

An American Primacy: The Project for the New American Century and its Doctrine for U.S. Global Leadership

The Architects of a New Century: Formation, Ideology, and Personnel

The Project for the New American Century (PNAC) emerged in the late 1990s not merely as another Washington think tank, but as a focused ideological movement with a clear and ambitious objective: to define and implement a grand strategy for the United States in the post-Cold War era. Its formation was a direct response to a perceived vacuum in American foreign policy, a sense among its neoconservative founders that the "unipolar moment" following the collapse of the Soviet Union was being squandered. The organization's core documents and the powerful network of individuals it assembled laid the intellectual and political groundwork for a radical reorientation of U.S. foreign policy, one that would find its ultimate expression in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001 attacks.

The Post-Cold War "Drift": Context for PNAC's Creation

In the spring of 1997, William Kristol and Robert Kagan, two leading figures of a new generation of neoconservative thinkers, established the Project for the New American Century as a non-profit educational organization operating under the umbrella of the New Citizenship Project. The stated mission was succinct and sweeping: "to promote American global leadership". This mission was born from a profound dissatisfaction with the prevailing direction of U.S. foreign policy. In their view, the victory in the Cold War had presented the United States with an unprecedented strategic opportunity, yet American foreign and defense policy was "adrift". The founders argued that the administration of President Bill Clinton was pursuing "incoherent policies" and that conservatives, for their part, lacked a "compelling vision for American foreign policy". This had allowed the strategic and military capital built up by past administrations, particularly that of Ronald Reagan, to erode through significant cuts in defense spending and what they termed "inconstant leadership". PNAC was therefore conceived as a corrective, an intellectual and political vehicle designed to fight a two-front ideological battle. On one front, it aimed to challenge the liberal internationalism of the Clinton administration. On the other, and perhaps more critically for the conservative movement, it sought to counter and defeat the "isolationist impulses from within their own ranks". The neoconservative founders recognized that to capitalize on the "unipolar moment," they first had to consolidate their own political flank, unifying conservatives around an assertive, interventionist agenda and marginalizing competing foreign policy visions such as paleoconservative isolationism or traditional realism.

The "Neo-Reaganite" Vision: The Statement of Principles

On June 3, 1997, PNAC released its foundational document, the "Statement of Principles." This

concise manifesto declared that the United States, as the "world's preeminent power," faced a historic opportunity and challenge: "Does the United States have the vision to build upon the achievements of past decades? Does the United States have the resolve to shape a new century favorable to American principles and interests?"

The statement articulated four core consequences of this vision, which would become the pillars of the neoconservative foreign policy agenda:

1. A significant increase in defense spending to carry out global responsibilities and modernize the armed forces for the future.
2. A policy to "strengthen our ties to democratic allies and to challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values."
3. The promotion of political and economic freedom abroad.
4. The need to "accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles".

This agenda was explicitly framed as a "Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity".

By invoking the legacy of Ronald Reagan, Kristol and Kagan sought to tap into a powerful current within the conservative movement, championing Reagan's refusal to accept perceived limits on American power and his morally unambiguous confrontation with the Soviet Union.

This "neo-Reaganite" posture was designed to resonate with a conservative base that responded to messaging about American exceptionalism and a clear-eyed distinction between good and evil in world affairs.

Intellectual Lineage: From the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) to PNAC

The ideological framework advanced by PNAC was not an invention of 1997. Its intellectual roots can be traced directly to a controversial Pentagon document drafted five years earlier. In the final months of the George H. W. Bush administration, then-Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Paul Wolfowitz, working under Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, authored a draft of the Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) for the 1994–99 fiscal years.

This 1992 DPG was, in essence, the original blueprint for the PNAC mission. It argued that America's primary objective must be to prevent the re-emergence of a new rival on the world stage. It called for the U.S. to "maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role". The document provided a "blueprint for maintaining U.S. preeminence, precluding the rise of a great power rival, and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests". The language and logic are nearly identical to those used in PNAC's founding documents.

When the DPG was leaked to the *New York Times* in March 1992, it created a political firestorm. Critics, including influential Democrats, denounced it as a call for a "Pax Americana" and American imperialism. The public backlash forced the Bush Sr. administration to distance itself from the document and issue a heavily revised version. However, the core vision of unchallenged American hegemony persisted among its authors. The formation of PNAC in 1997 represented the resurrection of this doctrine, transplanted from a classified government document into a public-facing think tank, where it could be refined and promoted until a more opportune political moment arrived.

The Signatories: A Government-in-Waiting

The power of PNAC lay not only in its ideas but in the formidable coalition of individuals it assembled. The original 25 signatories of the "Statement of Principles" constituted a veritable who's who of the conservative foreign policy establishment, a powerful network of politicians, academics, and policy experts who would soon occupy the highest echelons of the U.S. government. The list of signatories was more than a declaration of support; it functioned as a roster for a government-in-waiting, incubating a shared ideology and pre-positioning personnel who could execute that agenda upon gaining power. The subsequent transition of so many key members into the George W. Bush administration was not a series of coincidences but the culmination of a deliberate strategy. PNAC served as a shadow cabinet, developing the very policies its members would later be in a position to implement.

This direct personnel pipeline is illustrated by the subsequent careers of its most prominent members. The appointment of at least ten signatories to senior national security positions demonstrates the seamless transfer of personnel and policy from the think tank directly into the executive branch.

Name	PNAC Role	Key Position in George W. Bush Administration
Dick Cheney	Signatory	Vice President
Donald Rumsfeld	Signatory	Secretary of Defense
Paul Wolfowitz	Signatory	Deputy Secretary of Defense
Elliott Abrams	Signatory	Special Assistant to the President & Senior Director for Near East and North African Affairs, National Security Council
I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby	Signatory	Chief of Staff to the Vice President
John R. Bolton	Director	Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security
Paula Dobriansky	Signatory	Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs
Zalmay Khalilzad	Signatory	Special Presidential Envoy for Afghanistan; Ambassador to Afghanistan, Iraq, and the United Nations

Sources for table data:

Other notable signatories included Jeb Bush, then-candidate for Governor of Florida; William J. Bennett, former Secretary of Education; and influential academic Francis Fukuyama. This assembly of talent and influence ensured that when George W. Bush took office, he "opened the door to the Pentagon, vice president's office, State Department, and the National Security Council for PNAC associates". They did not arrive as individuals with disparate ideas; they arrived as a cohort, armed with a pre-formed, coherent, and radical vision for American power in the 21st century.

The Blueprint for Primacy: An In-Depth Analysis of

"Rebuilding America's Defenses"

In September 2000, one year before the event that would provide the catalyst for its implementation, the Project for the New American Century published its magnum opus: a 90-page report titled *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces, and Resources For a New Century*. Authored principally by Thomas Donnelly, the report was a detailed and uncompromising blueprint for achieving and maintaining American global military supremacy. It moved beyond the broad principles of the 1997 statement to articulate the specific military, strategic, and budgetary requirements of a "Pax Americana." The document represents a fundamental shift in strategic thinking, reframing the purpose of the U.S. military from a force for defending against existing threats to an instrument for proactively shaping the entire global environment to prevent any *potential* future challenge to U.S. preeminence.

The Premise: From "Peace Dividend" to "Primacy Mandate"

The central premise of *Rebuilding America's Defenses* (RAD) was that the post-Cold War "peace dividend"—the reduction in defense spending that followed the collapse of the Soviet Union—was a strategic blunder of historic proportions. The report argued that America's status as the "world's only superpower" afforded it a "remarkable strategic opportunity" that was being dangerously squandered by years of budget cuts under both the elder Bush and Clinton administrations.

According to the authors, this had created a perilous gap between America's strategic responsibilities and its military resources. The solution was not to curtail the strategy but to dramatically increase the resources. The report's grand strategic aim was unambiguous: "America's grand strategy should aim to preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible". This required, above all, "unquestioned U.S. military preeminence" as the essential foundation for a stable, U.S.-led global order—a "global Pax Americana". The goal was not simply to win a future war, but to create a military so dominant that it would deter any nation from even aspiring to become a peer competitor.

The Four Core Missions: A Doctrine for Perpetual Intervention

To achieve this preeminence, the report outlined four "essential missions" for the U.S. military. These missions, taken together, provided a doctrinal justification for a state of perpetual global intervention and military expansion.

1. **Defend the American Homeland:** This went beyond traditional defense, explicitly calling for the control of new strategic domains like space and cyberspace and, crucially, the deployment of a global missile defense system. This system was intended not only to protect the U.S. but also to "provide a secure basis for U.S. power projection around the world," effectively neutralizing the deterrent capabilities of other nations.
2. **Fight and Win Multiple, Simultaneous Major Theater Wars:** This doctrine was a direct rejection of the post-Cold War trend of downsizing the military. By demanding a force structure capable of fighting and winning large-scale wars in different regions of the world at the same time, PNAC was arguing for a military far larger than required by any single identifiable threat. The purpose was to demonstrate overwhelming capacity and thereby dissuade potential great-power rivals from challenging U.S. interests anywhere.
3. **Perform "Constabulary" Duties:** This was perhaps the most expansive and open-ended

of the missions. It tasked the U.S. military with "shaping the security environment in critical regions". This "constabulary" or policing function provided a broad and ill-defined mandate for military presence and intervention in conflicts that did not pose a direct or immediate threat to the United States, legitimizing a role as the world's policeman.

4. **Transform U.S. Forces for a New Century of Warfare:** The report called for aggressively exploiting the "revolution in military affairs" (RMA). This meant investing heavily in high-tech, information-centric warfare, unmanned weaponry, and advanced surveillance capabilities to ensure not just current but long-term technological dominance over any and all potential adversaries.

The report's call for a massive increase in defense spending—to a "minimum level of 3.5 to 3.8 percent of Gross Domestic Product"—was not merely a budgetary recommendation but a core component of the strategy itself. This level of expenditure was a forcing function, designed to make a "strategy of retreat" impossible. By committing such a vast portion of national wealth to the military, the U.S. would be institutionally locked into a permanently interventionist posture. The existence of such a massive and technologically advanced military would create its own powerful incentives for use, ensuring that the means to project power would drive the will to do so.

Expanding the "American Security Perimeter"

A key element of the RAD report was a radical reimagining of the U.S. military's global posture. The authors argued that the Cold War-era stationing of forces primarily in Western Europe and Northeast Asia was obsolete. To effectively perform its new constabulary and power-projection missions, the U.S. needed to expand its "security perimeter".

This required a strategic repositioning of American forces into new regions. The report explicitly called for establishing a "network of 'deployment bases' or 'forward operating bases'" to increase the global reach of U.S. forces. It recommended permanently redeploying U.S. Army units to Southeast Europe and establishing a permanent military base in the Persian Gulf region. This global dispersal of military power was aimed at several objectives: managing regional security environments, responding rapidly to crises, and, explicitly, to "cope with the rise of China to great-power status" by enhancing the U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia.

Dominating the New Domains of Warfare

The RAD report was remarkably prescient in its focus on future domains of conflict. It argued that U.S. preeminence could not be guaranteed by dominance on land, sea, and in the air alone. The doctrine of control had to be extended to the "new 'international commons' of space and 'cyberspace'".

The report was unequivocal in its call for "space control." It argued that the U.S. must have the ability to deny other nations access to space during wartime and protect U.S. space-based assets. To achieve this, it made a startlingly specific recommendation: the creation of a new, separate military service, which it termed "U.S. Space Forces". This proposal, made in 2000, prefigured the actual establishment of the U.S. Space Force by nearly two decades, demonstrating the long-term strategic vision of the PNAC project. By seeking to control the ultimate strategic high ground of space, the report aimed to secure a permanent and unassailable military advantage for the United States.

The following table distills the core tenets of this ambitious blueprint, linking the strategic goals of the RAD report to its specific recommendations and their profound implications for U.S.

policy.

Strategic Goal	Key Recommendations/Quotes from RAD	Strategic Implication
Maintain U.S. Preeminence	"preserve and extend this advantageous position as far into the future as possible"	Shift from a Cold War strategy of containment to a proactive grand strategy of preventing the rise of any near-peer competitor.
Increase Military Capacity	Fight and win "multiple, simultaneous major theatre wars"	Justify massive increases in defense spending and create a force structure far beyond any single identifiable threat, designed for global power projection.
Expand Global Footprint	Perform "'constabular' duties"; establish a "network of 'forward operating bases'" in new regions	Legitimizes a permanent, global military presence and a posture of continuous intervention to "shape" regional events according to U.S. interests.
Control Future Domains	Create "U.S. Space Forces"; control "cyberspace"	Extend the doctrine of military dominance to new technological frontiers to secure the ultimate strategic high ground and ensure long-term superiority.

Sources for table data:

"A New Pearl Harbor": Context, Controversy, and Consequence

Buried deep within the dense, 90-page text of *Rebuilding America's Defenses* is a single, 29-word sentence that would become the most notorious and controversial passage ever produced by the Project for the New American Century. This phrase, "like a new Pearl Harbor," would be lifted from its original context and transformed into a central pillar of conspiracy theories surrounding the 9/11 attacks. An objective analysis requires a careful examination of the phrase in its original setting, an understanding of how the events of September 11, 2001, retroactively imbued it with a sinister meaning, and an appreciation for its role in subsequent counter-narratives about the origins of the War on Terror.

The Original Context: A Statement of Political Realism

The phrase appears on page 51 of the report (page 63 of the widely circulated PDF version) within a chapter titled "Creating Tomorrow's Dominant Force". This section of the report deals with the immense challenge of implementing the "revolution in military affairs" that PNAC advocated. The authors acknowledge that the kind of radical, technologically driven transformation they envision—requiring vast financial investment and a complete overhaul of

military structures—would be difficult to achieve in peacetime.

The full sentence reads: "Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor".

In its original context, the statement functions not as a call to action or a desire for a crisis, but as a sober, if cynical, observation about the nature of American political life. It is an acknowledgment of political inertia: that mobilizing the immense resources and sustained political will required for such a radical and expensive military overhaul would be a slow, incremental, and politically fraught process. The reference to Pearl Harbor is used as a historical analogy for a sudden, shocking attack that galvanizes a previously hesitant nation, shatters old paradigms, and creates a political consensus for massive, rapid change. It was, in essence, a statement of political realism about the difficulty of achieving revolutionary change in a democracy without the impetus of a major crisis.

September 11th as the "Catalyzing Event"

Exactly one year after the publication of RAD, on September 11, 2001, the United States suffered the most devastating terrorist attack in its history. For many observers and critics of PNAC, the 9/11 attacks were the shocking and horrifying realization of the report's abstract prediction. The attacks served as the precise "catastrophic and catalyzing event" that the document had described.

In the aftermath of 9/11, the political inertia that PNAC had lamented was shattered. The attacks created an overwhelming public and political mandate for a dramatically more aggressive and interventionist foreign policy. The defense budget, which PNAC had argued was dangerously low, surged to the levels the report had called for. The abstract goals of the PNAC agenda—preemption, unilateral action, and regime change—suddenly became politically viable. The agenda of PNAC was a constant; the justification for it became the variable. The 9/11 attacks did not create the neoconservative desire for military buildup or regime change in Iraq; rather, they provided a powerful, emotionally resonant justification that could be fused onto that pre-existing agenda. The speed with which PNAC and its members in the Bush administration pivoted from the attacks to their long-held goal of overthrowing Saddam Hussein is revealing. Just nine days after 9/11, PNAC sent a public letter to President Bush. While supporting military action against Osama bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network in Afghanistan, the letter insisted that any comprehensive strategy must also include "a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq." Crucially, it made this demand "even if evidence does not link Iraq to the September 11 attacks". This demonstrates that the target—Iraq—was pre-selected. The attacks were the opportunity, the key that unlocked the political will to implement a blueprint that had been prepared years in advance.

The Birth of a Conspiracy: Interpretations and Counter-Narratives

The shocking prescience of the "new Pearl Harbor" phrase, written by men like Paul Wolfowitz and I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby who were now at the center of power, inevitably became a cornerstone for 9/11 conspiracy theories. The phrase was detached from its original context and reinterpreted not as a prediction, but as a statement of intent—a Freudian slip revealing a desire for a pretext to launch their planned wars.

This interpretation was most famously articulated by author David Ray Griffin in his 2004 book, *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11*. The

book, which took its title directly from the PNAC report, argued that the Bush administration was complicit in the attacks, allowing them to happen to provide the necessary pretext for its foreign policy ambitions. In this view, the phrase was evidence of a pre-meditated plot to use a manufactured crisis to justify the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq.

The power of the phrase in these counter-narratives lies in its inherent ambiguity as a historical analogy. For supporters of the administration, "a new Pearl Harbor" was a metaphor for a nation caught tragically unprepared, a wake-up call to the dangers of a new era. For critics and conspiracists, it was a metaphor for a government that knew an attack was coming and allowed it to happen to achieve its political goals, echoing long-standing debates about foreknowledge surrounding the original Pearl Harbor attack. This semantic ambiguity allowed the phrase to take on a life of its own, becoming far more influential in its reinterpretation than it ever was in its original, mundane context as a single sentence in a lengthy policy report.

From Think Tank to White House: PNAC's Influence on the Bush Administration

The ascendancy of George W. Bush to the presidency in 2001 marked the transition of the Project for the New American Century from an external advocacy group to a quasi-internal policy driver. The installation of numerous PNAC signatories and associates into the highest levels of the national security apparatus created a direct conduit for its ideas to become official U.S. policy. This influence was most profoundly demonstrated in the administration's march to war with Iraq, a long-standing neoconservative objective that was realized through the political opportunity created by the 9/11 attacks. The administration's landmark strategic document, the 2002 National Security Strategy, effectively codified the core tenets of the PNAC worldview, transforming the think tank's blueprint for primacy into the grand strategy of the world's sole superpower.

The Personnel is Policy: PNAC in Power

The adage "personnel is policy" was never more true than in the early years of the Bush administration. The election of George W. Bush brought a cohort of PNAC's most influential figures into the core of the government's foreign policy and defense establishment. Vice President Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz formed a powerful triumvirate at the heart of national security decision-making. They were joined by other key associates, including I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby as Cheney's chief of staff, John Bolton at the State Department, and Elliott Abrams on the National Security Council.

This created an unprecedented situation where the intellectual authors of a radical foreign policy agenda were now in the positions of power necessary to implement it. As journalist William Rivers Pitt observed, "When Bush assumed the Presidency, the men who created and nurtured the imperial dreams of PNAC became the men who run the Pentagon, the Defense Department and the White House". Their shared ideological background, forged through their association with PNAC and its foundational documents, ensured a remarkable unity of purpose in advancing the cause of American preeminence.

The Road to Iraq: Executing a Pre-Existing Goal

From its very inception, PNAC identified the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq as a paramount strategic objective. This was not a reaction to the events of 9/11 but a long-standing preoccupation. As early as January 1998, PNAC sent a public letter to President Clinton arguing that the policy of containing Iraq was "steadily eroding" and that the only way to prevent Saddam from acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction was to "remove Saddam and his regime from power" through decisive military action.

PNAC was a primary driving force behind the passage of the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, which was spearheaded by Donald Rumsfeld and signed into law by President Clinton. This act formally made regime change in Iraq the official policy of the United States, providing a legal and political foundation for future action. Iraq was consistently framed as the crucial "first test" for the doctrine of American primacy. The thinking was clear: if the United States could not impose its will on a state as weakened by war and sanctions as Iraq, its grander ambitions for enforcing a "Pax Americana" would be unattainable.

The 9/11 attacks provided the opportunity to activate this long-dormant policy. Within the administration, Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz reportedly began pushing for military action against Iraq on September 12, 2001. This internal advocacy was mirrored by PNAC's public letter a week later, which explicitly decoupled the case for war with Iraq from any direct involvement in the 9/11 attacks. The "War on Terror" became the vehicle through which a broader, pre-planned geopolitical agenda could be pursued. The administration masterfully fused the legitimate public fear of terrorism with its pre-existing strategic goal of removing Saddam Hussein, using the former to justify the latter.

This effort was bolstered by the creation of an intelligence and media echo chamber. Key PNAC figures, particularly Richard Perle, then-chairman of the Defense Policy Board, used their official positions and extensive media connections to build a "formidable echo chamber" that amplified claims of a link between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda and the existence of a robust Iraqi WMD program. This network utilized favored journalists and conservative media outlets like *The Weekly Standard* and the *Wall Street Journal* editorial page to disseminate disinformation and create a self-validating information loop that marginalized dissenting views from within the CIA and the State Department. This was not merely policy advocacy; it was a sophisticated information operation designed to manufacture the public justification for a pre-determined war.

The Bush Doctrine: PNAC Ideology as National Strategy

In September 2002, the Bush administration released its National Security Strategy (NSS), a document that would come to be known as the Bush Doctrine. The NSS was the formal codification of PNAC's core principles into the official grand strategy of the United States. The most revolutionary element of the doctrine was its embrace of preemptive and preventive war. Drawing on the intellectual legacy of the 1992 "Wolfowitz Doctrine," the NSS declared that the United States could no longer wait for threats to fully materialize. It asserted, "we will not hesitate to act alone, if necessary, to exercise our right of self-defense by acting pre-emptively against such terrorists, to prevent them from doing harm against our people and our country". The document deliberately conflated the threat posed by non-state terrorist groups like al-Qaeda with that of "rogue states" like Iraq, thereby extending the logic of preemption against an imminent terrorist plot to a justification for a preventive war against a sovereign state. Furthermore, the Bush Doctrine institutionalized PNAC's deep skepticism of international institutions and its preference for unilateral action. It championed the use of "coalitions of the willing" and made clear that the U.S. would not allow its security decisions to be vetoed by bodies like the United Nations Security Council. This directly reflected PNAC's long-held

resentment that U.S. policy could be "crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the UN Security Council". With the publication of the 2002 NSS, the ideas developed in the offices of a small neoconservative think tank had become the official foreign policy of the most powerful nation on Earth.

Critical Perspectives and Enduring Legacy

The Project for the New American Century was formally dissolved in 2006, its mission seemingly accomplished with the U.S. military occupying Baghdad, but its reputation irrevocably tarnished by the brutal reality of the war it had championed. The legacy of PNAC is a complex tapestry of profound influence, catastrophic failure, and unintended consequences. While its signature policy, the invasion and occupation of Iraq, is widely regarded as a strategic disaster, the ideological framework it advanced became deeply embedded within the American foreign policy establishment, normalizing concepts that continue to shape U.S. actions on the world stage.

The Unraveling: Iraq and the Discrediting of the PNAC Vision

The neoconservative vision for Iraq—a swift, decisive military victory followed by the blossoming of a pro-American democracy that would inspire a wave of liberalization across the Middle East—crumbled in the face of reality. The failure to discover weapons of mass destruction, the primary public justification for the war, severely damaged the administration's credibility. The "cakewalk" invasion quickly devolved into a bloody, protracted insurgency that cost thousands of American lives, hundreds of thousands of Iraqi lives, and trillions of dollars.

The war in Iraq, far from establishing a stable "Pax Americana," destabilized the entire region, strengthened Iran's geopolitical position, and created the conditions for the rise of new and more virulent terrorist groups like ISIS. The conflict starkly revealed the "limits of U.S. power," demonstrating that overwhelming military preeminence does not automatically translate into the ability to achieve desired political outcomes. The PNAC project, which had been hailed by its proponents as a bold assertion of American strength and moral clarity, was condemned by critics like the late Senator Edward Kennedy as "a call for 21st century American imperialism that no other country can or should accept". As the quagmire in Iraq deepened and the war became deeply unpopular at home and abroad, the PNAC brand became politically toxic, leading the organization to quietly cease operations.

The Ghost in the Machine: The Normalization of Neoconservative Ideas

The most striking legacy of PNAC is the paradox that while its signature policy was a catastrophic failure and the organization itself was disbanded in disgrace, its underlying ideological framework became more entrenched in the Washington establishment. The individuals involved were discredited in the eyes of many, but the ideas they championed were mainstreamed.

Although PNAC was gone, its intellectual DNA persisted. Successor organizations, most notably the Foreign Policy Initiative (2009–2017), were founded by the same key figures—William Kristol and Robert Kagan—and continued to advocate for a hawkish, interventionist U.S. foreign policy. More broadly, critics argue that the neoconservative project succeeded in permanently

shifting the "Overton window" of acceptable foreign policy discourse. Ideas that were once considered radical—such as preventive war, overt disregard for international institutions, and a default preference for military solutions over diplomacy—became normalized components of the bipartisan foreign policy consensus in Washington. This has resulted in a more militarized and interventionist foreign policy establishment across both Republican and Democratic administrations than existed prior to 9/11.

The Enduring Legacy and Unintended Consequences

Today, the legacy of PNAC is widely viewed by its critics as one of "miserable failure". It is seen as the intellectual engine that drove the United States into disastrous and unnecessary wars, damaging the nation's economy, its international standing, and its moral authority. A significant aspect of this legacy is the profound lack of accountability. Many of the key architects of the Iraq War have faced few, if any, professional consequences for their role in the debacle and remain influential voices in foreign policy debates.

Perhaps the most profound and ironic legacy of the Project for the New American Century is its role in creating the ideological preconditions for the rise of Donald Trump's "America First" nationalism. While PNAC's leading figures were among the most prominent "Never Trump" Republicans, their own doctrine inadvertently paved the way for a figure like Trump. By championing aggressive unilateralism, expressing deep skepticism of international law and institutions like the UN, and treating allies as instruments rather than partners, the neoconservatives systematically eroded the very foundations of the post-World War II "liberal international order" they claimed to be leading. They taught a generation of conservatives that alliances were constraints and international norms were for weaker nations.

An academic analysis of PNAC's history concludes that some of its positions "laid the ground for Donald Trump's brand of conservatism to take over the Republican Party". PNAC's vision of "benevolent global hegemony" and Trump's "America First" nationalism appear to be opposites, but they can be seen as two sides of the same coin of American exceptionalism. Both share a core disdain for external constraints on American power. By seeking to establish an unchallengeable American primacy through force, PNAC helped to destroy the bipartisan consensus for the alliance-based international system that preceded it. In doing so, they created an ideological vacuum that the cruder, more transactional, and ultimately more isolationist nationalism of Donald Trump would later fill.

Works cited

1. Project for the New American Century - Powerbase, https://powerbase.info/index.php/Project_for_the_New_American_Century
2. The PNAC (1997–2006) and the Post-Cold War 'Neoconservative Moment', <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/02/01/new-american-century-1997-2006-and-the-post-cold-war-neoconservative-moment/>
3. Project for the New American Century - SourceWatch, https://www.sourcewatch.org/index.php/Project_for_the_New_American_Century
4. Project for the New American Century - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_for_the_New_American_Century
5. PNAC-----Statement of Principles, <https://www.rrojasdatabank.info/pfpc/PNAC---statement%20of%20principles.pdf>
6. Rise and Demise of the New American Century - University of Alberta, <https://sites.ualberta.ca/~raitken/documents/0606riseanddemise.pdf>
7. Project for a New American Century - Gwern, <https://gwern.net/doc/rotten.com/library/conspiracy/pnac/index.html>

8. The Project for the New American Century - David Morrison, <http://www.david-morrison.org.uk/us/pnac.htm> 9. Rebuilding America's Defenses - Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century - Tamilnation.org, <https://tamilnation.org/intframe/000901pnac> 10. How 9/11 enabled a preconceived vision of an imperial US foreign policy, <https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2021/09/11/how-9-11-enabled-a-preconceived-vision-of-an-imperial-us-foreign-policy/> 11. Rebuilding America's Defenses - Resistir.info, https://resistir.info/livros/rebuilding_americas_defenses.pdf 12. 'Our Responsibility and Privilege to Fight Freedom's Fight': Neoconservatism, the Project for the New America - ScholarWorks@UNO, <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3254&context=td> 13. Rebuilding Americas Defenses - PNAC | PDF | National Security | Military Strategy - Scribd, <https://www.scribd.com/doc/9651/Rebuilding-Americas-Defenses-PNAC> 14. Beware the Iran 'Pearl Harbor' Moment - Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft, <https://quincyinst.org/2024/02/03/beware-the-iran-pearl-harbor-moment-2/> 15. Does the publication "Rebuilding America's Defenses" still influence decisions in the halls of power? : r/PoliticalDiscussion - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/PoliticalDiscussion/comments/ars0ir/does_the_publication_rebuilding_americas_defenses/ 16. The Road to 9/11: Wealth, Empire, and the Future of America, <https://content.ucpress.edu/chapters/9959.ch01.pdf> 17. The New Pearl Harbor - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_New_Pearl_Harbor 18. (PDF) 9/11 – A New Pearl Harbor? Analogies, Narratives, and Meanings of 9/11 in Civil Society - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254085828_911_-_A_New_Pearl_Harbor_Analogies_Narratives_and_Meanings_of_911_in_Civil_Society 19. The Neoconservative Influence on US Foreign Policy and the 2003 Iraq War, <https://www.e-ir.info/2014/06/14/the-neoconservative-influence-on-us-foreign-policy-and-the-2003-iraq-war/> 20. Symposium: Aside from Bush & Cheney who is at fault for the Iraq ..., <https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2023/03/20/iraq-symposium/> 21. Review of Stefan Halper's and Jonathan Clarke's <i>America Alone: The Neo-Conservatives and the Global Order</i> - History News Network, <https://www.hnn.us/article/review-of-stefan-halpers-and-jonathan-clarke-s-ame> 22. (PDF) War Programming: The Propaganda Project and the Iraq War, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227687399_War_Programming_The_Propaganda_Project_and_the_Iraq_War 23. The Impact of Neoconservative Think Tanks on American Foreign Policy, <https://www.e-ir.info/2014/05/26/the-impact-of-neoconservative-think-tanks-on-american-foreign-policy/> 24. The Project for the New American Century (1997–2006) and the post-Cold War “neoconservative moment” | Cairn.info, <https://shs.cairn.info/journal-politique-americaine-2018-2-page-173?lang=en> 25. 'Our Responsibility and Privilege to Fight Freedom's Fight': Neoconservatism, the Project for the New American Century, and the Making of the Invasion of Iraq in 2003 - ScholarWorks@UNO, <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/2177/> 26. Cameron and the crisis of the Project for the New American Century | Stop the War, <https://www.stopwar.org.uk/article/cameron-and-the-crisis-of-the-project-for-the-new-american-century/> 27. The Scary Not-So-Winding Road from Iraq to Ukraine - Fair Observer, <https://www.fairobserver.com/world-news/the-scary-not-so-winding-road-from-iraq-to-ukraine/> 28. Foreign Policy Initiative - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Foreign_Policy_Initiative 29. How much did "The Project for The New American Century" influence United States foreign policy? : r/PoliticalDiscussion - Reddit,

https://www.reddit.com/r/PoliticalDiscussion/comments/iu4n3v/how_much_did_the_project_for_the_new_american/ 30. Neo-conservatism and foreign policy - UNH Scholars Repository, <https://scholars.unh.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1115&context=thesis> 31. Decades after 9/11, what became of the US's neoconservatives ..., <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2021/9/10/decades-after-9-11-what-became-of-the-uss> 32. Rise of the Neo-Reaganites: A History of the Project for the New American Century - ProQuest, <https://search.proquest.com/openview/0dd1f975ce63ada903a31cb95bc51f8f/1.pdf?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y> 33. Rise of the Neo-Reaganites: a History of the Project for the New ..., <https://search.proquest.com/openview/0dd1f975ce63ada903a31cb95bc51f8f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>