Project for the New American Century

The Project for the New American Century (PNAC) is an American neoconservative think tank based in Washington, D.C., co-founded as "a non-profit educational organization" by William Kristol and Robert Kagan in early 1997. The PNAC's stated goal is "to promote American global leadership."[1] Fundamental to the PNAC are the views that "American leadership is both good for America and good for the world" and support for "a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity."[2] It has exerted strong influence on high-level U.S. government officials in the administration of U.S President George W. Bush and strongly affected the George Bush administration's development of military and foreign policies, especially involving national security and the Iraq War.[3][4][5] As of May 20, 2008, The Project for the New American Century website was inoperable. A message saying that the account has been suspended and to contact the billing department was put on the sites page.

Background and history

An initiative of the New Citizenship Project, a 501(c)(3) organization headed by William Kristol (Chairman) and Gary Schmitt (President),[1] the Project for the New American Century is funded in part by such organizations as the Sarah Scaife Foundation, the John M. Olin Foundation and the Bradley Foundation.[6]

On January 26, 1998, in the PNAC's open letter to President Bill Clinton, its members explicitly called for a U.S. ground campaign to oust Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq.[7]

Further information: #Open letter to President Clinton on Iraq

The goal of regime change remained their consistent position throughout the Iraq disarmament crisis.[8] They followed that up with a letter to Republican members of the U.S. Congress Newt Gingrich and Trent Lott.[9]

On November 16, 1998, citing Iraq's demand for the expulsion of UN weapons inspectors and the removal of Richard Butler as head of the inspections regime, William Kristol, co-founder of the PNAC and editor of The Weekly Standard, called again for regime change in an editorial in his online magazine: "...any sustained bombing and missile campaign against Iraq should be part
of any overall political-military strategy aimed at removing Saddam from power.Kristol states that Paul Wolfowitz and others believed that the goal was to create "a 'liberated zone' in southern Iraq that would provide a safe haven where opponents of Saddam could rally and organize a credible alternative to the present regime ... The liberated zone would have to be protected by U.S. military might, both from the air and, if necessary, on the ground."
The PNAC also supported the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (H.R.4655), which President Clinton had signed into law.[11] In January of 1999, the PNAC circulated a memo that criticized the December 1998 bombing of Iraq in Operation Desert Fox as ineffective, questioned the viability of Iraqi democratic opposition which the U.S. was supporting through the Iraq Liberation Act, and referred to any "containment" policy as an illusion.[12] In September 2000, the PNAC published a controversial 90-page report entitled Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategies, Forces, and Resources For a New Century.

Further information: #Rebuilding America's Defenses

From 2001 through 2002, the co-founders and other members of the PNAC published articles supporting the United States' invasion of Iraq.[13] On its website, the PNAC promoted its point of view that leaving Saddam Hussein in power would be "surrender to terrorism."[14][15][16][17] On September 20, 2001 (nine days after the September 11, 2001 attacks), the PNAC sent a letter to President George W. Bush, advocating "a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq," or regime change:

...even if evidence does not link Iraq directly to the attack, any strategy aiming at the eradication of terrorism and its sponsors must include a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq. Failure to undertake such an effort will constitute an early and perhaps decisive surrender in the war on international terrorism.[18][4]

In 2003, during the period leading up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the PNAC had seven full-time staff members in addition to its board of directors.[1] According to Tom Barry, "The glory days of the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) quickly passed but the website is still functioning and was updated as of Feb 8, 2007.[19][20]

As quoted in Paul Reynolds' BBC News report, David Rothkopf states:

Their [The Project for the New American Century's] signal enterprise was the invasion of Iraq and their failure to produce results is clear. Precisely the opposite has happened. The US use of force has been seen as doing wrong and as inflaming a region that has been less than susceptible to democracy. Their plan has fallen on hard times. There were flaws in the conception and horrendously bad execution. The neo-cons have been undone by their own ideas and the incompetence of the Bush administration.[20]

Gary Schmitt, former executive director of the PNAC, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and director of its program in Advanced Strategic Studies, countered that PNAC had come to a natural end:

When the project started, it was not intended to go forever. That is why we are shutting it down. We would have had to spend too much time raising money for it and it has already done its job. We felt at the time that there were flaws in American foreign policy, that it was neo-isolationist. We tried to resurrect a Reaganite policy. Our view has been adopted. Even during the Clinton administration we had an effect, with Madeleine Albright [then secretary of state] saying that the United States was 'the indispensable nation'. But our ideas have not necessarily dominated. We did not have anyone sitting on Bush's shoulder. So the work now is to see how they are implemented.[20]

"Fundamental propositions"
The Project for the New American Century website states the following "fundamental propositions": "that American leadership is good both for America and for the world; and that such leadership requires military strength, diplomatic energy and commitment to moral principle."[22] Its original "Statement of Principles" of June 3, 1997, posted on its current website, begins by framing a series of questions, which the rest of the document proposes to answer:

As the 20th century draws to a close, the United States stands as the world's pre-eminent power. Having led the West to victory in the Cold War, America faces an opportunity and a 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?[21]
In response to these questions, the PNAC states its aim to "remind America" of "lessons" learned from American history, drawing the following "four consequences" for America in 1997:

- we need to increase defense spending significantly if we are to carry out our global responsibilities today and modernize our armed forces for the future;
- we need to strengthen our ties to democratic allies and to challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values;
- we need to promote the cause of political and economic freedom abroad; [and]
- we 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.

While "Such a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity may not be fashionable today [1997]," the "Statement of Principles" concludes, "it is necessary if the United States is to build on the successes of this past century and to ensure our security and our greatness in the next."[21]

Open letter to President Clinton on Iraq

On January 16, 1998, following perceived Iraqi unwillingness to co-operate with UN weapons inspections, members of the PNAC, including Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and Robert Zoellick drafted an open letter to President Bill Clinton, posted on its website, urging President Clinton to remove Saddam Hussein from power using U.S. diplomatic, political, and military power. The signers argue that Saddam would pose a threat to the United States, its Middle East allies, and oil resources in the region, if he succeeded in maintaining what they asserted was a stockpile of Weapons of Mass Destruction. They also state: "we can no longer depend on our partners in the Gulf War to continue to uphold the sanctions or to punish Saddam when he blocks or evades UN inspections" and "American policy cannot continue to be crippled by a misguided insistence on unanimity in the UN Security Council." They argue that an Iraq war would be justified by Hussein's defiance of UN "containment" policy and his persistent threat to U.S. interests.[7]

Rebuilding America's Defenses

Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategies, Forces, and Resources For a New Century (2000), which lists as Project Chairmen Donald Kagan and Gary Schmitt and as Principal Author Thomas Donnelly, quotes from the PNAC's June 1997 "Statement of Principles" and proceeds "from the belief that America should seek to preserve and extend its position of global leadership by maintaining the preeminence of U.S. military forces."[22][23]

The report argues:

The American peace has proven itself peaceful, stable, and durable. It has, over the past decade, provided the geopolitical framework for widespread economic growth and the spread of American principles of liberty and democracy. Yet no moment in international politics can be frozen in time; even a global Pax Americana will not preserve itself.[22]

After its title page, the report features a page entitled "About the Project for the New American Century", quoting key passages from its 1997 "Statement of Principles":

"[What we require is] a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges; a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad; and national leadership that accepts the United States' global responsibilities. Of course, the United States must be prudent in how it exercises its power. But we cannot safely avoid the responsibilities of global leadership of the costs that are associated with its exercise. America has a vital role in maintaining peace and security in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. If we shirk our responsibilities, we invite challenges to our fundamental interests. The history of the 20th century should have taught us that it is important to shape circumstances before crises emerge, and to meet threats before they become dire. The history of the past century should have taught us to embrace the cause of American leadership."

[22]

In its "Preface", in highlighted boxes, Rebuilding America's Defenses states that it aims to:

ESTABLISH FOUR CORE MISSIONS for the U.S. military:
- defend the American homeland;
- fight and decisively win multiple, simultaneous major theater wars;
- perform the "constabulary" duties associated with shaping the security environment in critical regions;
- transform U.S. forces to exploit the “revolution in military affairs”;

and that

To carry out these core missions, we need to provide sufficient force and budgetary allocations. In particular, the United States must:

**MAINTAIN NUCLEAR STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY,** basing the U.S. deterrent upon a global, nuclear net assessment that weighs the full range of current and emerging threats, not merely the U.S.-Russia balance.

**RESTORE THE PERSONNEL STRENGTH** of today’s force to roughly the levels anticipated in the “Base Force” outlined by the Bush Administration, an increase in active-duty strength from 1.4 million to 1.6 million.

**REPOSITION U.S. FORCES** to respond to 21st century strategic realities by shifting permanently-based forces to Southeast Europe and Southeast Asia, and by changing naval deployment patterns to reflect growing U.S. strategic concerns in East Asia.

(iv)

It specifies the following goals:

**MODERNIZE CURRENT U.S. FORCES SELECTIVELY,** proceeding with the F-22 program while increasing purchases of lift, electronic support and other aircraft; expanding submarine and surface combatant fleets; purchasing Comanche helicopters and medium-weight ground vehicles for the Army, and the V-22 Osprey “tilt-rotor” aircraft for the Marine Corps.

**CANCEL “ROADBLOCK” PROGRAMS** such as the Joint Strike Fighter, CVX aircraft carrier, and Crusader howitzer system that would absorb exorbitant amounts of Pentagon funding while providing limited improvements to current capabilities. Savings from these canceled programs should be used to spur the process of military transformation.

**DEVELOP AND DEPLOY GLOBAL MISSILE DEFENSES** to defend the American homeland and American allies, and to provide a secure basis for U.S. power projection around the world.

**CONTROL THE NEW “INTERNATIONAL COMMONS” OF SPACE AND “CYBERSPACE,”** and pave the way for the creation of a new military service – U.S. Space Forces – with the mission of space control.

**EXPLOIT THE “REVOLUTION IN MILITARY AFFAIRS”** to insure the long-term superiority of U.S. conventional forces. Establish a two-stage transformation process which

- maximizes the value of current weapons systems through the application of advanced technologies, and
- produces more profound improvements in military capabilities, encourages competition between single services and joint-service experimentation efforts.

**INCREASE DEFENSE SPENDING** gradually to a minimum level of 3.5 to 3.8 percent of gross domestic product, adding $15 billion to $20 billion to total defense spending annually. (v)

The report emphasizes:

Fulfilling these requirements is essential if America is to retain its militarily dominant status for the coming decades. Conversely, the failure to meet any of these needs must result in some form of strategic retreat. At current levels of defense spending, the only option is to try ineffectually to “manage” increasingly large risks: paying for today’s needs by shortchanging tomorrow’s; withdrawing from constabulary missions to retain strength for large-scale wars; “choosing” between presence in Europe or presence in Asia; and so on. These are bad choices. They are also false economies. The “savings” from withdrawing from the Balkans, for example, will not free up anywhere near the magnitude of funds needed for military modernization or transformation. But these are false economies in other, more profound ways as well. The true cost of not meeting our defense requirements will be a lessened capacity for American global leadership and, ultimately, the loss of a global security order that is uniquely friendly to American principles and prosperity. (v-vi)

In relation to the Persian Gulf, citing particularly Iraq and Iran, *Rebuilding America’s Defenses* states that "while the unresolved conflict in Iraq provides the immediate justification [for U.S. military presence], the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein" and "Over the long term, Iran may well prove as large a threat to U.S. interests in the Gulf as Iraq has. And even should U.S.-Iranian relations improve, retaining forward-based forces in the region would still be an essential element in U.S. security strategy given the longstanding American interests in the region."[22]

One of the core missions outlined in the 2000 report *Rebuilding America's Defenses* is "fight and decisively win multiple, simultaneous major theater wars."[26]

The report also states:

"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"

The report *Rebuilding America's Defenses* has been the subject of much analysis and criticism.[4][5]

**Controversy**

**US World Dominance ("American Empire")**

According to its critics, the PNAC promotes American "hegemony" and "Full-spectrum" dominance in its own publications featured on its website.[27][28][29][30]

Ebrahim Afsah, in "Creed, Cabal, or Conspiracy – The Origins of the Current Neo-Conservative Revolution in US Strategic Thinking", published in the *German Law Journal*, cites Jochen Bölsche's view that the goal of the PNAC is world dominance or global hegemony by the United States.[31][32] According to Bölsche, *Rebuilding America's Defenses* "was developed by Rumsfeld, Cheney, Wolfowitz and Libby, and is devoted to matters of 'maintaining US pre-eminence, thwarting rival powers and shaping the global security system according to US interests.'"[31][32]

William Rivers Pitt, editorial director of *Progressive Democrats of America*, writes, in an editorial published by *Truthout.org*, that the PNAC is motivated by an imperial agenda of US military expansionism, which will bring negative side effects to ordinary citizens of the United States, while it enriches some industries: "defense contractors who sup on American tax revenue will be handsomely paid for arming this new American empire."[33]

George Monbiot, a political activist from the United Kingdom, observes: "...to pretend that this battle begins and ends in Iraq requires a willful denial of the context in which it occurs. That context is a blunt attempt by the superpower to reshape the world to suit itself."[34]

PNAC co-founder Robert Kagan counters such criticism in his statement during a debate on whether or not "The United States Is, and Should Be, an Empire":

"There is a vital distinction between being powerful--even most powerful in the world--and being an empire. Economic expansion does not equal imperialism, and there is no such thing as "cultural imperialism". If America is an empire, then why was it unable to mobilize its subjects to support the war against Saddam Hussein? America is not an empire, and its power stems from voluntary associations and alliances. American hegemony is relatively well accepted because people all over the world know that U.S. forces will eventually withdraw from the occupied territories. The effect of declaring that the United States is an empire would not only be factually wrong, but strategically catastrophic. Contrary to the exploitative purposes of the British, the American intentions of spreading democracy and individual rights are incompatible with the notion of an empire. The genius of American power is expressed in the movie The Godfather II, where, like Hyman Roth, the United States has always made money for its partners. America has not turned countries in which it intervened into deserts; it enriched them. Even the Russians knew they could surrender after the Cold War without being subjected to occupation."[35]

**Excessive focus on military strategies, neglect of diplomatic strategies**

Jeffrey Record, of the Strategic Studies Institute, in his monograph *Bounding the Global War on Terrorism*, Gabriel Kolko, research professor emeritus at York University in Toronto, and author of *Another Century of War?* (The New Press, 2002), in his article published in *CounterPunch*, and William Rivers Pitt, in *Truthout.org*, respectively, argue that the PNAC's goals of military hegemony exaggerate what the military can accomplish, that they fail to recognize "the limits of US power", and that favoring pre-emptive exercise of military might over diplomatic strategies can have "adverse side effects."[36][37][38] (Paul Reynolds and Max Boot have made similar observations.[27][28])

*The Sydney Morning Herald* publishes an English translation of an article published in German in *Der Spiegel* summarizing former President Jimmy Carter's position and stating that President Carter:

judges the PNAC agenda in the same way. At first, argues Carter, Bush responded to the challenge of September 11 in an effective and intelligent way, "but in the meantime a group of conservatives worked to get approval for their long held ambitions under the mantle of 'the war on terror'." The restrictions on civil rights in the US and at Guantanamo, cancellation of international accords, "contempt for the rest of the world", and finally an attack on Iraq "although there is no threat to the US from Baghdad" - all these things will have devastating consequences, according to Carter. "This entire unilateralism", warns the ex-President, "will increasingly isolate the US from those nations that we need in order to do battle with terrorism".[31]

Though not arguing that Bush administration PNAC members were complicit in those attacks, other social critics such as commentator Manuel Valenzuela and journalist Mark Danner,[38][39][40] investigative journalist John Pilger, in *The New
Inexperienced in realities of war

Former US Congressman Lionel Van Deerlin and UK Labour MP and Father of the House of Commons, Tam Dalyell, have criticized PNAC members for promoting policies which vociferously support an idealized version of war, even though only a handful of PNAC members have served in the military or, if they served, seen combat. 

In discussing the PNAC report *Rebuilding America's Defenses* (2000), Neil MacKay, investigations editor for the Scottish Sunday Herald, quotes Tam Dalyell: "This is garbage from right-wing think-tanks stuffed with chicken-hawks -- men who have never seen the horror of war but are in love with the idea of war. Men like Cheney, who were draft-dodgers in the Vietnam war. These are the thought processes of fantasist Americans who want to control the world."

Eliot A. Cohen, a signatory to the PNAC "Statement of Principles", responded in *The Washington Post*: "There is no evidence that generals as a class make wiser national security policymakers than civilians. George C. Marshall, our greatest soldier statesman after George Washington, opposed shipping arms to Britain in 1940. His boss, Franklin D. Roosevelt, with nary a day in uniform, thought otherwise. Whose judgment looks better?"

PNAC role in promoting invasion of Iraq

Commentators from divergent parts of the political spectrum—such as *Democracy Now!* and *American Free Press*, including Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Jody Williams and former Republican Congressmen Pete McCloskey and Paul Findley—have voiced their concerns about the influence of the PNAC on the decision by President George W. Bush to invade Iraq. Some have regarded the PNAC's January 16, 1998 letter to President Clinton, which urged him to embrace a plan for "the removal of Saddam Hussein's regime from power," and the large number of members of PNAC appointed to the Bush administration as evidence that the 2003 invasion of Iraq was a foregone conclusion. 

The television program *Frontline*, broadcast on PBS, presents the PNAC's letter to President Clinton as a notable event in the leadup to the Iraq war.

Media commentators have found it significant that signatories to the PNAC's January 16, 1998 letter to President Clinton (and some of its other position papers, letters, and reports) include such Bush administration officials as Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, John Bolton, Richard Armitage, and Elliott Abrams.

PNAC’s Rise to Power: Jeb Bush’s Role in 2000 US Presidential Election Controversy in Florida

In 2000, PNAC signator Dick Cheney and George W. Bush became the Vice President and President of the United States following a landmark Supreme Court decision to not perform a recount of the Florida votes in the highly contented U.S. Presidential Election in 2000. With a PNAC member in the number-two spot in the U.S. Federal Government, who could provide advice to the newly elected President on his White House appointments, many PNAC members were elevated from their nascent thinktank to many of the most powerful positions in the executive office of the United States, including Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of State, and multiple additional posts within the Defense and State Departments. It is inconclusive whether Cheney's affiliation with PNAC was related to these appointments, although it has been repeatedly alleged that Bush and Cheney had every intent of bringing PNAC’s foreign policy ideas to fruition in their administration.

The close election that brought Bush and Cheney to the White House hinged on the outcome of the Florida’s votes. At this time, the governor of Florida was Jeb Bush, also a PNAC signator. Jeb Bush, along with Katherine Harris, his secretary of state, were accused by the US Commission on Civil Rights of "injustice, ineptitude and inefficiency," and "gross dereliction of duty" with regard to Florida’s 2000 presidential election, which was riddled with numerous voting fraud issues. The commission found that Governor Bush knew that black voters were 10 times more likely to have their ballots rejected than white voters, often due to outdated voting technology in black and hispanic areas. It was also found that DBT Online (now ChoicePoint), the private company whose list of felons (who cannot vote in Florida) included non-felons and ex-felons, had warned Jeb Bush to check for irregularities prior to using its list in the election. This problem helped swing election results, as 93% of blacks in Florida (and 90% of blacks nationwide) voted for Gore, and while Bush and PNAC signator Cheney's
margin of victory in Florida was only 1,725 votes[67], at least 8,000 of the 173,000 people on the felons list had the right to vote, and 54% of the supposed felons were black[64]. It has been estimated that a total of 22,000 black democrats were barred from voting[68]. Jeb Bush's role in the alleged election fraud was further examined in a BBC report[68] by investigative journalist Greg Palast.

After the Supreme Court’s decision not to allow a recount in Florida, The NORC at the University of Chicago conducted a recount study that found that Bush won the 2000 election in Florida[69], although the possible votes from ex-felons, who were barred from filling out a ballot in the first place, were not considered.

William Rivers Pitt has asserted that Jeb's actions in the election fraud were done deliberately so that his fellow PNAC members would be assured the high-power posts in the Federal government that they received upon Bush and Cheney taking office[70]. Bernard Weiner noted that PNAC expected victory for its candidate, Cheney, in the 2000 election, and hence penned Rebuilding America’s Defenses just two months before the election[71]. This coincidence was also noticed by Steve Brouwer, who further claims that the organization’s very name (coined in 1997) was anticipatory of political takeover in 2000, right at the start of the new century[72]. However, records are scarce regarding whether Jeb’s decision to allow an election biased in favor of a fellow PNAC member to proceed was a purposeful attempt to bring PNAC to power or simply a coincidence.

Persons associated with the PNAC

Project directors

[as currently listed on the PNAC website:]

- William Kristol, Co-founder and Chairman[1]
- Bruce P. Jackson[1]
- Mark Gerson[1]
- Randy Scheunemann[1]

Project staff

- Ellen Bork, Deputy Director[1]
- Gary Schmitt, Senior Fellow[1][73]
- Thomas Donnelly, Senior Fellow[1]
- Reuel Marc Gerecht, Senior Fellow[1]
- Timothy Lehmann, Assistant Director[1]
- Michael Goldfarb, Research Associate[1]

Former directors and staff

- Daniel McKivergan, Deputy Director[74]

Signatories to Statement of Principles

- Elliott Abrams[21]
- Gary Bauer[21]
- William J. Bennett[21]
- John Ellis "Jeb" Bush[21]
- Richard B. Cheney[21]
- Eliot A. Cohen[21]
- Midge Decter[21]
- Paula Dobriansky[21]
- Steve Forbes[21]
- Aaron Friedberg[21]
- Francis Fukuyama[21]
- Frank Gaffney[21]
- Fred C. Ikle[21]
- Donald Kagan[21]
- Zalmay Khalilzad[21]
- I. Lewis "Scooter" Libby[21]
- Norman Podhoretz[21]
- J. Danforth Quayle[21]
- Peter W. Rodman[21]
- Stephen P. Rosen[21]
- Henry S. Rowen[21]
- Donald Rumsfeld[21]
- Vin Weber[21]
- George Weigel[21]
- Paul Wolfowitz[21]

Signatories or contributors to other significant letters or reports[23]

- Elliott Abrams[7][9]
- Kenneth Adelman[75]
- Richard V. Allen[18]
- Richard L. Armitage[7]
- Gary Bauer[18][75]
- Zalmay Khalilzad[7][9]
- Jeane Kirkpatrick[18]
- Charles Krauthammer[18]
- William Kristol[7][9][22][18]
- John Lehman[18][75]
After the election of George W. Bush in 2000, a number of PNAC's members or signatories were appointed to key positions within the President's administration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position(s) held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Abrams</td>
<td>Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Democracy, Human Rights, and International Operations (2001–2002), Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Near East and North African Affairs (2002–2005), Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Global Democracy Strategy (2005-) (all within the National Security Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Armitage</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary of State (2001-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Cheney</td>
<td>Vice President (2001-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot A. Cohen</td>
<td>Member of the Defense Policy Advisory Board (2007-) [83]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Cropsey</td>
<td>Director of the International Broadcasting Bureau (12/2002-12/2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Dobriansky</td>
<td>Under-Secretary of State for Global Affairs (2001-2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fukuyama</td>
<td>Member of the President's Council on Bioethics (2001-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Lewis &quot;Scooter&quot; Libby</td>
<td>Chief of Staff for the Vice President (2001-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Secretary of Defense (2001-2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Scheunemann</td>
<td>Member of the U.S. Committee on NATO, Project on Transitional Democracies, International Republican Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Wolfowitz</td>
<td>Deputy Secretary of Defense (2001-2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References in popular culture**

- The band KMFDM have a song called "New American Century" on their 2005 album *Hau Ruck*, which includes the lyrics "Love thy neighbor and turn him in, It's called patriotism" and "Those who cannot learn from history are doomed to repeat it!", reflecting a negative attitude towards PNAC.

- The band Anti-Flag have a song called "The Project for a New American Century" on their 2006 album *For Blood and Empire*, which addresses what they call the PNAC's support of fascism, Pax Americana, and American supremacy. In the song they ask people if they want American democracy or "PNAC fascism" [84]

**See also**

- American Century
- *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm*
- Committee for the Liberation of Iraq
- Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs
- Office of Special Plans
- *The Power of Nightmares*

**Notes**

1. "About PNAC", newamericancentury.org, n.d., accessed May 30, 2007: "Established in the spring of 1997, the Project for the New American Century is a non-profit, educational organization whose goal is to promote American global leadership. The Project is an initiative of the New Citizenship Project (501c3); the New Citizenship Project's chairman is William Kristol and its president is Gary Schmitt."
4. The PNAC is often identified as a "neo-con" or "right-wing think tank" in profiles featured on the websites of "left-wing" and "progressive" "policy institute" and "media watchdog" organizations, which are highly critical of it; see, e.g., "Profile: Project for the New American Century", Right Web (International Relations Center), November 22, 2003, accessed June 1, 2007.
6. "Funder profile: The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, Inc.", Media Transparency ("The Money behind the Conservative Media"), n.d., accessed May 28, 2007: e.g., "With $706 million in assets (2005), the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation of Milwaukee, Wisconsin is the country's largest and most influential right-wing foundation. As of the end of 2005, it was giving away more than $34 million a year [Bradley Foundation 2005 IRS 99-PF]."
23. ^ It is important to note that at the end of the list of "Project Participants", on page 90 of Rebuilding America's Defenses, there appears the following statement: "The above list of individuals participated in at least one project meeting or contributed a paper for discussion. The report is a product solely of the Project for the New American Century and does not necessarily represent the views of the project participants or their affiliated institutions."
24. ^ For additional information and projected building schedule [as updated], see CVX aircraft carrier, Federation of American Scientists, updated October 15, 2000, accessed June 1, 2007.
25. ^ In its emphasis on developing and deploying "Global Missile Defenses", the PNAC renews its call for the United States to abandon the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty between the U.S. and the former Soviet Union, from which the U.S. withdrew in 2002.
26. ^ Why Another Defense Review
43. ^abcd Christopher Bollyn, "America 'Pearl Harbored': Fanatical Warhorses Drafted Blueprint for Bloody U.S. World Domination Years Ago", American Free Press, December 24, 2002, accessed June 1, 2007. "The cabal of war fanatics advising the White House secretly planned a 'transformation of defense policy years ago, calling for war against Iraq and huge increases in military spending. A 'catalyzing event — like a new Pearl Harbor' — was seen as necessary to bring this about."
Further reading and media programs: Analysis and criticism

As of May 16 2008, newamericancentury.org redirects to a btnaccess.com page which states "This Account Has Been Suspended. Please contact the billing/support department as soon as possible."
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Century; Joseph Nye, Dean and Don K. Price Professor of Public Policy, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, and Victor Davis Hanson, former Professor of Greek, California State University, Fresno.

- "Project for the New American Century", Information Clearing House (ICH) (Article No. 1665)
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