The Architecture of Pre-Planned Hegemony: Institutional Capture, Intelligence Manipulation, and the Legality of the Post-9/11 Geopolitical Rupture

The Intellectual Genealogy of American Unipolar Primacy

The geopolitical trajectory of the United States in the early 21st century—marked by unilateral preemptive warfare, persistent military intervention, and regional regime change—was not an impromptu reaction to the catastrophic events of September 11, 2001. Historical records, declassified policy memoranda, and institutional archives confirm that the post-9/11 national security architecture was conceptualized and drafted during the post-Cold War transition of the early 1990s. Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, American foreign policy strategists confronted a structural shift in international relations: the transition from a bipolar balance of power to an unprecedented unipolar order dominated by U.S. military capabilities. The original ideological blueprint for exploiting this unipolarity was articulated in the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance (DPG), an internal Department of Defense document drafted under the direction of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Paul Wolfowitz and his principal deputy I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby, operating under the executive authority of Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney. Colloquially termed the "Wolfowitz Doctrine," the draft DPG asserted three core tenets that redefined post-Cold War strategy:

- The absolute imperative to prevent the re-emergence of any regional or global peer competitor capable of challenging American military preeminence on the territory of the former Soviet Union or elsewhere.
- The explicit rejection of reliance on collective international security frameworks, such as the United Nations Security Council, whenever foreign policy objectives diverged from international legal consensus.
- The operational right to execute unilateral preemptive military strikes against hostile states seeking or possessing weapons of mass destruction.

When the draft DPG was leaked to *The New York Times* in March 1992, the resulting domestic and international backlash forced the George H.W. Bush administration to publicly soften the document's explicit language. However, the core intellectual network responsible for the thesis did not abandon its goals. Instead, key personnel retreated to private policy foundations, corporate boards, and conservative think tanks to construct an organized advocacy pipeline aimed at waiting for the next political opportunity to institutionalize their strategy.

In the spring of 1997, William Kristol, editor of *The Weekly Standard*, and foreign policy analyst Robert Kagan formally launched the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) at 1150 17th Street NW in Washington, D.C., co-located within the physical infrastructure of the American

Enterprise Institute (AEI). PNAC's founding charter, the June 3, 1997 *Statement of Principles*, advocated for a "Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity," demanding substantial increases in defense spending, assertive global power projection, and a determined effort to reshape the international environment to preserve American unipolar hegemony.

Historical Marker / Policy Document	Core Authors & Key Figures	Central Strategic Principle	Policy Outcome / Operational Legacy
1992 Defense Planning Guidance (Draft)	Paul Wolfowitz, I. Lewis Libby, Dick Cheney	Preclusion of peer rivals; unilateral preemption; rejection of UN constraints.	Leaked publicly; sanitized officially but preserved by neoconservative networks.
1997 PNAC Statement of Principles	William Kristol, Robert Kagan, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld	"Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity"; benevolent global hegemony.	Established an ideologically unified advocacy network and shadow foreign policy apparatus.
1998 PNAC Open Letters to Clinton & Congress	Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, John Bolton, Richard Armitage	Abandonment of containment; unilateral military overthrow of Saddam Hussein.	Codified in federal law via the *Iraq Liberation Act of 1998* (P.L. 105-338).
2000 Rebuilding America's Defenses (RAD)	Thomas Donnelly, Donald Kagan, Gary Schmitt, Paul Wolfowitz	Full-spectrum dominance; force transformation requiring a "catalyzing event".	Served as the primary blueprint for post-9/11 defense expansion and military strategy.
2002 National Security Strategy (NSS)	Executive Office of the President, Condoleezza Rice, PNAC Core	Formal codification of the "Bush Doctrine": anticipatory preemptive war.	Provided the official executive rationale for the unilateral 2003 invasion of Iraq.

The Transformation Blueprint: *Rebuilding America's Defenses* and the "New Pearl Harbor" Thesis

In September 2000, during the final stretch of the U.S. presidential campaign, PNAC published its master architectural study: *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century* (RAD). Authored primarily by Thomas Donnelly, with Donald Kagan and Gary Schmitt serving as project chairmen, the 90-page report sought to operationalize the 1992 DPG into specific force-structure, budgetary, and operational requirements.

The RAD report established four core operational missions required to maintain global Pax Americana: defending the American homeland through national missile defense, fighting and winning multiple, simultaneous major theater wars, performing global constabulary duties to shape regional security environments, and transforming U.S. armed forces to exploit the "Revolution in Military Affairs".

Crucially, the document underscored that the geopolitical rationale for projecting military power into strategic regions was permanent and independent of specific regional autocrats. On page 14 of the RAD report, the authors explicitly noted that the requirement for a long-term U.S. military garrison in the Persian Gulf extended far beyond the immediate threat posed by the Ba'athist regime: "While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification,

the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein".
The political obstacle facing this grand strategy was a profound lack of domestic urgency. During the economic prosperity and relative peace of the late 1990s, neither the American public nor Congress supported military budget surcharges, global imperial garrisoning, or preemptive foreign wars. The authors explicitly acknowledged this systemic bottleneck on page 51 of the report, within an analytical assessment of military force transformation:
"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 forensic political risk analysis, this statement represents a sober calculation of domestic democratic inertia. The authors recognized that peacetime democratic societies do not undergo radical militarization or abandon traditional constitutional constraints without a severe national shock. A "catastrophic and catalyzing event" was identified not as an unanticipated crisis to be prevented, but as an indispensable political prerequisite to overcome legislative resistance and reset the national consciousness.
The report also addressed technological transformation, including a controversial discussion on page 60 regarding advanced biological warfare:
"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."
This contemplation of genotype-specific biological weaponry as a "politically useful tool" illustrated the scope of full-spectrum dominance contemplated by PNAC strategists. Critics and legal scholars highlight that evaluating bio-agents tailored to target specific ethnic or genetic populations demonstrates how the pursuit of absolute technological preeminence routinely crossed conventional ethical and legal boundaries.

Executive Infiltration: The Revolving Door and Administrative Capture

The structural transition of PNAC's vision from think-tank policy paper to state action occurred following the contested 2000 U.S. presidential election. Rather than recruiting foreign policy leadership from traditional diplomatic or moderate academic pools, incoming President George W. Bush appointed core signatories of PNAC's 1997 *Statement of Principles* and its strategic mementoes to the apex decision-making posts of the national security apparatus.
This systematic appointment pipeline transformed PNAC into an administrative government-in-waiting, placing its core personnel inside the Office of the Vice President, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the National Security Council.

Personnel	Core PNAC Role / Affiliation	Bush Administration Position (2001–2005)	Key Policy / Operational Role in the Path to War
Dick Cheney	Signatory, 1997 Statement of Principles	Vice President of the United States	Executive manager of national security policy; overseer of intelligence stovepiping.
Donald Rumsfeld	Signatory, 1997 Statement & 1998 Iraq Letters	Secretary of Defense	Directed immediate post-9/11 targeting of Iraq; authorized

Personnel	Core PNAC Role / Affiliation	Bush Administration Position (2001–2005)	Key Policy / Operational Role in the Path to War
			creation of the Office of Special Plans.
Paul Wolfowitz	Signatory, 1997 Statement & Author of 1992 DPG	Deputy Secretary of Defense	Primary intellectual driver of Middle East regime change; supervised parallel intelligence cells.
I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby	Signatory, 1997 Statement & DPG Co-Author	Chief of Staff to the Vice President	Key conduit for unvetted exile intelligence; managed strategic leaks to national media outlets.
John R. Bolton	Director, PNAC	Under Secretary of State for Arms Control	Neutralized internal State Department intelligence dissent; pressured international biological/chemical inspectors.
Elliott Abrams	Signatory, 1997 Statement & 1998 Iraq Letter	Senior Director, National Security Council	Directed Middle East policy within the White House NSC structure.
Richard Perle	Signatory, 1997 Statement & 1998 Iraq Letter	Chairman of the Defense Policy Board	Promoted exile intelligence (INC); convened post-9/11 board meetings resolving on regime change.
Douglas Feith	Associate, PNAC; Co-author of *A Clean Break* (1996)	Under Secretary of Defense for Policy	Operational founder of the Policy Counterterrorism Evaluation Group and the Office of Special Plans.
Zalmay Khalilzad	Signatory, 1997 Statement & 1998 Iraq Letter	NSC Senior Director; U.S. Ambassador	Coordinated Iraqi exile opposition networks and post-invasion governance transitions.
Abram Shulsky	Associate / Contributor, PNAC & Straussian Scholar	Director, Office of Special Plans (DoD)	Executed the "raw stovepiping" of unvetted intelligence directly to executive decision-makers.

The pre-existing intent of this network to overthrow the Ba'athist government in Baghdad had been established years prior to taking office. On January 26, 1998, PNAC sent an open letter to

President Bill Clinton demanding a radical shift in Middle Eastern foreign policy. Signed by Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Perle, Bolton, Armitage, and Khalilzad, the letter urged the administration to abandon containment and explicitly rejected United Nations Security Council authority:
"We believe the U.S. has the authority under existing UN resolutions to take the necessary steps, including military steps, to protect our vital interests in the Gulf. In any case, American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on Unanimity in the UN Security Council."
When the Clinton administration declined to launch an unprovoked ground invasion, PNAC executed a secondary legislative pressure campaign, addressing an open letter on May 29, 1998, to Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott. This effort led directly to the passage of the *Iraq Liberation Act of 1998* (Public Law 105-338), which was signed into law on October 31, 1998.
The statute declared it statutory United States policy to support efforts to remove Saddam Hussein from power, allocated federal funding to Ahmad Chalabi's exile coalition, the Iraqi National Congress (INC), and constructed the legal precedent that the Bush administration subsequently operationalized in 2002 and 2003.

Post-9/11 Instrumentalization: Converting Crisis into War

The catastrophic terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, provided the exact "catastrophic and catalyzing event" theorized in the RAD report one year earlier. Declassified notes, logs, and contemporaneous memoranda demonstrate that key PNAC signatories inside the national security structure immediately moved to superimpose their pre-existing regional regime-change agenda onto the national crisis.
At approximately 2:40 PM on the afternoon of September 11, 2001—while the Pentagon was still burning—Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld dictated handwritten instructions to his senior aides. Declassified records capture Rumsfeld's explicit command to target Iraq immediately, explicitly acknowledging that the state target might be unconnected to the terrorist attack:
"Best info fast. Judge whether good enough hit S.H. [Saddam Hussein] @ same time. Not only UBL [Usama bin Laden]. Go massive. Sweep it all up. Things related and not."
Four days later, during the national security strategy retreat at Camp David on September 15, 2001, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz formally advocated that the United States launch an immediate military strike against Iraq rather than limiting military action to Afghanistan. Wolfowitz asserted a "10-to-50 percent chance" of Iraqi involvement and argued that Iraq presented a more accessible theater for demonstrating American military dominance.
On September 20, 2001—nine days after the attacks—PNAC sent an open letter to President George W. Bush. The letter insisted that any comprehensive counter-terrorism doctrine must mandate the military overthrow of the Ba'athist regime in Baghdad, regardless of evidentiary links:
"...any strategy aiming at the eradication of terrorism and its sponsors must include a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. This includes a willingness to apply military force, even if evidence does not link Iraq directly to the attack."
To manufacture the public consensus required for an unprovoked invasion, the administration established the White House Iraq Group (WHIG) in August 2002. Chaired by White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card and featuring strategic planners Karl Rove, I. Lewis Libby, and

Condoleezza Rice, WHIG operated as an internal communications center tasked with coordinating a synchronized marketing strategy for the war.
WHIG drafted high-impact rhetorical warnings, specifically introducing speechwriter Michael Gerson's phrase regarding the danger of a "smoking gun" taking the form of a "mushroom cloud". This metaphor was systematically leaked to *The New York Times* and simultaneously repeated by Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, and National Security Advisor Rice across Sunday television broadcasts, establishing a false narrative of nuclear imminence.

The Bureaucratic Engine of Deception: The Office of Special Plans

Because professional analysts within the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR) repeatedly concluded that no operational alliance existed between Ba'athist Iraq and Al-Qaeda, senior Department of Defense officials constructed a parallel intelligence cell designed to produce findings aligned with executive policy.
In the summer of 2002, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Douglas Feith expanded the Pentagon's internal Policy Counterterrorism Evaluation Group into the Office of Special Plans (OSP). Situated in Room 4E936 of the Pentagon and directed by Abram Shulsky, a neoconservative analyst affiliated with PNAC, the OSP operated outside established intelligence verification procedures.
The operational method of the OSP was defined by "raw stovepiping"—a process wherein uncorroborated, unvetted intelligence reports were routed directly to the Office of the Vice President and the National Security Council, bypassing the analytical checks of the Director of Central Intelligence.
The primary raw material feeding this pipeline originated from Ahmad Chalabi's Iraqi National Congress (INC), which was funded by U.S. taxpayers. INC defectors delivered fabricated intelligence regarding weapons of mass destruction and non-existent operational links to transnational terrorist networks.

Disinformation Claim / Casus Belli	OSP Intelligence Pipeline & Primary Source	Professional Intelligence Community Consensus (Pre-War)	Post-War Forensic Verification & Inquiry Findings
Mobile Biological Warfare Laboratories	Sourced via INC defector Rafid Ahmed Alwan al-Janabi ("Curveball").	German Intelligence (BND) and DIA issued formal notices marking "Curveball" as unstable.	Iraq Survey Group confirmed the mobile units were harmless facilities producing tactical weather balloons.
Iraqi Purchase of Niger Yellowcake Uranium	Forged documents funneled through Italian intelligence conduits to OSP.	CIA and State Dept INR flagged documents as obvious forgeries; Ambassador Joseph Wilson verified claim was false.	Formally debunked by the IAEA; confirmed as crude document forgeries featuring fake official signatures.
Conspiratorial 9/11 Link (Prague Meeting)	OSP promoted claims that hijacker Mohamed	CIA and FBI tracking logs confirmed	Senate Intelligence Committee confirmed

Disinformation Claim / Casus Belli	OSP Intelligence Pipeline & Primary Source	Professional Intelligence Community Consensus (Pre-War)	Post-War Forensic Verification & Inquiry Findings
	Atta met Iraqi intelligence in Prague.	Mohamed Atta was inside the United States in Florida during the alleged meeting.	no meeting occurred; claim was entirely fabricated.
High-Strength Aluminum Tubes for Centrifuges	Pentagon analysts asserted imported aluminum tubes were destined for uranium enrichment.	Department of Energy (DOE) centrifuge experts confirmed tubes were designed for standard tactical rockets.	Post-invasion physical audits confirmed DOE analysis; zero centrifuges or nuclear enrichment programs existed.
Ansar al-Islam Operational Bridge to Al-Qaeda	OSP claimed Saddam Hussein harbored and operationalized violent jihadist networks.	CIA assessments emphasized Ba'athist secular ideology was fundamentally hostile to violent Islamist movements.	Senate Intelligence Committee Phase II Report (2007) confirmed zero operational links or joint planning existed.

The official post-war investigation conducted by the Department of Defense Inspector General concluded that Douglas Feith's Office of Special Plans had engaged in "inappropriate, non-validated, and unauthorized activities" by manufacturing alternative intelligence assessments that bypassed established review processes to justify a pre-determined policy. This was corroborated by the British Chilcot Inquiry (2016), which declassified a secret memorandum from Prime Minister Tony Blair to President George W. Bush dated July 28, 2002. Opening with the commitment "I will be with you, whatever," the memo revealed that the commitment to invade Iraq was finalized eight months prior to the commencement of hostilities, confirming the contemporaneous assessment of the July 2002 UK "Downing Street Memo" that "the facts were being fixed around the policy".

Defense Economics, Corporate Interlocks, and Accounting Opacity

The execution of PNAC's transformation strategy triggered a massive reallocation of public funds into the defense-industrial sector. The post-9/11 national security strategy replaced post-Cold War fiscal restraint with a sustained, multi-trillion-dollar defense expansion. Between 2001 and 2009, the base U.S. defense budget nearly doubled, expanding from $287 billion to over $530 billion. This base growth was augmented by off-budget emergency supplemental funding passed as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) appropriations. From 2001 through 2011, over $1.2 trillion was funneled through OCO mechanisms specifically to finance military campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Because OCO appropriations were exempt from statutory federal budget caps, they provided an unconstrained off-budget mechanism to fund long-term military modernization, global power projection, and private contractor logistics envisioned in the 2000 RAD report.

Defense Industrial Entity	Executive Interlock / PNAC Connection	Primary Contract Mechanism	Post-9/11 Revenue Acceleration
Halliburton / KBR	Dick Cheney (CEO of Halliburton 1995–2000; Vice President 2001–2009).	Non-competitive, sole-source LOGCAP III logistics & infrastructure restoration contracts.	Pentagon contract revenue surged from $491 million (2002) to over $3.1 billion (2003); awarded billions in no-bid contracts.
The Carlyle Group	Frank Carlucci (Former SecDef; Chairman); James Baker III; Bush Family investor ties.	Private equity acquisitions of defense technology suppliers and aerospace firms.	Managed defense portfolio assets expanded from $1 billion to over $20 billion during the post-9/11 procurement surge.
Lockheed Martin	Bruce P. Jackson (Director of PNAC; Vice President of Lockheed Martin).	National Missile Defense systems; advanced fighter aircraft programs (F-22, F-35).	Secured major funding increases for procurement priorities specified in the 2000 RAD report.
Boeing Defense	Richard Perle (PNAC Signatory; Chairman of Defense Policy Board).	Aerial refueling tankers; precision-guided munitions systems (JDAMs).	Substantial increases in procurement contracts for precision-strike technology and strategic airlift capabilities.

This rapid expansion of military spending operated alongside systemic structural accounting opacity. The Department of Defense consistently failed mandatory federal financial audits, leaving trillions of dollars in cumulative allocations untraceable.

This opacity was compounded by the physical destruction of accounting infrastructure on September 11, 2001, when the attack on the Pentagon struck the Resource Services Washington (RSW) auditing office, and when World Trade Center Building 7 collapsed, destroying key federal financial fraud investigation records. The resulting lack of financial transparency shielded corporate profiteering, non-bid contracting abuse, and institutional conflicts of interest.

International Legal Audit: Preemption, the UN Charter, and the Crime of Aggression

The execution of the 2003 invasion of Iraq without an explicit United Nations Security Council mandate represented a structural violation of international legal frameworks established post-1945. Evaluating the operational pretexts of the war against established international law confirms fundamental breaches of *jus ad bellum*.

Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter establishes a universal prohibition on the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Under positive international law, only two exceptions to this absolute prohibition exist: actions explicitly

authorized by the UN Security Council pursuant to Chapter VII powers, or individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 in response to an actual armed attack or an imminent threat.
The legal pretexts presented by U.S. and UK executive authorities failed to meet either exception. The administration argued that UN Security Council Resolution 1441 (passed in November 2002) revived prior authorization from Resolution 678 (1990) due to Iraqi breaches of weapons inspection regimes.
However, international legal consensus establishes that Resolution 1441 contained no explicit "all necessary means" authorization required to permit military force. The Security Council explicitly refused to pass a secondary resolution authorizing military action in early 2003, rendering the invasion a unilateral military action conducted outside Chapter VII authority.
To justify striking a state that had committed no armed attack against the United States, the Bush administration articulated the "Preemption Doctrine" in its September 2002 National Security Strategy. This doctrine redefined self-defense to include anticipatory military strikes against speculative future threats.
Under customary international law, established in the *Caroline* incident (1837), anticipatory self-defense is strictly permissible only when the necessity of self-defense is "instant, overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation".
Because Ba'athist Iraq possessed no operational weapons of mass destruction, no active nuclear enrichment infrastructure, no long-range delivery systems capable of striking the U.S., no operational links to the 9/11 attacks, and was subject to continuous international inspection regimes, no imminent threat existed. Re-interpreting "imminent self-defense" to justify speculative preemptive intervention violated established customary international law.
The legal framework established by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg categorized unprovoked aggressive war as the primary international offense. The Nuremberg Tribunal famously concluded:
"War is essentially an evil thing. Its consequences are not confined to the belligerent States alone, but affect the whole world. To initiate a war of aggression, therefore, is not only an international crime; it is the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole."
This principle—codified under the Nuremberg Principles as a "Crime Against Peace"—was updated under Article 8 *bis* of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Article 8 *bis* defines the crime of aggression as:
"...the planning, preparation, initiation or execution, by a person in a position effectively to exercise control over or to direct the political or military action of a State, of an act of aggression which, by its character, gravity and scale, constitutes a manifest violation of the Charter of the United Nations."
Because the 2003 invasion of Iraq involved the full-scale military invasion, occupation, and forcible overthrow of a sovereign state based on fabricated pretexts and in direct breach of UN Charter Article 2(4), the military campaign constitutes an unlawful war of aggression under international legal standards.

Systemic Legacy and Synthesis

The transformation of PNAC’s strategic vision into official state doctrine generated profound structural impacts across international law, domestic governance, and geopolitical stability. Dismantling the Iraqi civil administration, military apparatus, and state security infrastructure through radical "De-Ba'athification" shattered the regional balance of power in the Persian Gulf.

The resulting institutional vacuum precipitated prolonged sectarian warfare, expanded regional influence for neighboring autocracies, and created the operational conditions that led to the emergence of transnational jihadist movements, including the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS).

Concurrently, executing an unprovoked invasion without Security Council backing severely degraded the norm against aggressive war established in 1945. It created a precedent of unilateral preemption that major nuclear powers subsequently cited to justify their own military interventions against sovereign states.

Domestically, the OSP's success in bypassing professional intelligence verification demonstrated how dedicated executive networks can manipulate administrative mechanisms to manufacture a *casus belli*, undermining public confidence in national security institutions.

The post-9/11 era also institutionalized a permanent expansion of executive authority. Expanded domestic surveillance programs under the USA PATRIOT Act and Total Information Awareness, off-budget war financing through Overseas Contingency Operations accounts, extrajudicial detention, and sanctioned enhanced interrogation protocols were integrated into state practice.

Historical evidence confirms that the post-9/11 foreign policy trajectory was driven by a pre-existing ideological blueprint formulated throughout the 1990s. The Project for the New American Century served as the primary institutional vehicle through which an ideologically unified network gained control of the national security apparatus.

By instrumentalizing the national trauma of September 11, 2001, as their anticipated "catastrophic and catalyzing event," this network superimposed their pre-planned agenda onto national security policy, manufactured a false *casus belli* through parallel intelligence channels, and executed an unlawful war of aggression that permanently transformed American democracy and global stability.

Works cited

1. THE CATALYZING EVENT The Project for the New American Century, 9:11 & The Architecture of Pre-Planned War .pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=18iF-i_N8J5ZqpiMxGy_jb1KRRHAiyBqg 2. Doctrinal Transformation and Institutional Capture....pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1nlwb6GGfpXhWKKzLCU_tPfBnSLqocL-o 3. ThePathToWar(PNAC-IRAQ).pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1EkZd_q4zSd9PpZqXuSmEAYsFrhNLqrLh 4. Neoconservatism, the Project for the New American, https://scholarworks.uno.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3254&context=td 5. An American Primacy - The Project for the New American Century and its Doctrine for US Global Leadership .pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=13pDIAM-dQhnaJZQfwMDHGWRH6knv8Uul 6. Briefing Document: Post-9/11 Geopolitical Architecture, Strategic Planning, and Institutional Analysis, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1lkjPGvRhuQ0zCCcDsuEuT9mDGEEsFSY15u087QLzGXI 7. War_An_Investigation_Exposing_the_Project_for_the_New_American_Century__PNAC___Influence_and_Controversies.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1JmWEHQdEXOyDQ8dNMXM1cs6hZ0MZ0JBQ 8. OSINT Report: Project for the New American Century (PNAC).pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1uawKEBmX-NbfY1ybP_zrzge_82wL3ffG 9. Project for the New American Century - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_for_the_New_American_Century 10. The Path to War: From the PNAC Blueprint to the Invasion of Iraq.pdf,

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1dIzsJhEY7AacacAB6CIjzDBYcrw9GABi 11. Rebuilding America's Defenses 2000 | PDF | National Security - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/doc/9651/Rebuilding-Americas-Defenses-PNAC 12. Research Framework for Defense and Finance.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1BRbvc6vjWhzSSWv89Hhnwnzi0r_If9Qu 13. Donald_Rumsfeld.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1Jy3P_l4XOdercc0iL7J7__gX6HxgnviJ 14. Forensic Analysis of the Architecture of Conflict: Ideology, War Profiteering, and Accountability Failures in the War on Terror.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1wjtKUa-WgSiMw8lRGsQcq4Ry-z2X2-rW 15. Documents.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=13xTTMOi6Wr5UWB2RFV4Uyn96JfOCJu1B 16. OSINT Report - PNAC, 9:11, and the Path to War in Iraq.pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=18-ouNNyGmMauY1Hw-avc_oou20TSNCyq 17. ARCHITECTS OF INTERVENTION The Project for the New American Century and the Pre-Meditation of the Iraq War (1997-2003).pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1IzoH2Gl4HRuK5s7UcKzCp-xNgJSo_Hxz 18. OSINT REPORT: THE PNAC ARCHITECTURAL FRAMEWORK AND THE IRAQ WAR (1997–2003).pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1qMBanrhcfNgCDlpkGK3BSPvlMkPEnueW 19. The Unipole in Twilight: American Strategy from 9/11 to the Present, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/2021-08/logan-tir-8-26-2021.pdf 20. Paying for War: Funding U.S. Military Operations Since 2001 - RAND, https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/rgs_dissertations/2011/RAND_RGSD283.pdf 21. THE WAR IN IRAQ AND INTERNATIONAL LAW, https://law.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1681149/Simpson.pdf 22. The Crime of Aggression: A Response to the Maryland Journal of, https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1741&context=mjil 23. Implications of the Criminalization of Aggression, https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/NR/rdonlyres/6B2BA9C6-C5B5-417A-8EF4-DA3CA0902172/282974/07022011_ImplicationsoftheCriminalizationofAggress.pdf 24. Closing Impunity Gaps for the Crime of Aggression, https://cjil.uchicago.edu/print-archive/closing-impunity-gaps-crime-aggression 25. Aggressors' Rights: The Doctrine of 'Equality between Belligerents, https://digitalcommons.osgoode.yorku.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1915&context=scholarly_works 26. The Missing Piece Defining the Crime of Aggression, https://lup.lub.lu.se/luur/download?func=downloadFile&recordOId=1557034&fileOId=1564187 27. Universal Jurisdiction and the Crime of Aggression, https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1745&context=faculty_publications 28. UNCLASSIFIED REPORT - PNAC (PROJECT FOR NEW AME....pdf, https://drive.google.com/open?id=1CIus49JCiCUcyKzLyqgYcniYc9L2axHw