 10, 2003 - [Transcript](#) - [Google Video](#)



LT. COL. ANTHONY SHAFFER - 'ABLE DANGER' & DIA PRIOR KNOWLEDGE OF 9/11

In the early-2001 Clancy/Piecznik fiction book, [Line of Control](#), India's intelligence forces tracked Islamist terrorists right up until their bombing attack in Indian-controlled Kashmir. Likewise, in the real world, Lt. Col. Anthony Shaffer and the Defense Intelligence Agency's ABLE DANGER team had been monitoring the 9/11 terrorist cells all along. Why was their surveillance mission stopped, and why did the 9/11 Commission cover it up? (YouTube video: [Part One](#) - [Part Two](#) - [Part Three](#))

Also: [Fox News](#) and [other reports](#) on [Lt. Col. Shaffer](#)

[Why Did the 9/11 Commission Ignore "Able Danger"?](#) (OpEd by Former FBI Dir. Louis Freeh)

[Who's Afraid of Sibel Edmonds?](#) – The American Conservative 11/1/09. [Edmonds Vindicated – Wash Times 1/14/05](#)

Video – [BBC News 11/6/01](#) - FBI agents were told to "back off" investigating bin Ladens and Saudis - [Transcript](#)

[THE 'AIRLIFT OF EVIL'](#) - MSNBC 11/29/01 – [Video](#) - [U.S. allowed Taliban, al Qaeda to be airlifted from Pakistan](#)

[Were 1998 Memos a Blueprint for War?](#) [PNAC's "A New Pearl Harbor"] ABC News, 3/10/03

Video - Fox News *Dayside*, July 29, 2005 [7/7 Bomber Was Working for British Intelligence](#) – [Transcript](#)

Video - [TERRORSTORM \(5 of 14\)](#) London 7/7 bombings at exact time, place as "crisis management" terror drills.

Madrid Bombers Linked to Spanish Security Service – [London Times, June 19, 2004](#)

[Why Would "Terrorists" Want To Decapitate Anti-US Leadership In Pakistan?](#)

[Terrorists 'helped by CIA' to stop rise of left in Italy](#) – London Guardian, March 26, 2001

'93 WTC Bombing: FBI agents' prior knowledge, complicity – [NY Times 10/28/93](#) Video: [CBS News 10/28/93](#)

State Dept allowed "Underwear Bomber" terrorist to keep visa "to avoid tipping off larger investigation." [Detroit News, 10/27/10](#).

[The Skinny on Full Body Scanners](#) – MSNBC | [Associated Press, 12-31-10](#) – "High-tech, full-body scanning machines... may become more common as security officials around the world respond to the attempted [*'Underwear Bomber'*] attack on an airliner on Christmas Day." [As usual, the public receives increased monitoring instead of the "crisis management" derelicts that caused the problem, as per the [Detroit News](#) and other articles above. A fine line exists between "crisis management" and "crisis creation" for more population control by big-government elitist like Hillary Clinton, who has said, "[Never waste a good crisis.](#)"]

Google video - [9/11: BLUEPRINT FOR TRUTH](#) - [Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#)

[9/11 Survivors and Family Members Question the 9/11 Commission Report](#)

[Representative of Largest 9/11 Families Group Says Government Complicit In Attack](#)

[Polls show broad skepticism among Americans of official 9/11 narrative](#)

[BEFORE 9/11: Taleban in Texas for talks on gas pipeline](#) – BBC News, December 4, 1997

[Oil Negotiations with Taliban May Have Interfered with Efforts to Get Bin Laden](#) -CNN, [Part 1-1/8/02](#) - [Part 2-1/9/02](#)

[U.S. OK'd Plan to Topple Taliban a Day Before 9/11](#) – MSNBC, March 25, 2004

YouTube video - Alan Keyes: Obamacare, Eugenics, Created Crises [Part 1](#) - [Part 2](#) - [Part 3](#) - [Part 4](#) - [Part 5](#)

Google video - [ENDGAME - HQ](#) Full Length Version (See eugenics section beginning at 1hour, 25 min.)

