

OSINT Report: Project for the New American Century (PNAC)

Author: Manus AI

Date: June 1, 2026

Executive Summary

This report details an Open Source Intelligence (OSINT) investigation into the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), a neoconservative think tank active from 1997 to 2006. The investigation focused on identifying suspicious activities, key documents, influential members, funding sources, and geopolitical implications. Key findings reveal a significant overlap between PNAC's stated objectives and the foreign policy decisions of the George W. Bush administration, particularly concerning the Iraq War. Controversial statements within PNAC documents, such as the concept of a "new Pearl Harbor" and the discussion of "genotype-specific" biological warfare, raise significant questions regarding the organization's influence and foresight.

1. Introduction to the Project for the New American Century (PNAC)

The Project for the New American Century (PNAC) was a Washington, D.C.-based neoconservative think tank established in 1997 by William Kristol and Robert Kagan. Its stated mission was to "promote American global leadership" by advocating for a "Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity" [1]. The organization ceased operations in 2006 and was succeeded by the Foreign Policy Initiative in 2009.

2. Key Personnel and Influence within the Bush Administration

A notable aspect of PNAC's influence was the significant number of its signatories and associates who later held prominent positions in the George W. Bush administration. This overlap has led many observers to suggest that PNAC functioned as a "government in waiting," effectively shaping U.S. foreign policy from within [2].

Individual	PNAC Affiliation	Bush Administration Role
Dick Cheney	Signatory, Statement of Principles	Vice President

Donald Rumsfeld	Signatory, Statement of Principles	Secretary of Defense
Paul Wolfowitz	Signatory, Statement of Principles	Deputy Secretary of Defense
John Bolton	Director	Under Secretary of State, later UN Ambassador
Eliot Abrams	Signatory, Statement of Principles	National Security Council
I. Lewis Libby	Signatory, Statement of Principles	Chief of Staff to the Vice President
Richard Perle	Signatory, Statement of Principles	Chairman, Defense Policy Board
Jeb Bush	Signatory, Statement of Principles	Governor of Florida
Abram Shulsky	Associate	Director, Office of Special Plans (OSP)

3. Controversial Documents and Statements

PNAC produced several influential documents, two of which contain particularly controversial statements that have drawn significant scrutiny in OSINT circles.

3.1. "Rebuilding America's Defenses" (RAD) - September 2000

This 90-page report, primarily authored by Thomas Donnelly, with Donald Kagan and Gary Schmitt as project chairmen, outlined a strategy for maintaining U.S. military preeminence in the 21st century [3].

"New Pearl Harbor" Quote

On page 51 of the RAD report, the following statement appears:

"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."
[3]

This quote, published just one year before the September 11, 2001, attacks, has been widely cited as a suspicious element. Critics argue that it suggests a pre-existing desire or

expectation for a major catalyzing event to accelerate military transformation and public support for interventionist foreign policies [4].

"Genotype-Specific Biological Warfare" Quote

On page 60, the report discusses future warfare scenarios:

"And advanced forms of biological warfare that can 'target' specific genotypes may transform biological warfare from the realm of terror to a politically useful tool." [3]

This statement has raised concerns among researchers, who interpret it as an early contemplation of ethnic bioweapons or biological agents designed to target specific populations based on genetic characteristics. The phrasing "politically useful tool" has been particularly alarming to those investigating the ethical implications of such technologies [5].

3.2. 1998 Letter to President Clinton

In 1998, several PNAC members, including Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and Richard Perle, sent an open letter to President Bill Clinton advocating for the removal of Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. The letter asserted that the U.S. had the authority to take military steps independently, without relying on UN Security Council unanimity [6]. This demonstrated a clear pre-9/11 commitment to regime change in Iraq among PNAC's leadership.

3.3. September 20, 2001 Letter to President George W. Bush

Just nine days after the 9/11 attacks, PNAC sent a letter to President George W. Bush. This letter explicitly argued that even if Iraq had no direct link to the attacks, the removal of Saddam Hussein was a necessary component of the broader "War on Terror." This document is seen as a critical juncture where PNAC successfully advocated for a strategic pivot from a focused response against Al-Qaeda to a wider regional regime-change agenda [7].

4. Funding and Organizational Links

PNAC was funded primarily by conservative foundations and maintained close ties with other neoconservative think tanks, fostering a network of influence.

4.1. Funding Sources

PNAC received substantial funding from several prominent conservative foundations:

- **The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation:** The largest source of foundation support,

providing approximately \$700,000 to \$1.8 million between 1997 and 2004 [8].

- **Sarah Scaife Foundation:** Contributed to PNAC's funding [8].
- **John M. Olin Foundation:** Also a significant funder [8].

PNAC operated as an initiative of the New Citizenship Project, a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization, which received over \$2.7 million in grants between 1994 and 2004 [9].

4.2. Interlocking Directorates and Shared Infrastructure

PNAC shared physical space with the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and had numerous members who also served on the boards or held positions in other influential neoconservative organizations, such as the Center for Security Policy (CSP) and the Hudson Institute. This interconnectedness facilitated a unified approach to promoting neoconservative foreign policy objectives [10].

5. OSINT Red Flags and Suspicious Activities

Several elements within PNAC's history and publications raise OSINT red flags, suggesting a coordinated effort to shape U.S. foreign policy towards pre-emptive military intervention.

1. **The "New Pearl Harbor" Timeline:** The uncanny timing of the RAD report's publication (September 2000) and the 9/11 attacks (September 2001) has led to speculation that the attacks provided the "catalyzing event" PNAC had anticipated to justify its agenda [4].
2. **Pre-emptive Regime Change Advocacy:** PNAC consistently advocated for the invasion of Iraq and the removal of Saddam Hussein years before 9/11, using arguments about WMDs and regional stability. This suggests a pre-determined policy goal rather than a reactive response to emerging threats [6].
3. **Biological Warfare Speculation:** The discussion of "genotype-specific" biological weapons as a "politically useful tool" is highly controversial and has been interpreted by some as an indication of interest in ethically dubious forms of warfare [5].
4. **Personnel Overlap and "Government in Waiting":** The direct transition of numerous PNAC members into key defense and foreign policy roles within the Bush administration allowed for the direct implementation of PNAC's principles and recommendations [2].
5. **Office of Special Plans (OSP) Connection:** The creation of the OSP within the Pentagon by PNAC-linked individuals (Paul Wolfowitz and Douglas Feith), and its directorship by PNAC associate Abram Shulsky, is particularly suspicious. The OSP was criticized for bypassing established intelligence agencies to produce intelligence that supported the administration's rationale for invading Iraq [11].

6. **"A Clean Break" Report (1996):** While not a PNAC document, the involvement of key PNAC figures in this earlier report, which advocated for regime change in Iraq, Syria, and Iran, demonstrates a long-standing strategic vision for the Middle East that predates PNAC's formal establishment [12].

6. Conclusion

The OSINT investigation into the Project for the New American Century reveals a highly influential organization that played a significant role in shaping the neoconservative foreign policy agenda of the early 21st century. The consistent advocacy for military preeminence, pre-emptive intervention, and regime change, coupled with the direct placement of its members into high-level government positions, indicates a concerted effort to implement its vision. The controversial statements within its key documents, particularly regarding a "new Pearl Harbor" and "genotype-specific biological warfare," continue to be subjects of intense debate and scrutiny, highlighting the perceived suspicious nature of the organization's foresight and objectives.

References

1. [Project for the New American Century - Wikipedia](#)
2. [A PNAC Primer - CounterPunch.org](#)
3. [Rebuilding America's Defenses - Resistir.info](#)
4. [Were 1998 Memos a Blueprint for War? - ABC News](#)
5. [Ethnic bioweapon - Wikipedia](#)
6. [PNAC and Iraq | The New Yorker](#)
7. [The PNAC Letter to Bush, Sept. 20, 2001](#)
8. [Rise and Demise of the New American Century - University of Alberta](#)
9. [New Citizenship Project - SourceWatch](#)
10. [Project for the New American Century - SourceWatch](#)
11. [Office of Special Plans - Wikipedia](#)
12. [A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm - Wikipedia](#)